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Terms of Reference

Responsibilities

This committee guides the physical development and growth of Auckland through a focus on land use planning, housing and the appropriate provision of infrastructure and strategic projects associated with these activities. Key responsibilities include:

- Relevant regional strategy and policy
- Infrastructure strategy and policy
- Unitary Plan
- Spatial plans
- Plan changes to operative plans
- Housing policy and projects
- Special Housing Areas
- City centre development
- Tamaki regeneration
- Built heritage
- Urban design
- Environmental matters relating to the committee’s responsibilities
- Acquisition of property relating to the committee’s responsibilities and within approved annual budgets
- Activities of the following Council Controlled Organisations:
  - Panuku Development Auckland
  - Auckland Transport
  - Watercare Services Limited

Powers

(i) All powers necessary to perform the committee’s responsibilities, including:
   (a) approval of a submission to an external body
   (b) establishment of working parties or steering groups.

(ii) The committee has the powers to perform the responsibilities of another committee, where it is necessary to make a decision prior to the next meeting of that other committee.

(iii) The committee does not have:
   (a) the power to establish subcommittees
   (b) powers that the Governing Body cannot delegate or has retained to itself (section 2).
Exclusion of the public – who needs to leave the meeting

Members of the public

All members of the public must leave the meeting when the public are excluded unless a resolution is passed permitting a person to remain because their knowledge will assist the meeting.

Those who are not members of the public

General principles

- Access to confidential information is managed on a “need to know” basis where access to the information is required in order for a person to perform their role.
- Those who are not members of the meeting (see list below) must leave unless it is necessary for them to remain and hear the debate in order to perform their role.
- Those who need to be present for one confidential item can remain only for that item and must leave the room for any other confidential items.
- In any case of doubt, the ruling of the chairperson is final.

Members of the meeting

- The members of the meeting remain (all Governing Body members if the meeting is a Governing Body meeting; all members of the committee if the meeting is a committee meeting).
- However, standing orders require that a councillor who has a pecuniary conflict of interest leave the room.
- All councillors have the right to attend any meeting of a committee and councillors who are not members of a committee may remain, subject to any limitations in standing orders.

Independent Māori Statutory Board

- Members of the Independent Māori Statutory Board who are appointed members of the committee remain.
- Independent Māori Statutory Board members and staff remain if this is necessary in order for them to perform their role.

Staff

- All staff supporting the meeting (administrative, senior management) remain.
- Other staff who need to because of their role may remain.

Local Board members

- Local Board members who need to hear the matter being discussed in order to perform their role may remain. This will usually be if the matter affects, or is relevant to, a particular Local Board area.

Council Controlled Organisations

- Representatives of a Council Controlled Organisation can remain only if required to for discussion of a matter relevant to the Council Controlled Organisation.
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1 Apologies

An apology from Cr J Watson has been received.

2 Declaration of Interest

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

3 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Planning Committee:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Monday, 5 February 2018 as a true and correct record.

4 Petitions

At the close of the agenda no requests to present petitions had been received.

5 Public Input

Standing Order 7.7 provides for Public Input. Applications to speak must be made to the Governance Advisor, in writing, no later than one (1) clear working day prior to the meeting and must include the subject matter. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders. A maximum of thirty (30) minutes is allocated to the period for public input with five (5) minutes speaking time for each speaker.

5.1 Public Input - Ben Ross - The Southern Airport Line, Airport to Botany Rapid Transit

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. Ben Ross will speak to the committee regarding the Southern Airport Line, Airport to Botany Rapid Transit, and the importance of completing it as soon as possible.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Planning Committee:

a) receive the presentation from Ben Ross regarding the importance of completing the Southern Airport Line, Airport to Botany Rapid Transit, as soon as possible and thank him for attending.

Attachments

A Southern Airport Line background information ........................................... 175
5.2 Public Input - Harriet Gale - Regional rapid rail

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Harriet Gale will speak to the committee about regional rapid rail.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) receive the public input presentation from Harriet Gale regarding regional rapid rail and thank her for attending.

6 Local Board Input

Standing Order 6.2 provides for Local Board Input. The Chairperson (or nominee of that Chairperson) is entitled to speak for up to five (5) minutes during this time. The Chairperson of the Local Board (or nominee of that Chairperson) shall wherever practical, give one (1) day’s notice of their wish to speak. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders.

This right is in addition to the right under Standing Order 6.1 to speak to matters on the agenda.

At the close of the agenda no requests for local board input had been received.

7 Extraordinary Business

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-

(a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and

(b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public,-

(i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and

(ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting.”

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,-

(a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-

(i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and
(ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but

(b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion."

8 Notices of Motion

There were no notices of motion.
Auckland Council District Plan (Hauraki Gulf Islands Section) 2013 - Decision to make the plan fully operative

File No.: CP2018/00458

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval to update and make fully operative the Auckland Council District Plan (Hauraki Gulf Islands Section) 2013 (‘the plan’) following the Environment Court’s final resolution of appeals.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. On 19 September 2013, Auckland Council resolved to declare the Auckland Council District Plan (Hauraki Gulf Islands Section) ‘operative in part’.

3. While the remaining appeals to the plan were being resolved, an exclusions schedule identified those parts subject to challenge, and therefore not made operative. On 22 May 2017 the Environment Court released its final decision, [2017] NZEnvC 074, on the last of the appeals (Attachment A).

4. The decision on the appeals between Thumb Point Station Limited, Huruhe Station Limited, Man O’War Farm Limited, Man O’War Station Limited, South Coast Station Limited and Auckland Council resolves the last of the parts under appeal, meaning that the exclusions schedule can now be removed, and the plan made fully operative.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) authorise the General Manager - Plans and Places to complete the necessary statutory processes required to update the Auckland Council District Plan (Hauraki Gulf Islands Section) and to make the plan fully operative in accordance with Clause 17 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Horopaki / Context

Background
5. In 2005 the former Auckland City Council began a review of the first-generation Auckland City District Plan: Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 1996. The formal statutory phase of the review commenced with the notification of the Proposed Plan on 11 September 2006. Submissions were heard between July 2007 and November 2008, with the Hearing Panel’s decision publicly notified on 4 May 2009. From 4 May 2009 until 27 July 2009, the Environment Court received 45 appeals to these decisions.

6. Since November 2009, the council has been working to resolve appeals to the plan. By the time the plan was made operative in part in September 2013, all but three appeals had been resolved.

7. At its meeting on 19 September 2013, the Regional Development and Operations Committee approved resolution RDO/2013/178, declaring that the Auckland Council District Plan (Hauraki Gulf Islands 2013) be made operative in part, pursuant to Clause 17(2) of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991. Following statutory processes under Clause 20(1) of Schedule 1, the plan then became operative in part on 7 October 2013, replacing the Auckland City District Plan: Hauraki Gulf Islands Section 1996.
8. The provisions of the plan that remained under challenge were not made operative and were listed in an exclusions schedule, to be removed once the remaining appeals were resolved.

9. The provisions of the plan currently remaining in the exclusions schedule are:

   - Part 10a - Land units, objectives, policies and activity tables
     (i) 10a.2 Landform 1 (coastal cliffs); 10a.3 Landform 2 (sand flats only); 10a.6 Landform 5 (productive land); 10a.7 Landform 6 (regenerating slopes); 10a.8 Landform 7 (forest and bush areas); 10a.26 land unit – Pakatoa

   - Part 10c - Development controls for land units and settlement areas
     (ii) Table 10c.5 Development controls Pakatoa and Rotoroa as they relate to Pakatoa Island only

   - Part 11 - Assessment matters

   - Part 12 - Subdivision
     (iii) 12.8 Discretionary activities; 12.9 General assessment criteria for discretionary activities; 12.10 Specific assessment criteria for discretionary activities

   - Part 14 - Definitions

**Appeal history**

10. The Environment Court released its decision in relation to the appeals on 22 May 2017. The decision explains that the appeals have had a long and complex history, with related appeals taken to the High Court, as well as a separate appeal taken to the Court of Appeal in relation to the higher order Auckland Regional Policy Statement (ARPS) introducing policy provisions for outstanding natural landscapes.

11. The Environment Court’s interim decision of 13 August 2014 addressed some aspects under appeal, with leave reserved to await the outcome of the aforementioned Man O’War appeal on the ARPS. This in part affected the timeliness of the subject appeals being resolved.

12. The Environment Court’s final decision on the outstanding matters of appeal between Thumb Point Station Limited, Huruhe Station Limited, Man O’War Farm Limited, Man O’War Station Limited, South Coast Station Limited (Appellants) and Auckland Council (Respondent) addressed the following topics: (Thumb Point Station Limited v Auckland Council [2017] NZEnvC 074)

   - A. Whether there is scope to include “alterations and additions” in the new restricted discretionary rule for non-production-related buildings in Landform 5
   - B. Whether the new “construction and relocation rule” applies to all visitor accommodation (of whatever size) in Landform 5.
   - C. The wording of an additional assessment criterion relating to multiple dwellings and Landforms 6 and 7.
   - D. Whether a specific (additional) non-notification rule is required for the new multiple dwelling rule.

13. The Environment Court’s final decision on these topics is annotated in the plan’s text, attached to this report as Attachment A.

14. The annotated text from the Environment Court decision needs to be incorporated into the plan. Once the text and tables are updated, the exclusions schedule summarised in paragraph 10 is no longer necessary and can be removed. The plan can then be declared fully operative.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views
15. The Waiheke and Great Barrier local boards have been updated on the final decision of the Environment Court, and they will be further informed when the plan is updated and made fully operative.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement
16. Making part or all of a plan operative under Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act is the final step in the plan-making process, but is largely administrative in nature. The impact of the Auckland District Plan (Hauraki Gulf Islands Section) 2013 on Māori was taken into account throughout the preparation of the plan, from initial drafting through to the resolution of the appeals.

17. In terms of future district plan provisions for the Hauraki Gulf Islands, there will be an opportunity for renewed engagement with Māori through the incorporation of the islands subject to the Auckland District Plan (Hauraki Gulf Islands Section) 2013 into the Auckland Unitary Plan. A recommended process and timeframe for this work will be brought to the Planning Committee for approval in March or April this year.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
18. There are administrative costs associated with updating the plan to make it fully operative; these costs are provided for within the existing Plans and Places department budget. As this report relates to the resolution of the last of the appeals to the plan, there are no further costs required for litigation.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
19. The recommendations in this report are a result of an Environment Court decision and are procedural. They do not result in substantive changes to existing policy. Therefore, there is a low level, if any, of risk associated with making the plan fully operative and removing the exclusions schedule. Having the plan fully operative will allow for more efficient and effective processing of resource consents.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
20. The next step is updating the plan on the council website, notifying the date on which the plan becomes fully operative and advising stakeholder users of the update.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Environment Court Decision</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Joao Machado - Team Leader Planning - Central/Islands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>John Duguid - General Manager - Plans and Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Quinn - Chief of Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENT COURT

Decision No. [2017] NZEnvC 074

IN THE MATTER of an appeal under Clause 14 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act)

BETWEEN

THUMB POINT STATION LIMITED,
HURUHE STATION LIMITED, MAN O'WAR
FARM LIMITED, MAN O'WAR STATION
LIMITED AND SOUTH COAST STATION
LIMITED
(ENV-2009-AKL-000336)
Appellants

AND

AUCKLAND COUNCIL (formerly Auckland Regional Council)
(ENV-2009-AKL-000329)
Appellant

AND

AUCKLAND COUNCIL (formerly Auckland City Council)
Respondent

Decision made on the papers

Court:
Principal Environment Judge LJ Newhook
Environment Commissioner RM Dunlop
Environment Commissioner I Buchanan

Representation:
Mr GC Lanning for Auckland Council
Mr MJE Williams for Thumb Point Station Limited, Huruhe Station Limited, Man O' War Farm Limited, Man O' War Station Limited and South Coast Station Limited (Appellants to ENV-2009-AKL-000336) and Thumb Point Station Limited (s.274 party to ENV-2009-AKL-000329)
Date of Decision: 22 May 2017  
Date of Issue: 22 May 2017

FINAL DECISION OF THE ENVIRONMENT COURT

A: The parties’ joint and agreed responses on consequential matters on which leave was reserved, confirmed.

B: No order as to costs

REASONS

Introduction

[1] These appeals have had a rather long history, in part occasioned by the time taken over appeals to the High Court in connection with them, and a separate appeal as far as the Court of Appeal concerning a higher order policy document, the Auckland Regional Policy Statement.¹

[2] The parties received the High Court decision refusing the appeal against our interim decision, as long as ago as May 2015. Unfortunately they overlooked filing a memorandum about the matters on which we had reserved leave until the end of 2016. To be fair however, even at the time they responded, the Court of Appeal was yet to issue its decision on the higher order instrument.²

The Consequential Topics to be Addressed

[3] The Court gave leave to address detailed responses on the following topics:

¹ Man O’War Station Ltd v Auckland Council [2017] NZCA 24.
² The decision of the Environment Court on the Regional Policy Statement was upheld by the Court of Appeal (and the High Court before it), so it is considered that no adjustments are required to our interim decision in the present appeals.
A. Whether there is scope to include "alterations and additions" in the new restricted discretionary rule for non-production-related buildings in Landform 5.\(^3\)

B. Whether the new "construction and relocation rule" applies to all visitor accommodation (cf whatever size) in Landform 5.\(^4\)

C. The wording of an additional assessment criterion relating to multiple dwellings and Landforms 6 and 7.\(^5\)

D. Whether a specific (additional) non-notification rule is required for the new multiple dwelling rule.\(^6\)

**A: "Alterations and Additions"**

[4] The Council had sought a new rule that "construction, relocation, additions and alterations of buildings in Landform 5" be a restricted discretionary (RD) activity. However, given that the Council's appeal only referred to "construction and relocation" and made no mention of "additions and alterations", the Court sought submissions on whether there was scope to include "alterations and additions".

[5] The Council and Thumb Point Ltd agreed in a memorandum of counsel that there was no scope to make such a change because:

(a) The HGI Plan makes express distinction between "construction and relocation", and "additions and alterations" (including in the Landform 5 activity table). It was conceded that it could not reasonably be argued that the latter were implicitly part of the former, or to conclude that making "additions and alterations" an RD activity would be a foreseeable consequence of the relief sought in the Council appeal;\(^7\)

(b) The proposed change would be from the subject activities being permitted to requiring RD resource consent (an additional control); therefore there might be a risk that other parties would have wished to

---

\(^3\) Paragraphs [106] and [142].

\(^4\) Paragraph [105].

\(^5\) Paragraphs [115] and [142].

\(^6\) Paragraphs [118] and [142].

\(^7\) In the sense described in Westfield (NZ) Ltd v Hamilton City Council [2004] NZRMA 550.
participate in the proceedings had they known the rule would require consent for alterations and additions. 8

B: Visitor Accommodation

[6] It was the case for the Council that the relevant rule should apply to buildings for non-productive activities, including visitor accommodation. In the activity table in Rule 10a.6.5, there is a distinction drawn as between visitor accommodation for up to 10 people, and over 10 people. In the interim decision we tentatively proposed that the RD building rule would apply to both of those provisions in the activity table, and invited a response. 9

[7] The parties have confirmed that they consider that the RD rule should apply to all visitor accommodation, because the rule is intended to control the effects of the buildings rather than effects of the scale of the visitor accommodation activity itself. We find this logical, and hold accordingly.

C: Additional Assessment Criteria – Multiple Dwellings in Landforms 6 and 7

[8] In our interim decision we determined that multiple dwellings should be RD status in Landforms 5 to 7 based on the wording proposed in the planners’ conference statement of 13 May 2013, but considered that an additional assessment criterion should be included in Rule 11.6.3(4) addressing appropriate enhancement and restoration of resources with forest or bush in Landform 7 where such resources have been impacted directly by a proposal. 10

[9] The parties proposed the following assessment criterion be added to that rule:

The proposal shall include appropriate measures for enhancing or restoring areas of forest and bush and/or regenerating slopes directly affected by the proposal, including details of any proposed planting and methods to protect such planting.

[10] The parties submitted that there is scope to add the additional assessment criterion because:

(a) In the notified plan, multiple dwellings in Landform 6 were discretionary activities, allowing an unrestricted assessment of any proposal and its

---

8 See Environment Defence Society v Otorohanga District Council [2014] NZEnvC 070 at paras [18]-[22].
9 See paragraph [105].
10 See paragraphs [119] and [142].
adverse effects on resources in that zone;

(b) While the Landform 6 objectives do not refer specifically to “enhancement and restoration” (unlike the Landform 7 objectives) they refer to protecting the ecological, natural character, landscape and visual amenity values of the land unit; and

(c) An assessment criterion addressing the extent to which the proposal enhances or restores the Landform 6 resources will serve the protection of the values referred to in the objectives and policies. In fact, even without such an assessment criterion this aspect of proposed development would (where appropriate) be a relevant matter when considering landscape issues. We recall saying\(^{11}\) that the term landscape in section 11.6.2(c), matters for discretion, would be sufficiently broad to cover these aspects.

**D: Non-notification Rule for Multiple Dwellings**

[11] In the interim decision we indicated acceptance of Thumb Point’s argument that RD consent for multiple dwellings should be subject to a non-notification rule, but questioned whether it was really required, having regard to the existing provisions of the plan.\(^{12}\)

[12] The parties submitted that there should be a specific rule because the existing non-notification rules relating to buildings do not relate to the activity for which the building is used – see for example Rule 10(a).6.6.1. We agree with the submission, and direct inclusion of the specific rule.

**E: Other Proposed Amendments**

[13] The parties have proposed some other minor tidy-ups, which we agree with and confirm:

(a) Amendments to the standards and terms for multiple dwellings by splitting them into two sections – one for RD multiple dwelling proposals; and one for discretionary multiple dwelling proposals;

---

\(^{11}\) At paragraph [116] in the interim decision.

\(^{12}\) See paragraph [117] where we discussed Rules 11.5.1 and 11.5.2 which provide for non-notification of resource consents for buildings.
(b) An application for multiple dwellings will only be considered as RD activity where the resulting number of dwellings on the site will be no more than that which would occur if –

- the site were subdivided in accordance with the minimum site areas set out in table 12.1 for the land unit; and

- one dwelling was located on each site.

(c) An application for multiple dwellings should be considered as a discretionary activity where one or more of the following criteria are met.

(i) An application is made at the same time for subdivision resulting in the amalgamation of sites such that the number of dwellings on the new site created would be no greater than that which could be achieved through locating a dwelling on each of the original sites;

(ii) The dwellings are for papakainga housing;

(iii) The land has been owned co-operatively by a number of individuals since prior to 29 September 1992.

(d) Remove the RD criteria from the activity table as had originally been proposed, and put them back into the standards and terms section, because some proposals for multiple dwellings might still require discretionary activity consent, particularly on Great Barrier Island.

(e) A new definition for "Thumb Point Waiheke Island Property", is proposed for inclusion in part 14 Definitions as follows:

**Thumb Point Waiheke Island Property**

7

Outcome

[14] The parties have satisfied us with their responses and further thoughtful consequential amendments.

[15] We attach as Appendix A the relevant provisions, with the changes now directed shown underlined or struck through.

[16] There is no order as to costs.

DATED at Auckland this 22nd day of May 2017

For the court:

[Signature]

LJ Newhook
Principal Environment Judge
Appendix A

10a.6 Land unit - Landform 5 (productive land)

10a.6.1 Introduction

This land unit applies to land which is predominantly pastoral, but includes other productive uses such as horticulture and woodlots. The land unit is applied to the expansive areas of land on eastern Waiheke while on Great Barrier, the land unit is generally applied to pockets of land.

Productive land is characterised by:
- Pastoral and horticultural activities, these are often of a moderate to large scale as compared to the productive activities occurring within other land units.
- Varying contours, with some areas being characterised as 'rolling to moderately sloping and others being 'steep slopes'.
- An expansive landscape with an open pattern and a rural character.
- A range of pasture quality and productive capability due to the varying soil types.
- A number of natural features such as smaller wetlands and water systems.
- A working landscape with various built elements such as farm buildings, houses and drainage systems.

Overall, productive land provides for large scale rural activities which contribute to the lifestyle, economy and identity of the islands.

10a.6.2 Resource management issues

The significant resource management issues which need to be addressed in the Plan are:
1. How to provide for productive activities, such as pastoral farming and horticulture, to establish and operate within the land unit.
2. How to maintain the open pattern and rural character of the landscape.

10a.6.3 Objective

To provide for productive activities and to ensure that the open pattern and rural character of the landscape is maintained.

Policies
1. By providing for productive activities, such as pastoral farming, viticulture and horticulture to establish and operate within the land unit.
2. By limiting the non-productive activities that can occur so that the rural use and character of the landscape is maintained.
3. By requiring new sites to be of a size and nature which ensures that moderate to large scale productive activities can occur and which protects the open pattern and rural character of the landscape.

10a.6.4 Resource management strategy

The resource management strategy is to provide for productive activities, such as pastoral farming and horticulture, so that these activities can continue to contribute to the economy, lifestyle and the identity of the islands.

Provision for non-productive activities is limited and the minimum site size is large so that the objective of using the land for productive activities will be achieved.
### 10a.5.5 Rules - activity table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The construction and relocation of buildings, including buildings used for any of the other activities listed in this table unless otherwise specified as a restricted discretionary activity in this table</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The construction and relocation of buildings for the following activities: Dwelling, Visitor accommodation, Home occupation, Homestay and Residential accessory buildings</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations and additions to the exterior of existing buildings including buildings used for any of the other activities listed in this table¹</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding house or hostel</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding kennels and catteries</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial firewood harvesting²</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous canoepotherapy indigenous forestry</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling (one per site)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling (two per site), on Great Barrier Island only, where the following circumstances apply: • there is no visitor accommodation (existing or proposed) on the site; and • the site is not required to meet the minimum subdivision site size in tables 12.1 and 12.2; and • a restrictive covenant is to be registered on the title to avoid subdivision for sites that do not meet the provisions of tables 12.1 and 12.2</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry²</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home occupations</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homestay</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple dwellings on Waitemata and Porirua Islands</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple dwellings unless otherwise specified as a restricted discretionary activity in this table</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor adventure activities</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral farming</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential accessory buildings</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural property management plan</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The disposal of settled solids from septic tanks and wastewater treatment and disposal systems | D
Visitor accommodation for up to 10 people (excluding Great Barrier Island) | P
Visitor accommodation for up to 10 people, on Great Barrier Island only, where there is no more than one dwelling per site | P
Visitor accommodation for more than 10 people (excluding Great Barrier Island) | D
Visitor accommodation for more than 10 people, on Great Barrier Island only, where there is no more than one dwelling per site | D
Winery | P

Legend
P = Permitted
RD = Restricted discretionary
D = Discretionary

Notes:
1. An explanation of the requirements associated with the construction, relocation, alteration and additions to buildings is outlined in rule 4.3.
2. Commercial firewood harvesting and forestry are not expected to comply with the vegetation clearance controls set out in part 10C - Development controls for land units and settlement areas for landform 5.
3. The activities of earthworks and vegetation clearance (including domestic firewood harvesting) are treated as development controls and are therefore not listed in this table.

10a.6.6 Rules - standards and terms for multiple dwellings

10a.6.6.1 An application for multiple dwellings will only be considered as a restricted discretionary activity where the resulting number of dwellings on the site will be no more than that which would occur if:
   a. the site were subdivided in accordance with the minimum site areas set out in table 12.1 for this land unit end
   b. one dwelling was located on each site.

10a.6.6.2 An application for multiple dwellings, other than under clause 10a.6.6.1 above, will only be considered as a discretionary activity where one or more of the following criteria are met:
   1. The resulting number of dwellings on the site will be no more than that which would occur if:
      a. the site were subdivided in accordance with the minimum site areas set out in table 12.1 for this land unit end
      b. one dwelling was located on each site.
   2.1 An application is made at the same time for subdivision resulting in the amalgamation of sites such that the number of dwellings on the new site created would be no greater than that which could be achieved through locating a dwelling on each of the original sites.
3.2. The dwellings are for papaКaienga housing.

4.3. The land has been owned co-operatively by a number of individuals since prior to 29 September 1992.

10a.6.6.3 Proposals which do not meet these standards in 10a.6.6.1 or 10a.6.6.2 are a non-complying activity.

10a.6.7 Rules - development controls

Refer to part 10c - Development controls for land units and settlement areas for the controls applying in this land unit. The development controls listed in that part apply to all activities, whether or not those activities are otherwise permitted, restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying. Infringements to these development controls will be considered as development control modifications as set out in clause 10c.3.

10a.6.8 Assessment matters

1. Matters of discretion for dwelling (two per site)

When considering an application for resource consent for dwelling (two per site) on Great Barrier Island only, the Council has restricted its discretion to considering the following matters:

a. adequacy of a restrictive covenant
b. access to dwelling
c. location of dwelling

Explanation

A second dwelling on a site shall be considered as a restricted discretionary activity where a restrictive covenant is registered on the title, prior to the issue of any building consent, to restrict the future subdivision of the second dwelling from the parent site where the minimum site size set out in table 12.1 and 12.2 are not achieved.

2. Other listed activities

For other applications for resource consent refer to part 11 - Assessment matters for:

a. Matters of discretion and notification requirements applying to the construction and relocation of buildings and to exterior alterations and additions to existing buildings.

b. Assessment criteria for discretionary activities.

Assessment criteria

• whether the restrictive covenant is adequate to control future subdivision of the site that would result in the second dwelling being located on a separate title

• whether the dwelling and access are located so as to minimise or avoid future opportunities to create a separate lot for the second dwelling where sites do not meet the minimum site sizes specified in tables 12.1 and 12.2.
10a.5.9 Relationship with rules in other parts of the Plan

Part 14 - Definitions must be referred to as it is likely to contain definitions of terms used in this part of the Plan.

The following parts of the Plan should also be referred to as they may contain rules which apply to a particular site or proposal:

Part 4 - General rules
Part 5 - Network utility services
Part 6 - Financial contributions
Part 7 - Heritage
Part 8 - Natural hazards
Part 9 - Hazardous facilities and contaminated land
Part 10c - Development controls for land units and settlement areas
Part 12 - Subdivision
Part 13 – Transport
10a.7 Land unit - Landform 6 (regenerating slopes)

10a.7.1 Introduction

This land unit is applied to extensive areas of regenerating bush where kanuka and manuka are the predominant vegetation.

Regenerating slopes is characterised by:

- High natural character and visual amenity value, as a result of its visual prominence (in both coastal locations and as a backdrop to settlement areas) and its unbroken expansive qualities.
- Varying rates of regeneration due to differences in factors such as soil quality and stability, aspect and exposure.
- High ecological values, especially in areas where the regenerating vegetation has been long established and consequently there is an increased diversity of podocarp and broadleaf species and wildlife habitats.
- Small, scattered and unobtrusive buildings, if there are buildings at all.
- Isolated pockets of erosion particularly on north facing slopes.

Overall, regenerating slopes makes a significant contribution to the natural character, ecological and the visual amenity value of the islands.

10a.7.2 Resource management issue

The significant resource management issue which needs to be addressed in the Plan is:

- How to protect the natural character, ecological and visual amenity value of the regenerating slopes from the adverse effects of activities and buildings.

10a.7.3 Objective

To protect the ecological, natural character, landscape, and visual amenity values of the regenerating slopes from the adverse effects of activities and buildings.

Policies

1. By limiting the activities that can occur to those which avoid adverse effects on the ecological, natural character, landscape and visual amenity values of the land unit.
2. By managing the number, scale, form, colour and location of new buildings to avoid remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the ecological, landscape, natural character, and visual amenity values of the land unit.
3. By requiring new sites to be of a size and nature that protect the natural character, ecological and visual amenity values of the land unit.

10a.7.4 Resource management strategy

The resource management strategy is to limit activities to those of a low intensity and to require buildings to be assessed to ensure that there will be no adverse effects on the natural character, ecological and visual amenity value of the land unit.
### 10a.7.5 Rules - activity table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The construction and relocation of buildings, including buildings used for any of the other activities listed in this table¹</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations and additions to the exterior of existing buildings including buildings used for any of the other activities listed in this table. However, this does not apply to minor alterations and additions as defined in part 14 - Definitions¹</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping facilities</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial firewood harvesting</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous canopy indigenous forestry</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling (one per site)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling (two per site), on Great Barrier Island only, where the following circumstances apply:</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• there is no visitor accommodation (existing or proposed) on the site; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the site is not required to meet the minimum subdivision site size in tables 12.1 and 12.2; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a restrictive covenant is to be registered on the title to avoid subdivision for sites that do not meet the provisions of tables 12.1 and 12.2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home occupations</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homestay</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple dwellings on Waiheke and Porur Islands</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple dwellings unless otherwise specified as a restricted discretionary activity in this table</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor adventure activities</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential accessory buildings</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural property management plan</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor accommodation for up to 10 people (excluding Great Barrier Island)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor accommodation for up to 10 people, on Great Barrier Island only, where there is no more than one dwelling per site</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor accommodation for more than 10 people (excluding Great Barrier Island)</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor accommodation for more than 10 people, on Great Barrier Island only, where there is no more than one dwelling per site</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10a.7.6 Rules - standards and terms for multiple dwellings

10a.7.6.1 An application for multiple dwellings will only be considered as a restricted discretionary activity where the resulting number of dwellings on the site will be no more than that which would occur if:

a. the site were subdivided in accordance with the minimum site areas set out in table 12.1 for this land unit and

b. one dwelling was located on each site.

10a.7.6.2 An application for multiple dwellings, other than under clause 10a.7.6.1 above, will only be considered as a discretionary activity where one or more of the following criteria are met:

1. The resulting number of dwellings on the site will be no more than that which would occur if:

a. the site were subdivided in accordance with the minimum site areas set out in table 12.1 for this land unit and

b. one dwelling was located on each site.

2. An application is made at the same time for subdivision resulting in the amalgamation of sites such that the number of dwellings on the new site created would be no greater than that which could be achieved through locating a dwelling on each of the original sites.

3. The dwellings are for papakāinga housing.

4. The land has been owned co-operatively by a number of individuals since prior to 29 September 1992.

10a.7.6.3 Proposals which do not meet those standards in 10a.7.6.1 or 10a.7.6.2 are a non-complying activity.

10a.7.7 Rules - development controls

Refer to part 10c - Development controls for land units and settlement areas for the controls applying in this land unit. The development controls listed in that part apply to all activities, whether or not those activities are otherwise permitted, restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying. Infringements to these development controls will be considered as development control modifications as set out in clause 10c.3.
10a.7.8 Assessment matters

1. Matters of discretion for dwelling (two per site)
   When considering an application for resource consent for dwelling (two per site) on Great Barrier Island only, the Council has restricted its discretion to considering the following matters:
   a. adequacy of a restrictive covenant
   b. access to dwelling
   c. location of dwelling

Explanation
A second dwelling on a site shall be considered as a restricted discretionary activity where a restrictive covenant is registered on the title, prior to the issue of any building consent, to restrict the future subdivision of the second dwelling from the parent site where the minimum site size set out in tables 12.1 and 12.2 is not achieved.

2. Other listed activities
   For other applications for resource consent refer to part 11 - Assessment matters for:
   a. Matters of discretion and notification requirements applying to the construction and relocation of buildings and to exterior alterations and additions to existing buildings.
   b. Assessment criteria for discretionary activities.

10a.7.9 Relationship with rules in other parts of the Plan

Part 14 - Definitions must be referred to as it is likely to contain definitions of terms used in this part of the Plan.

The following parts of the Plan should also be referred to as they may contain rules which apply to a particular site or proposal:

Part 4 - General rules
Part 5 - Network utility services
Part 6 - Financial contributions
Part 7 - Heritage
Part 8 - Natural hazards
Part 9 - Hazardous facilities and contaminated land
Part 10c - Development controls for land units and settlement areas
Part 12 - Subdivision
Part 13 - Transport
10a.8 Land unit - Landform 7 (forest and bush areas)

10a.8.1 Introduction

Forest and bush areas include extensive podocarp and broadleaf forest areas, areas of secondary regenerating forest and some isolated areas of manuka and kanuka.

Forest and bush areas are characterised by:

- Steep upper slopes and valley systems with some gently sloping areas.
- High conservation and ecological value as these areas have either survived or significantly recovered from milling activity in the past.
- High natural character and visual amenity due to the sheer dominance, scale and age of the vegetation cover.
- An absence of built structures.

Overall, forest and bush areas make a significant contribution to the natural character, conservation, ecological and visual amenity values of the islands.

10a.8.2 Resource management issue

The significant resource management issue which needs to be addressed in the Plan is:

- How to protect the natural character and the conservation, ecological and visual amenity value of the forest and bush areas from adverse effects of activities and buildings.

10a.8.3 Objectives

1. To protect the ecological, natural character, landscape, conservation, and visual amenity values of forest and bush areas from the adverse effects of activities and buildings.

2. To protect, where possible, enhance or restore, the conservation, ecological natural character, landscape and visual amenity values of forest and bush areas.

Policies

1. By limiting the activities that can occur to those which avoid adverse effects on the natural character and the conservation, ecological and visual amenity values of the land unit.

2. By ensuring that the scale, form, colour and location of new buildings will not have adverse effects on the natural character and the conservation, ecological and visual amenity values of the land unit.

3. By requiring new sites to be of a size and nature that protects the natural character and the conservation, landscape, ecological and visual amenity values of the land unit.

10a.8.4 Resource management strategy

The resource management strategy is to limit activities to those of a low intensity and to require buildings to be assessed to ensure that there will be no adverse effects on the natural character and the conservation, ecological and visual amenity value of the land unit.
### 10a.8.5 Rules - activity table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The construction and relocation of buildings, including buildings used for any of the other activities listed in this table</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations and additions to the exterior of existing buildings including buildings used for any of the other activities listed in this table. However this does not apply to minor alterations and additions as defined in part 14 - Definitions</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous canopy indigenous forestry</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITHER:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling (one per site)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR: visitor accommodation for up to 10 people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling (one per site) not otherwise provided for as a permitted activity</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home occupations</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homestay</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple dwellings on Waiheke and Fonui islands</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple dwellings unless otherwise specified as a restricted discretionary activity in this table</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential accessory buildings</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural property management plan</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor accommodation not otherwise provided for as a permitted activity</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winery</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- **P** = Permitted
- **RD** = Restricted discretionary
- **D** = Discretionary

**Notes:**
1. An explanation of the requirements associated with the construction, relocation, alteration and additions to buildings is outlined in rule 4.3.
2. The activities of earthworks and vegetation clearance (including domestic firewood harvesting) are treated as development controls and are therefore not listed in this table.
10a.8.6 Rules - standards and terms for multiple dwellings

10a.8.6.1 An application for multiple dwellings will only be considered as a restricted discretionary activity where the resulting number of dwellings on the site will be no more than that which would occur if:
   a. the site were subdivided in accordance with the minimum site areas set out in table 12.1 for this land unit end
   b. one dwelling was located on each site.

10a.8.6.2 An application for multiple dwellings, other than under clause 10a.8.6.1 above, will only be considered as a discretionary activity where one or more of the following criteria are met:
   1. The resulting number of dwellings on the site will be no more than that which would occur if:
      a. the site were subdivided in accordance with the minimum site areas set out in table 12.1 for this land unit end
      b. one dwelling was located on each site.

   2.1 An application is made at the same time for subdivision resulting in the amalgamation of sites such that the number of dwellings on the new site created would be no greater than that which could be achieved through locating a dwelling on each of the original sites.

   3.2 The dwellings are for papakāenga housing.

   4.3 The land has been owned co-operatively by a number of individuals since prior to 29 September 1992.

10a.8.6.3 Proposals which do not meet these standards in 10a.8.6.1 or 10a.8.6.2 are a non-complying activity.

10a.8.7 Rules - development controls

Refer to part 10c - Development controls for land units and settlement areas for the controls applying in this land unit. The development controls listed in that part apply to all activities, whether or not those activities are otherwise permitted, restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying. Infringements to these development controls will be considered as development control modifications as set out in clause 10c.3.

10a.8.8 Assessment matters

For applications for resource consent refer to part 11 - Assessment matters for:
   • Matters of discretion and notification requirements applying to the construction and relocation of buildings and to exterior alterations and additions to existing buildings
   • Assessment criteria for discretionary activities.

10a.8.9 Relationship with rules in other parts of the Plan

Part 14 - Definitions must be referred to as it is likely to contain definitions of terms used in this part of the Plan.

The following parts of the Plan should also be referred to as they may contain rules which apply to a particular site or proposal:

Part 4 - General rules
Part 5 - Network utility services
11.5 Buildings as a restricted discretionary activity

11.5.1 Notification requirements

Except as provided for by section 95A(4) of the RMA, applications for a resource consent for the construction and relocation of buildings, and alterations and additions to existing buildings as a restricted discretionary activity will be considered without public notification or the need to obtain written approval of or serve notice on affected persons (in accordance with section 95A(3) and 95B(2) of the RMA).

11.5.2 Matters of discretion

The activity tables for some land units and parts of settlement areas provide for the following building works as a restricted discretionary activity:

- The construction and relocation of buildings
- Alterations and additions to the exterior of existing buildings (other than minor alterations and additions as defined in part 14 - Definitions)

The land units and parts of settlement areas where such building works are provided for as a restricted discretionary activity are:

- landform 2, 5, 6 and 7
- island residential 1 (coastal amenity areas only)
- island residential 2
- commercial 1, 2 and 4
- rural 1-3
- open space 1-4
- conservation
- Paku Tara
- settlement area - local retailing areas
- settlement area - dune and wetland conservation areas
- settlement area - headland protection areas
- settlement area - Claris airport area
- Orama concept plan 41-16.

In the above land units and parts of settlement areas, and in the Orama concept plan, the council has restricted its discretion to considering the following matters for new buildings and alterations to existing buildings:

- scale
- form (design and materials)
• colour (except that this matter will not be considered in commercial 1 and 2)
• location
• any relevant open space strategy or reserve management plan (for open space 1-4 only)
• the need to provide for the building (for rural 3 only).

In the Matiatia land unit, construction and relocation of buildings, and alterations and additions to existing buildings are also a restricted discretionary activity. The matters of discretion and assessment criteria are contained in the Matiatia land unit (see clause 10a.10) rather than in this part.

11.5.3 Applying the matters of discretion

11.5.3.1 Landform 2, 5, 6 and 7

In landform 2, 5, 6 and 7, discretion over the matters identified in clause 11.5.2 will be applied so that the proposed building protects the natural landscape by:

1. Being of a scale, form and location that is not visually prominent when viewed from any public place, such as roads, public reserves and beaches.
2. Having an external colour that is integrated with the surrounding natural landscape. The council will refer to clause 10c.4.8 for guidance in assessing this matter.
3. Being located so that it does not dominate or detract from public views which are characterised by natural landscapes.
4. Being of a scale, form and location that maintains the visual coherence of the landscape character by not breaking the pattern of any natural features such as coastal escarpments, ridges, prominent slopes or indigenous vegetation.
5. Being of a scale, form, colour and location that does not give rise to cumulative effects on the natural landscape.

11.6 Multiple dwellings as a restricted discretionary activity

11.6.1 Notification requirements

Except as provided for by section 95A(4) of the RMA, applications for a resource consent for multiple dwellings as a restricted discretionary activity will be considered without public notification or the need to obtain written approval of or serve notice on affected persons (in accordance with section 96A(3) and 96B(2) of the RMA).

11.6.2 Matters of discretion

When considering an application for resource consent for multiple dwellings as a restricted discretionary activity, the Council has restricted its discretion to considering the following matters:

• access to dwellings
• scale, form, colour and location of dwellings
• landscape, including cumulative effects
11.6.3 **Applying the matters of discretion**

11.6.3.1 In landforms 5, 6 and 7, discretion over the matters identified in clause 11.6.2 will be applied so that an application for multiple dwellings meets the following criteria:

1. Any driveway, parking and turning areas shall be constructed in a manner which requires minimal disturbance to the existing landform or vegetation.
2. Any proposal shall indicate the location of all existing and proposed dwellings on the site. The proposed dwelling(s) shall protect the natural landscape by:
   - Being of a scale, form, and location that is not visually prominent when viewed from any public place, such as roads, public reserves and beaches.
   - Having an external colour that is integrated with the surrounding landscape. The council will refer to clause 10c.4.8 for guidance in assessing this matter.
   - Being of a scale, form, colour and location that maintains the visual coherence of the landscape character, by not breaking the pattern of any natural features such as coastal escarpments, ridges, prominent slopes or indigenous vegetation.
3. In addition, council will consider whether the location of the proposed dwelling(s) is appropriate, given the presence of other buildings and activities in the area and the extent to which they give rise to cumulative effects on the natural landscape.

In landforms 6 and 7, an application for Multiple dwellings will also be subject to the following criterion:

4. The proposal shall include appropriate measures for enhancing or restoring areas of forest and bush and/or regenerating slopes directly affected by the proposal, including details of any proposed planting and methods to protect such planting.

12.8.2 **Protection of significant environmental feature(s)**

12.8.2.1 **Provision**

In landform 2-7, and rural 1 only, and subject to the general rules in clause 12.6 and the specific standards and terms in rule 12.8.2.3, the council may consent to the subdivision of land as a discretionary activity to create sites which will protect any significant environmental feature(s) from development and any adverse effects of land use activities.

12.8.2.2 **Assessment matters**

The council’s assessment of an application for subdivision for the protection of significant environmental feature(s) will include consideration of the matters set out in clause 12.9 as well as the specific criteria contained in clause 12.10.1.

12.8.2.3 **Standards and terms**

The following standards and terms apply:

1. The area of each proposed site must meet the standards for minimum and average site areas specified in table 12.2: Minimum site areas for protecting significant environmental features.
2. An appropriately qualified, independent person must prepare a report certifying that:
   a. Any existing indigenous vegetation is of a quality and maturity that is self-sustaining and worthy of preservation. The criteria contained in appendix 4 -
Criteria for scheduling heritage items, must be used in determining whether these features are significant and therefore eligible for protection.

b. Any natural feature that is deemed a significant environmental feature and which is used for the purposes of active farming, must retire this activity as part of the protection and enhancement of the significant environmental feature. The natural feature or area must be managed in a way that preserves and enhances its existing ecological, heritage and/or landscape value. For the avoidance of doubt, where the SFF comprises or falls within an ONL (in whole or part), on the Thumb Point Waiheke Island property, active farming need only be retired in any areas that are proposed by the applicant as the SFF.

c. Any feature of archaeological, historical or cultural significance is of such significance to the community as to warrant its preservation in the public interest. The criteria contained in appendix 4 - Criteria for scheduling heritage items, must be used in determining whether these features are significant and therefore eligible for protection.

d. Any significant environmental feature will not be adversely affected by the impact of development associated with the subdivision.

3. Any area to be covenanted that is already scheduled in the Plan as a site of ecological significance (SES) or sensitive area (SA) or identified as an outstanding natural landscape (ONL) in a regional policy statement must be accurately surveyed to determine its true location on any proposed site. The council will also require certification of the SES, SA or ONL, recommended for protection in accordance with rule 12.6.2.3(2) above. For the avoidance of doubt, where the SFF comprises or falls within an ONL (in whole or in part) on the Thumb Point Waiheke Island property the only areas that need to be covenanted are the areas of ONL that are within what is proposed by the applicant as the SFF.

4. The application must detail the attributes of the feature(s) recommended for protection. This must include an on-going management programme that details any protection and enhancement.

5. Legal protection of the feature(s) must be secured through a consent notice or another suitable legal instrument that is registered on the title of the land concerned. Legal protection may also be achieved through a QEII National Trust Covenant, a covenant with council, a conservation covenant under section 77 of the Reserves Act or by vesting in a public authority or the crown as a public reserve. At the discretion of the council, legal protection may also be achieved by vesting in a charitable trust or public organisation which specialises in the ongoing management and enhancement of natural features. All costs associated with meeting this requirement must be met by the applicant.

6. Significant environmental features may only be used under these rules where those features have not already been legally protected as a condition of a resource consent or subdivision consent. However, allowances can be made for voluntary covenanted.

7. Accessways and building platforms must be located and designed to avoid any disturbance to the protected feature(s).
14.3 Definitions of terms used in the Plan

Significant environmental feature
means any of the following:
• The whole of any distinct natural feature, landform or landscape which makes a significant contribution to the quality of the local natural environment and amenity.
• Any feature of archaeological, historical or cultural significance.
It may include one or more of the following:
• any site of ecological significance scheduled in the Plan
• a water system
• a habitat for indigenous species
• an association of indigenous vegetation
• a landform (including any significant ridgeline identified on the planning maps)
• an ecological corridor
• a visually significant area or group of areas
• any item scheduled in the Plan for its archaeological, historical or cultural significance.

For the purposes of the Thumb Point Waiheke Island property, any site of ecological significance that is shown on the (Series 2) planning maps in the Plan is deemed to be a significant environmental feature (for the avoidance of doubt).

Thumb Point Waiheke Island property
Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) - Decision to Make Additional Parts of the Plan Operative

File No.: CP2018/00284

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To make those parts of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) that are no longer subject to appeal, “operative” under clause 20 of Schedule 1 to the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Under section 152 of the Local Government (Auckland Transitional Provisions) Act 2010 (LGATPA), any part of the proposed Auckland Unitary Plan that was not subject to appeal was deemed to have been approved by the council either from the expiry of the original appeal period (which was 16 September 2016), or the date on which any appeal is withdrawn or determined. As a result, large parts of the Auckland Unitary Plan were made “operative in part” in November 2016, with those parts under appeal remaining “proposed” in the meantime.

3. The Planning Committee further considered this matter on 10 October 2017 and made those parts of the Auckland Unitary Plan that were not subject to appeal at that point in time, operative.

4. Since the 10 October 2017, additional appeals have been resolved and further parts of the Unitary Plan can be made operative.

5. Section 160 of the LGATPA requires that the council publicly notify the date on which the Auckland Unitary Plan, or each part of the Auckland Unitary Plan, as the case may be, will become operative in accordance with clause 20. A formal resolution is required, after which the council will publicly notify that further parts of the Auckland Unitary Plan (that were formerly under appeal) will now become operative.

6. Attachment A to this report provides a summary of the appeals that have been resolved, withdrawn or otherwise determined since the 10 October 2017 report. These are highlighted in bold type.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendations
That the Planning Committee:

a) agree to make operative, under clause 20 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, those additional parts of the Auckland Unitary Plan that are no longer subject to appeal (as identified in Attachment A of the agenda report).

b) request that staff complete the necessary public notice requirements as soon as practicable.
Horopaki / Context

Update on Appeals

7. In September 2016, Auckland Council received 108 appeals against the council’s decisions on the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan. 67 appeals were lodged with the Environment Court and 41 with the High Court, raising questions of law. Five additional Environment Court appeals (ENV-2017-AKL-000096, ENV-2017-AKL-000110, ENV-2017-AKL-000155, ENV-2017-AKL-000156 and ENV-2017-AKL-000167) have arisen from High Court proceedings. In addition, eight judicial review applications were filed in the High Court against the council’s decisions. Of the 113 (108 plus the additional 5) appeals, only 31 remain currently active, and 8 of these have been partially resolved.

High Court

8. 34 High Court appeals have been settled. Three additional appeals have been partially resolved/withdrawn.

Environment Court

9. 48 Environment Court appeals have been resolved. Five have been settled in part/partially withdrawn. The remaining appeals are either awaiting a decision from the court, or are the subject of continuing settlement discussions, or awaiting hearing dates.

Update on judicial reviews

10. Of the eight judicial reviews, six have been determined or discontinued.

Parts of the Auckland Unitary Plan to be made operative

11. Details of each appeal can be found on the Auckland Unitary Plan website via the following link: https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plans-strategies/unitary-plan/auckland-unitary-plan-appeals/Pages/updates-on-auckland-unitary-plan-appeals.aspx

12. As appeal files were closed, and confirmation received from the courts, the associated appeal annotations in the Auckland Unitary Plan were removed. As a result, those parts of the Auckland Unitary Plan were no longer shown as under appeal and deemed to be “approved” under section 152 of the LGATPA.

13. Those parts of the Unitary Plan that were formerly under appeal can now be made operative under clause 20. Section 160 of the LGATPA requires that the council notify the date on which the Auckland Unitary Plan, or each part of it, will become operative in accordance with clause 20 of Schedule 1 to the RMA. In order to complete that process, this report seeks a resolution from the Planning Committee.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

14. This report deals with a procedural matter – making operative those parts of the Auckland Unitary Plan that are no longer subject to appeal. No analysis or additional advice is therefore required.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

15. Local boards have been involved in the development of the Auckland Unitary Plan since mid-2012. Their views were not sought for this report as the clause 20 process is an entirely procedural step.
**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

16. The final step in making parts of the Unitary Plan operative is a procedural matter only and therefore does not have any impact on Māori. Impacts on Māori have been considered throughout the process of developing the Auckland Unitary Plan and the resolution of appeals.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications**

17. The cost of making the Unitary Plan operative is covered by the Plans and Places department’s operational budget.

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

18. Delaying making further parts of the Auckland Unitary Plan fully operative would have cost implications for the council and the community, as development would continue to be subject to the provisions under both the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) and the legacy Regional and District Plans.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**

19. Following the Planning Committee’s decision, staff will publish a public notice advising of the date on which further parts of the Auckland Unitary Plan will be made operative.

20. A final report will be presented to the Planning Committee when the last remaining appeals are resolved. It is expected that this will occur in mid-2018. This report will seek that the Auckland Unitary Plan is made Operative (in full).

**Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments**
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## Attachment A - List of Unitary Plan Appeals Resolved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appeals Filed in the Environment Court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2017-AKL-000096 - Straits Protection Society Incorporated (settled in whole, but awaiting consent order) (RUB for Waiheke)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2017-AKL-000110 - G and C Smart (settled in part, but awaiting consent order) (RUB for Waiheke)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2015-AKL-000119 - Federated Farmers of New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2015-AKL-000184 - Smith and Caughey Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000185 - Viaduct Harbour Holdings Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2015-AKL-000186 - Viaduct Harbour Holdings Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2015-AKL-000187 - England and Spring Street Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2015-AKL-000188 - Lenhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000190 - The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2015-AKL-000191 - The National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000192 - Kiwi Property Group &amp; Kiwi Property Holdings Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000193 - Kiwi Property Group, Kiwi Property Holdings Limited and Sylvia Park Business Centre Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2015-AKL-000194 - Highgate Business Park Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2015-AKL-000195 - The Puheci Community Forum Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000198 - GM Welsford Family Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000200 - Fergil Hou and Wanahi Ruiy Trust Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000201 - Progressive Enterprises Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000202 - SFH Consultants Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000203 - Bruce Frizzell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2018-AKL-000204 - Davies Kahlenberg Family Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2018-AKL-000205 - Valerie Liddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2018-AKL-000208 - Marian I Kohier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000209 - No.12 Lomond Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2015-AKL-000210 - WFH Properties Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000214 - Todd Property Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000215 - Man O'War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000217 - Waste Management NZ Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000218 - Transpower NZ Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000219 - Houghton Family Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2018-AKL-000221 - Howick Residents and Ratepayers Association Incorporated and Moffatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000222 - New Zealand Starch Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000223 - Albany North Landowners Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2018-AKL-000224 - South Epsom Planning Group Incorporated and Three Kings United Group Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2015-AKL-000225 - ACI Operations NZ Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2015-AKL-000226 - Vector Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000227 - Kumeu Huapai Residents and Ratepayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2015-AKL-000228 - Pact Group (NZ) Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2015-AKL-000230 - (settled in part) Ryman Healthcare Limited and Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000231 - Friends of Churchill Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2015-AKL-000233 - NZ Steel Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000235 - Mahi Properties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ENV-2015-00236 (settled in part) - Housing New Zealand Corporation
ENV-2015-AKL-000237 - Housing New Zealand Corporation
ENV-2015-AKL-000239 - Coglan and others
ENV-2015-AKL-000240 - Sargisson and Barnes
ENV-2015-AKL-000243 (partially withdrawn) - K Vernon
ENV-2015-AKL-000244 - Silverton Group Limited
ENV-2015-AKL-000245 - Kuegler Family Trust and Dunbar - Paddy Trust
ENV-2015-AKL-000246 - Woolmore Morris
ENV-2015-AKL-000247 - Kevin O'Grady
ENV-2015-AKL-000248 (partially withdrawn) - Terra Nova Planning Limited
ENV-2015-AKL-000255 - Murphy, Adams and others
ENV-2015-AKL-000261 - Man O'War Farm Limited

Appeals Filed in the High Court
CIV-2016-404-002261 - Independent Maori Statutory Board
CIV-2016-404-002276 - Viaduct Harbour Holdings
CIV-2016-404-002284 - Kawau Island Access Organisation Incorporated
CIV-2016-404-002289 - Kiwi Property Group Limited
CIV-2016-404-002290 - The Waitakere Ranges Protection Society Incorporated
CIV-2016-404-002296 - Bayswater Marina Limited
CIV-2016-404-002298 - Auckland Memorial Park Limited
CIV-2016-404-002299 (partially withdrawn) - Federated Farmers of NZ Incorporated
CIV-2016-404-002302 - South Epsom Planning Group Incorporated
CIV-2016-404-002305 - Valerie Close Residents Group
CIV-2016-404-002308 - The Auckland Presbyterian Hospital Trustees Inc
CIV-2016-404-002310 - Samson Corporation Limited and Stirling Nominees Limited - 1-3 Grosvenor Street, Grey Lynn
CIV-2016-404-002311 - Samson Corporation Limited and Stirling Nominees Limited - Property bounded by Pollen Street, Ponsonby Road and McKelvie Street
CIV-2016-404-002312 - Waytemore Forests Limited
CIV-2016-404-002313 - Arena Living Limited
CIV-2016-404-002314 - The Minister of Defence
CIV-2016-404-002316 - Wallace Group Limited
CIV-2016-404-002317 - Karaka North Village Limited
CIV-2016-404-002318 - The University of Auckland
CIV-2016-404-002319 - Southern Gateway (Manukau) Limited
CIV-2016-404-002320 - UPR Enterprises
CIV-2016-404-002321 - Hawick Ratepayers and Residents Association Incorporated and W Moffatt
CIV-2016-404-002322 - Hollander
CIV-2016-404-002323 - Auckland University of Technology
CIV-2016-404-002326 - Character Coalition Incorporated and Auckland 2040 Incorporated
CIV-2016-404-002330 - Transpower New Zealand Limited
CIV-2016-404-002331 (partially withdrawn, settled in part) - Man O'War Farm Ltd
CIV-2016-404-002333 - Franco Belgiojorno-Nettis
CIV-2016-404-002336 - Albany North Landowners
CIV-2016-404-002338 - Ancona Properties Limited
CIV-2016-404-002339 - Horticulture New Zealand Incorporated
CIV-2016-404-002340 - Reidy, Kloezen, and Ruatahara Limited
CIV-2016-404-002341 - Villages of New Zealand (Pakuranga) Limited
CIV-2016-404-002343 (settled in part) - Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society New Zealand Incorporated
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### List of Unitary Plan Appeals Remaining

**Appeals Filed in the Environment Court**

- ENV-2017-AKL-000110 - G and C Smart (settled in part, but awaiting consent order) (RUB for Waiheke)
- ENV-2017-AKL-000155 - National Trading Company of New Zealand Limited
- ENV-2017-AKL-001156 - C Barbour Family Trust (Rechills Precinct)
- ENV-2017-AKL-001157 - Strategic Property Advocacy Network (Waiakere Ranges)
- ENV-2016-001188 - Cabra Rural Developments Limited and others
- ENV-2016-001196 - Wei Li Yang, Zhi Li and Jing Niu
- ENV-2016-001217 - Robert Adams
- ENV-2016-001219 - Self Family Trust
- ENV-2016-001206 - Gate Balam Consultants Limited
- ENV-2016-001207 - Mason and others
- ENV-2016-001211 - Okura Holdings Limited
- ENV-2016-001212 - Smithies Family Trust
- ENV-2016-001213 - North Eastern Investments Limited and Heritage Land Limited
- ENV-2016-001214 - Todd Property Group
- ENV-2016-001216 - Zakara Investments Limited
- ENV-2016-001220 - Strand Holdings Limited
- ENV-2016-001216 - Walden
- ENV-2016-001230 - (settled in part) Ryman Healthcare Limited and Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated
- ENV-2016-001232 - Bunnings Limited
- ENV-2015-001234 - Radiata Properties Limited
- ENV-2016-001236 (settled in part) - Housing New Zealand Corporation
- ENV-2016-001238 - Housing New Zealand Corporation
- ENV-2016-001241 - Wallace Group
- ENV-2016-001242 - Dunlop Family Trust
- ENV-2016-001243 (partially withdrawn) - Vernon
- ENV-2016-001248 (partially withdrawn) - Terra Nova Planning Limited

**Appeals Filed in the High Court**

- CIV-2016-404-022306 - Wetti Development
- CIV-2016-404-022309 - Samson Corporation Limited and Sterling Nominees Limited - 57 Patterson Ave, Mission Bay
- CIV-2016-404-022324 - North Eastern Investments and Heritage Land Limited (NEIL)
- CIV-2016-404-022331 (partially withdrawn, settled in part) - Man O'War Farm Ltd
- CIV-2016-404-022343 (settled in part) - Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society New Zealand Incorporated

---

**Key**

- Appeals not in bold type - resolved prior to October 2017
- Appeals in bold type - resolved after October 2017
Renewing Auckland Council’s commitment to quality urban design to deliver a world-class city

File No.: CP2017/24523

Purpose
1. The purpose of this report is three-fold. It aims to:
   a) outline Auckland Council’s commitment to providing quality urban design solutions for the built environment challenges faced by the growing city.
   b) highlight that the known and developing policy direction from central government represents a unique opportunity to achieve a new level of collaboration regarding urban design aspects of agreed urban development priorities for Auckland.
   c) to signal the need for a series of initiatives to promote and achieve quality urban design thinking and practices across all of Auckland, including a framework for collaboration with key stakeholders.

Executive summary
2. The value added to places by quality urban design thinking and approaches is being clearly demonstrated in Auckland, cities around New Zealand (like New Plymouth and Wellington) and in many global cities (such as London, New York, Paris, Melbourne, Copenhagen, Helsinki, Stockholm, and Barcelona).
3. While Auckland is benefiting from improved urban design and place-making decisions in many places, notably the City Centre and Waterfront, and including regional exemplars in Hobsonville, Newmarket, Takapuna, and New Lynn, there is still much to do to before Auckland can say it is achieving a consistent approach to quality built environment outcomes across the city region.
4. Auckland is growing at its fastest rate for decades. With this growth comes many challenges and opportunities. The city is responding by enabling intensification through the Auckland Unitary Plan promoting quality compact urban form, facilitated by targeted public transport investment (such as the City Rail Link, Mass Transit and improved bus, ferry and cycling networks and services). However, accommodating all the people that Auckland expects will require a concerted effort to manage growth. This means achieving higher quality urban design outcomes which create opportunities for making places of lasting value. Undertaken poorly, we will create environments which do quite the opposite.
5. The council group, private, government and not-for-profit sectors, have been instrumental in driving up standards of urban design across the city. The public has come to expect quality urban design outcomes that improve Auckland’s economic, social, environmental, and cultural performance whilst raising our global competitiveness and lifting our ability to attract and retain the best talent. This commitment to design quality is already being achieved through the cross-sector/cross-council implementation of the design-led city programme.
6. The significant changes and uplift in quality occurring in the City Centre in particular, are the result of a sustained political, public and private sector commitment (including a dedicated targeted rate) to achieving quality urban design over several decades. The successful approach in the City Centre could be adapted and applied to other parts of the region so that all Aucklanders gain the benefit of improved places.
Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) acknowledge the work under way across the council group to drive world-class urban design outcomes across the region.

b) acknowledge the critical role being played by the private sector in achieving our collective design-led aspirations for the city.

c) reaffirm the importance of Auckland Council’s commitment to quality urban design across the Auckland region.

Comments

Background

7. Half of the world’s population lives in cities, yet they cover only one per cent of the world’s surface area. Cities also consume some 70 per cent of the world’s energy and emit over 80 per cent of the world’s greenhouse gas emissions. By 2050, it is estimated that 70 per cent of the world’s population will live in cities and that the number of cities will double. Simply put, the future viability of the planet will hugely depend upon the way we plan, build and design our cities.

8. Auckland is the largest city in New Zealand and by 2040 its population is estimated to be 2.5 million. It has one-third of the population of the country and produces over 37 per cent of the nation’s GDP. Auckland continues to be New Zealand’s city and region of choice for people to live, work, play, prosper and migrate to.

9. Cities are highly complex and consist of many different components but fundamentally, they are places where people come together to trade goods and where ideas flourish. Growing cities must be planned and managed to ensure equality of opportunity that they bring.

10. Urban design is the skill and experience of managing different components of the built environment to create sustainable, human-scaled and people-centric buildings and places. It is an intentional act, which considers the form, function and feel of places. It is primarily focused on understanding:

   • the spaces and connections between neighbourhoods and buildings
   • the relationship between buildings and spaces in terms of size, appearance and uses
   • how the various elements of cities work together with a focus on the public realm
   • how people interact and move through an area or place

11. A number of international studies have revealed the wide benefits of good urban design. These support the findings of the 2005 report Value of Urban Design by the Ministry for the Environment. (https://www.mfe.govt.nz/sites/default/files/value-of-urban-design-full-report-jun05_0.pdf)

Strategic case for leadership in urban design

12. Council is in the early stages of its second (six-yearly) comprehensive strategic planning cycle. The Mayor’s vision sets a new ambitious direction for Auckland as a World-Class City, emphasising the importance of Auckland competing successfully with other global cities for talent while protecting and enhancing the things that already make Auckland special and which Aucklanders value. The ability to deliver successful place-making projects at all scales, and in ways that reflect our unique points of difference, will be a key enabler of this vision.
13. The Auckland Plan refresh and the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 will provide the high-level policy and spatial framework for investment and development. The 10-year investment programme will provide the funding and timetable to deliver actual services, infrastructure and other place-based investments. Collaborative design-led place-making projects will help to ensure these investments come together seamlessly and optimally.

14. As recognised in the Lee Kuan Yew World City Prize in 2016, Auckland has achieved a degree of integration in regional governance that is enabling it to move rapidly on key strategic issue such as improving public transport and rezoning for development. Auckland Council also has the scale and influence to drive positive change in the whole delivery system for infrastructure and housing.

15. This scale and influence can also be applied to the challenge of achieving quality urban design. Making the most of our size is one of council’s organisational priorities and is key to ensuring that town centres, streets and places across the region benefit from the urban design and place making approach.

16. The known and developing policy direction from central government also represents a unique point-in-time opportunity to achieve a new level of collaboration on agreed urban development priorities for Auckland and achieving quality urban design is an important component.

17. Council can proactively engage with central government on these issues and this report recommends a renewed commitment to quality urban design to help move this engagement forward at pace toward actual development issues and opportunities.

18. Collaborative design-led approaches to urban development have the potential to save time and reduce overall development costs. Getting the design process right also helps to prevent future unwanted costs when developments fail to deliver needed outcomes.

19. Across Auckland, the local boards also have a key role to play in urban design leadership and place-making. Every local board area has significant urban design issues, challenges and opportunities. Many cities have centres that are renowned for their quality and beauty, but not many are renowned for achieving quality across the whole of their urban environment. Auckland, by virtue of its unique governance arrangements, has an opportunity to work toward such a goal by making best use of the influence and expertise that every local board is able to bring to this challenge in the interest of their local communities.

The state and direction of urban design in Auckland

20. To maintain and build momentum at a time of unprecedented growth and opportunity, Auckland Council and its family of Council-Controlled Organisations will need to uphold quality outcomes through a renewed commitment to urban design and the concept of “place champions”. This is to ensure that what we develop today will have a lasting value for Auckland, as a world-class design-led city.

21. To date, the strongest and most visible focus on quality design in Auckland has been in the City Centre and the Waterfront, including regional exemplars in Hobsonville Point, Newmarket, Takapuna and New Lynn.

22. With broad public sector and stakeholder support, the award-winning City Centre Masterplan 2012 and the associated Waterfront Plan 2012, established and then cemented a compelling vision of an increasingly design-led and people-first City Centre.

23. The partly-complete Pedestrian Laneway Circuit programme demonstrates that when spaces are turned over to people, while still accommodating access and servicing by vehicles, pedestrian numbers and retail sales increase.

24. Investment in high-quality public realm improvements have been widely lauded and heavily utilised by citizens and visitors. Temporary space activation, such as the artificial lawn and deck chairs in Lower Queen Street for Auckland Anniversary Day and Griffiths Gardens in Wellesley Street, provide innovative, low-cost ways of making spaces inviting for people.
25. There are clear opportunities to take some of the learnings from the City Centre and apply them more broadly across the Auckland region. Panuku Development Auckland’s Design and Place Directorate is leading this in areas such as Onehunga, Takapuna, Northcote and Manukau. The Auckland Design Office is working more closely with them particularly around areas of Māori Design and Universal Access in housing for older persons.

26. Projects such as Ōtāhuhu Station, Te Oro Arts and Dance Centre and the Kopupaka Reserve Wetland Park demonstrate how respect for Māori Design can enrich projects.

27. Outside of the City Centre, urban design focus has been strongest in areas which have been subject to detailed structure planning based on creating mixed-use communities with a strong focus on urban design, around a defined and clear street grid network, prioritising walking and cycling, and connected by quality public transport.

28. The often-cited examples in Hobsonville Point and Talbot Park demonstrate council’s long-term partnership with central government working together to create a complete community. In the case of Hobsonville Point, a single land owner, Hobsonville Land Company (now Homes Land Community, a subsidiary of Housing New Zealand) was established. Its focus on public value, created through a long-term view of investment, means that high-quality urban design can be delivered at medium-density and at scale. New development was integrated with social infrastructure, public transport service and local retail delivered at an early stage of development. Other masterplanned developments planned and delivered by the private sector, such as Stonefields in Mt Wellington, Kensington Park in Orewa, Vinegar Lane in Ponsonby, Beaumont Quarter in the city fringe, and The Isaac in Grey Lynn, have demonstrated that quality urban design can also be market-attractive in an outer suburban context.

The role of a Place Champion

29. A Place Champion is a promoter of the city and an embodiment of our collective ambition for a world-class city. The idea is not to pull focus from high-profile projects but to integrate better design into decision-making across the board. The key purpose of the Place Champion is to ensure that council provides a vision and strategy for delivering quality design across council.

30. Place Champions promote the benefit and value of good design in delivering quality placemaking to communities. They provide leadership, local knowledge and commitment to good urban design outcomes and build this into local board projects and investments.

31. A Place Champion will be able to coordinate efforts across the local board, focusing on delivering a quality built environment.

32. The Place Champion will ensure local board processes promote the delivery of quality placemaking and development.

33. A political Place Champion will provide leadership, a voice for good design in decision-making, generate enthusiasm for a design-led city approach and promote the value of good design as adding economic (financial, environmental and social) value.

34. The Officer Design Champion, with the Auckland Design Office (ADO), will support the network and political champion by providing a visible point of contact for council and for external organisations.

Proposal for a renewed commitment to quality urban design

35. The Planning Committee is the body responsible for setting policy for Auckland Council on urban planning and design matters. This report provides the committee with an opportunity to recommit to its 2011 pledge for quality urban design across the city - see Attachment A: Tools for Creating a Liveable City.

36. An Elected Members’ and Independent Māori Statutory Board (IMSB) Place Champion Network could help officers and the committee develop policy and have a lead role in urban design advocacy. Members of such a network would be Place Champions within their respective local boards and within IMSB.
37. There needs to be effective co-ordination with other council programmes and agencies to deliver on the promise of a high-quality built environment. The Auckland Council group of organisations all have a part to play in delivering quality urban design for Aucklanders and the Auckland Design Office will continue to collaborate with these teams. (see Attachment B: Auckland Design Office (ADO) …enabling a design-led city strategy) The Auckland Design Office will encourage a network of senior-level Place Champions in all Council-Controlled Organisations.

38. Council can proactively engage with central government on these issues. A renewed commitment to quality urban design will help move this engagement forward to actual development issues and opportunities.

39. Figure 1 (below), is a Potential Urban Design Stakeholder Framework that can be used as a basis for engagement with key stakeholders. For the purposes of this report, it should help in the understanding of the stakeholder issues informing the recommendations in this report.

Figure 1. Potential Urban Design Stakeholder Framework

---

Consideration

Local board views and implications

40. Local boards are identified as a key stakeholder and the proposed period of stakeholder engagement will be an opportunity to engage directly with local boards on the ideas and recommendations in this first report.

41. The intent of this report is to increase opportunities for local boards to use the advice and support of the Auckland Design Office, to develop urban design advice for the Planning Committee and participate in a renewed commitment to quality urban design in shaping their own programmes and influencing development outcomes in their respective areas.
As a component of the Elected Member Development Programme “Kura Kawana”, Local Boards Services have undertaken surveying of Elected Members to better understand their expertise, their needs and any gaps. High on the agenda for local board members has been a desire for enhanced urban design and place-making skills and so there is an opportunity for Auckland Design Office and Local Board Services to partner and to support the local board members (and Local Board Place Champions Network) in this crucial area.

Māori impact statement

Ngā Aho, a network of Māori design professionals, have met with Mana Whenua and are engaging with other stakeholder groups and will be involved in the development of further design advice. The Auckland Design Office has a growing leadership capability in Māori design advice and this report identifies the promotion of Māori “Te Aranga” Design Principles as one of the key opportunities for council in promoting quality urban design outcomes.

Implementation

The key implementation action from this report is a period of targeted stakeholder engagement which will inform further advice to the committee on initiatives to support a renewed commitment to quality urban design. It is envisaged that this engagement would take place between this committee meeting and February 2018, allowing a further report to be submitted to the committee in March 2018.
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Tools for Creating a Liveable City

Executive Summary
At its meeting on 10 March 2011, the Planning and Urban Design Forum considered the following item, and resolved as follows:

**Tools for Creating a Liveable City: Becoming an Urban Design Protocol Signatory / Nominating Design Champions**

Resolution number DPUD/2011/1

MOVED by Councillor Coney, seconded Councillor Ane:

a) That the report be received.

MOVED by Councillor Coney, seconded by Councillor Ane:

b) That the Planning and Urban Design Forum endorses Auckland Council becoming a signatory to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol and recommends this approach to the Regional Development and Operations Committee.

c) That the Planning and Urban Design Forum nominates Councillor Brewer to be appointed by the Regional Development and Operations Committee as the Auckland Council Political Urban Design Champion.

d) That the Planning and Urban Design Forum endorses Ludo Campbell-Reid (Manager Environmental Strategy and Policy) as the Officer Design Champion.

e) That the Planning and Urban Design Forum requests that each Local Board nominate one Local Board Member to act as the Design Champion for their Board and recommends to the Regional Development and Operations Committee that Design Champion Networks be established to support them.

f) That the Planning and Urban Design Forum instructs officers to continue to develop the Auckland Urban Design Strategy to meet the Urban Design Protocol requirement for an Action Plan.

Recommendation/s

a) That the report be received.

b) That the Regional Development and Operations Committee endorses Auckland Council becoming a signatory to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol.

c) That Councillor Brewer be appointed by the Regional Development and Operations Committee as the Auckland Council Political Urban Design Champion.

d) That the Regional Development and Operations Committee agrees with the decision of the Planning and Urban Design Forum that Design Champion Networks be established to support Local Boards.
Renewing Auckland Council’s commitment to quality urban design to deliver a world-class city
Regional Development and Operations Committee
12 April 2011


File No.: Attachment A

Executive Summary
The Minister for the Environment has written to the Mayor requesting that the Auckland Council become a signatory to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol (see Attachment A).

The Ministry for the Environment launched the Urban Design Protocol (Attachment B) in 2005. Becoming a signatory to the Protocol is a voluntary commitment by various organisations (including central and local government, design professionals, property professionals and professional institutes) to make New Zealand’s cities and towns better places for their inhabitants, through good urban design. All the previous Councils within the Auckland region were signatories to the Protocol and the Minister for the Environment has now written to the Mayor inviting Auckland Council to become a signatory. Becoming a signatory means the Auckland Council as an organisation is committed to achieving and promoting quality urban design, setting an example to others. It requires the creation of an ‘Action Plan’ stating how the Council will achieve good urban design throughout the Region and the appointment of an Design Champion (or Champions).

Recommendations
a) That the report be received,

b) That the Planning and Urban Design Forum endorses Auckland Council becoming a signatory to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol and recommends this approach to the Regional Development and Operations Committee.

c) That the Planning and Urban Design Forum nominates a Councillor to be appointed by the Regional Development and Operations Committee as the Auckland Council Political Design Champion.

d) That the Planning and Urban Design Forum endorses Ludo Campbell-Reid (Manager Environmental Strategy and Policy) as the Officer Design Champion.

e) That the Planning and Urban Design Forum requests that each Local Board nominate one Local Board Member to act as the Design Champion for their Board and recommends to the Regional Development and Operations Committee that Design Champion Networks be established to support them.

f) That the Planning and Urban Design Forum instructs officers to continue to develop the Auckland Urban Design Strategy to meet the Urban Design Protocol requirement for an Action Plan.
Background

The Urban Design Protocol (Attachment B) was first launched by the Ministry for the Environment in 2005. The Protocol is a voluntary commitment by various organisations (including central and local government, design professionals, property professionals and professional institutes) to make New Zealand’s cities and towns better places for their inhabitants, through good urban design. Each of the Councils that amalgamated to become the Auckland Council were signatories to the Protocol.

The Minister for the Environment has written to the Mayor requesting that the Auckland Council become a signatory to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol. The letter (Attachment A) states “I would like to acknowledge the role that the previous Auckland Councils and their Council Controlled Organisations have played in the establishment and ongoing support of the Protocol. The Auckland region was the first to have all its councils signed up to the Protocol. With the creation of the new Auckland Council, the Protocol lost eleven of its most valuable signatory organisations. Auckland Council would be a welcome addition to the 180 Protocol signatory organisations. This provides a great opportunity for the Auckland Council, being the largest urban area in New Zealand, to continue to support and provide leadership in quality urban design by confirming its commitment to join the Protocol.”

Achieving good urban design will play a critical role in achieving the Mayor’s vision for Auckland becoming the most liveable city in the world.

The Protocol aims to make cities more successful by using quality urban design to help them become:

- Competitive places that thrive economically and facilitate creativity and innovation
- Liveable places that provide a choice of housing, work and lifestyle options
- A healthy environment that sustains people and nature
- Inclusive places that offer opportunities for all citizens
- Distinctive places that have a strong identity and sense of place
- Well-governed places that have a shared vision and sense of direction.

Becoming a signatory to the Urban Design Protocol requires a commitment from the organisation. The primary obligation as a signatory is the creation of an Urban Design Action Plan, which sets out how the organisation will promote and achieve good urban design through its actions.

Work has commenced on preparing the Auckland Urban Design Strategy (see Attachment C for first draft) as one of the Mayor’s 100 projects and it is proposed that this become Auckland Council Urban Design Action Plan to meet the Protocol obligation.

As a part of becoming a signatory to the Protocol, each organisation is required to appoint a design Champion (or Champions), who are senior, influential people who are then responsible for overseeing the implementation of an Urban Design Action Plan, and promoting good urban design throughout the organisation. In the instance of an organisation as large as the Council, it is considered appropriate to have a design champion at both the officer and Councillor level.

The Ministry for the Environment sees the role of the Design Champion as primarily being to promote quality urban design within the organisation, and ensuring that urban design issues are considered in all relevant decisions. It suggests that the Design Champions responsibilities could include:

- becoming a visible central point of contact both within and outside of the organisation
- promoting the value of quality urban design, persuading and influencing key decision-makers
- identifying opportunities and encouraging pro-active action to improve urban design outcomes
- sharing knowledge and learning across the organisation and with other partners
Regional Development and Operations Committee
12 April 2011

- helping build a common vision for the projects or programmes they are responsible for or how they see the quality of the urban environment improving through the organisation’s actions
- ensuring the urban design implications of any strategy, policy or project are considered at an early stage
- developing a multi-disciplinary approach across professions, departments, teams or groups within the organisation
- working jointly with other organisations and sectors to improve urban design outcomes
- encouraging early and pro-active consultation on major urban projects
- ensuring access to sufficient design skills within the organisation, including providing ongoing urban design training for all relevant staff
- developing ways to encourage innovation and creativity within the organisation
- developing ‘partnering’ approaches with other organisations.

It is also considered appropriate for each Local Board to appoint a Design Champion in order for good urban design to be achieved through local decision making. Auckland Council Design Champions would become part of a network that would meet regularly to share knowledge, best practice and receive urban design training.

Decision Making

The recommendations contained within this report fall within the Committee’s delegated authority.

The two options available to the Committee are to recommend that the Council becomes a signatory to the Urban Design Protocol, or to do nothing.

Becoming a signatory to the Urban Design Protocol will require the Council to prepare an Action Plan, which will outline how the Council will promote good urban design through its action. As this is already one of the Mayor’s 100 projects (the Auckland Urban Design Strategy), this should not involve any actions that the Council is not already involved in, or intending to implement as part of its work plan, specifically the work plan of the Council’s Built Environment Unit. If the Council becomes a signatory to the Protocol, it is then required to appoint a Design Champion (or Champions).

Significance of Decision

The course of action recommended in this report does not trigger the Council’s Significance Policy and has no direct impact on any Local Area Plans.

Consultation

There has been no consultation undertaken relating to this report.

Financial and Resourcing Implications

There are no direct financial implications involved in becoming a signatory to the Urban Design Protocol. Running costs associated with the Design Champions Network are estimated at $20,000 per annum and have been allowed for in existing budgets. The cost of producing the Urban Design Strategy (Action Plan) is estimated to be $15,000 and is budgeted for within the current financial year.

Legal and Legislative Implications

There are no legal implications relating to this report.

Implementation Issues

There are no direct implementation issues involved in becoming a signatory to the urban design protocol.
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I am writing to invite Auckland Council to become a signatory of the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol (the Protocol). The Protocol was launched in 2005 with the vision of Making New Zealand towns and cities more successful through quality urban design. Signatories to the Protocol make a voluntary commitment to undertake actions that, together, will make a significant difference to the quality of our towns and cities. The Government is committed to managing the urban environment and creating strong economic growth to support the needs of our urban population, and the Protocol is one mechanism for achieving this.

I would like to acknowledge the role that the previous Auckland Councils and their council controlled organisations have played in the establishment and ongoing support of the Protocol. The Auckland region was the first to have all its councils signed up to the Protocol. With the creation of the new Auckland Council, the Protocol lost eleven of its most valuable signatory organisations.

Auckland Council would be a welcome addition to the 180 Protocol signatory organisations. This provides a great opportunity for the Auckland Council, being the largest urban area of New Zealand, to continue to support and provide leadership in quality urban design by confirming its commitment to join the Protocol.

The Protocol has a number of supporting resources, sends out a monthly newsletter and holds symposium and workshops for its signatory organisations. Many of your goals, such as making Auckland the world’s most liveable city, would provide valuable actions in the implementation of the Protocol. If you would like assistance in signing the Council up to the Protocol, please feel free to contact Yvonne Weeber, Analyst in the Ministry for the Environment’s Business and Communities team on (04) 439 7554.

Yours sincerely,

Hon Dr Nick Smith
Minister for the Environment
Urban Design Strategy – Summary

Council’s Built Environment Unit (BEU) has the following principles:

- Working together across the city to improve Auckland’s distinctive identity and liveability
- Enhancing Auckland as a place which responds to the needs and aspirations of the local communities and the character of its environment
- Creating high quality, vibrant places that benefit the social, cultural, economic and environmental wellbeing of Auckland as a whole
- Ensuring that Auckland’s urban form responds to the regions distinctive physical and cultural landscape.

Explanation:

- The BEU will work with, and for, all parts of Council, local communities and the development sector to ensure best practice urban design outcomes are achieved, for all public and private projects and initiatives.
- The BEU will also work to ensure that all projects improve the distinctive identity and liveability of the Auckland region as a whole.
- The BEU will ensure that best practice, place-based urban planning and design techniques are used. This place-based (context sensitive) approach will ensure that projects respond to the needs and aspirations of the local people and communities; it will also ensure that projects and places respond to and enhance the physical and cultural character and landscape in which they are located.
- The BEU is committed to creating high quality, safe, vibrant and liveable places for Aucklanders. Such places and spaces have proven benefits for the social and cultural wellbeing of the region’s people. They also create economic benefits for its inhabitants, and contribute to the health and sustainability of the natural, and the built environment.

We believe good urban design needs to be delivered across the organisation, not just by the urban design team.

We believe to take Auckland forward the following issues need to be addressed:

- Growth - The population of the Auckland region is growing rapidly. This level of growth puts significant pressure on housing supply and affordability and other infrastructure such as roads. Urban design has a key role to play in the provision of quality housing that must not only meet people’s basic needs for accommodation, but also the need for high quality neighbourhoods that support the formation of robust and healthy communities.
- Global Competitiveness - Auckland is increasingly competing on the world stage for a mobile, skilled workforce and for international investment. The city faces issues such as quality of transport infrastructure, rising housing and land costs and a growing shortage of skilled workers. Urban design has a key role to play in tackling some of these issues and promoting Auckland in the global market. The city’s economic success requires excellent transport infrastructure and a high-quality, exciting urban environment.
- Sustainability - A more sustainable region is required to ensure that Auckland remains a desirable city to live in. Issues such as car dominance, rising energy costs and more sustainable building practices need to be addressed. Good urban design can help Auckland to become a more sustainable region by finding ways to use our resources wisely to reduce our impact on the environment.

- Community well-being - The improved provision, location and quality of connections to key services (such as community facilities, open spaces and public transport) can play a significant role in addressing social inequality and increasing well-being. Urban design also promotes place-based, affordable quality housing of a variety of sizes and tenures.

**An Urban Design Spatial Vision for the Auckland Region**

Considering all these issues, the BEU has the following vision for the development of the Auckland region:

A more compact city, made up of distinctive, walkable mixed-use villages. New development and infrastructure responds to the unique landscape and is of high quality, inclusive design which is sustainable and context-sensitive.
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Purpose of this document

What is urban design? Region-wide, Urban and Rural

Principles of Urban Design
   The Ministry for the Environment 7 Cs:

Key Urban Design Qualities - The Seven Cs

The Auckland Council will be a signatory to New Zealand’s Urban Design Protocol. The Protocol identifies seven essential design qualities that create quality urban design. Dubbed ‘the seven Cs’ they are:

   Context, Character, Choice, Connections, Creativity, Custodianship and Collaboration.

As discussed in the Protocol, these seven Cs:

   - provide a checklist of qualities that contribute to quality urban design
   - are based on sound urban design principles recognised and demonstrated throughout the world
   - explain these qualities in simple language, providing a common basis for discussing urban issues and objectives
   - provide core concepts to use in urban design projects and policies
   - can be adapted for use in towns and cities throughout New Zealand.

As a signatory to the Protocol, the Auckland Council is required to reflect these seven qualities in its policies and decision-making relating to urban design.

Context

Quality urban design sees buildings, places and spaces not as isolated elements but as part of the whole town or city. For example, a building is connected to its street, the street to its neighbourhood, the neighbourhood to its city, and the city to its region.

Urban design has a strong spatial dimension and optimises relationships between buildings, places, spaces, activities and networks. It also recognises that towns and cities are part of a constantly evolving relationship between people, land, culture and the wider environment.

What this means for Auckland:

   - need to base design on its context – both built and natural
   - consider people first
   - masterplan areas to make sure smaller developments do not undermine the bigger vision for an area

Case study

   - ??
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Foreword

The New Zealand Urban Design Protocol marks a significant milestone in our nation's urban development. The changes we make now in the way we design our towns and cities will make a difference not just to us, but to our children and our children's children in how they live their lives. The Urban Design Protocol forms part of the Government's Sustainable Development Programme of Action, which aims to ensure our towns and cities are healthy, safe and attractive places where business, social and cultural life can flourish.

New Zealand is one of the most urbanised nations in the world - almost 87% of our population live in towns and cities. Yet we haven't paid enough attention to making the places we live in successful places that work for people.

The design of our towns and cities affects almost every aspect of our lives - we all live and work in buildings, and use streets, public spaces, transport systems and other infrastructure. We need to ensure that what we design meets people's needs and aspirations, and that people want to live there. We need to ensure our towns and cities are successful places that contribute positively to our identity as a nation.

The Urban Design Protocol is the first step toward improving the quality of our towns and cities. The actions that individual signatories take will, together, make a significant difference. The Government is also committed to raising the standard of urban design, and we will lead this change through a programme of actions.

The success of the Urban Design Protocol in attracting such strong support from across New Zealand and so many different sectors illustrates that the time is right for New Zealand to make a leap forward in the quality of our urban design. The Urban Design Protocol is just the start of a number of initiatives that will be developed under the Urban Affairs portfolio, and which will demonstrate the Government's commitment to creating towns and cities that we can all be proud of.

Marian L. Hobbs
Minister with Responsibility for Urban Affairs
Minister for the Environment
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Executive Summary

The New Zealand Urban Design Protocol provides a platform to make New Zealand towns and cities more successful through quality urban design. It is part of the Government's Sustainable Development Programme of Action and Urban Affairs portfolio.

Urban design seeks to ensure that the design of buildings, places, spaces and networks that make up our towns and cities work for all of us, both now and in the future.

The Urban Design Protocol identifies seven essential design qualities that together create quality urban design:

- **Context**: seeing buildings, places and spaces as part of whole towns and cities
- **Character**: reflecting and enhancing the distinctive character, heritage and identity of our urban environment
- **Choice**: ensuring diversity and choice for people
- **Connections**: enhancing how different networks link together for people
- **Creativity**: encouraging innovative and imaginative solutions
- **Custodianship**: ensuring design is environmentally sustainable, safe and healthy
- **Collaboration**: communicating and sharing knowledge across sectors, professions and with communities.

The Urban Design Protocol is a voluntary commitment by central and local government, property developers and investors, design professionals, educational institutes and other groups to undertake specific urban design initiatives. The actions that individual signatories take will, together, make a significant difference to the quality of our towns and cities.

To support the implementation of the Urban Design Protocol, the Government will provide leadership through a suite of supporting resources and a programme of action. These will build the capacity of organisations to deliver quality urban design, provide guidance, raise community awareness, and ensure that the key messages of the Urban Design Protocol are firmly grasped and put into action.
Vision and Mission Statement

Vision
Making New Zealand towns and cities more successful through quality urban design.

Mission Statement
The New Zealand Urban Design Protocol calls for a significant step up in the quality of urban design in New Zealand and a change in the way we think about our towns and cities. As part of a co-ordinated programme of sustainable development, it aims to ensure New Zealand's towns and cities are successful places for people.

It will achieve this by:
- creating a national cross-sector commitment to quality urban design
- providing a national resource of tools, actions and experiences
- setting up partnerships between government, the private sector and professionals
- increasing the awareness of quality urban design and demonstrating its value.

The Urban Design Protocol recognises that:
- towns and cities are complex systems that require integrated management
- quality urban design is an essential component of successful towns and cities
- urban design needs to be an integral part of all urban decision-making
- urban design requires alliances across sectors and professionals
- urban design applies at all scales, from small towns to large cities
- urban design has a significant influence on people and how they live their lives
- our towns and cities are important expressions of New Zealand's cultural identity including our unique Māori heritage.
Introduction

This New Zealand Urban Design Protocol (Urban Design Protocol) is part of the Government's Sustainable Development Programme of Action. The Urban Design Protocol is a key deliverable of the 'Sustainable Cities' action area, which seeks to make our cities healthy, safe and attractive places where business, social and cultural life can flourish.

It supports and builds on a range of government strategies for improving our urban environments that encompass economic growth and innovation, transport, housing, regional development, social development, health, disability, and culture and heritage (see Appendix 1).

The principal audiences for the Urban Design Protocol are urban decision-makers in government, property developers and investors, and professionals working in the built environment, including planners, architects, landscape architects, surveyors, transport planners, and engineers. The purpose of the Protocol is to signal the Government’s commitment to quality urban design, to start debate and raise awareness of urban design across the country, to improve the exchange of learning and information, and to initiate a programme of action to result in quality urban design.
The Urban Design Protocol is supported by Urban Design Case Studies that show practical examples of successful urban design, an Urban Design Toolkit that provides a compendium of tools and mechanisms to help create quality urban design, a Summary of Urban Design Research, covering current research in New Zealand on urban design and urban environments; and a Value Case, which shows evidence of the link between quality urban design and economic, environmental, social and cultural value (see Section 4).

The Urban Design Protocol will be implemented through the actions of its signatories, through leadership by government, and through raising wider awareness of the value of quality urban design. By endorsing the Protocol, signatories are indicating their commitment to the pursuit of quality urban design that will result in benefits, both to the signatory and the wider community.

**What is a Protocol?**

A protocol is a formal undertaking between signatories. Parties to a protocol agree to support and demonstrate the principles outlined in the document and to make demonstrable progress towards achieving its vision. A protocol is an agreement and has no force in law.

**What is Urban Design?**

Urban design is concerned with the design of the buildings, places, spaces and networks that make up our towns and cities, and the ways people use them. It ranges in scale from a metropolitan region, city or town down to a street, public space or even a single building. Urban design is concerned not just with appearances and built form but with the environmental, economic, social and cultural consequences of design. It is an approach that draws together many different sectors and professions, and it includes both the process of decision-making as well as the outcomes of design.

**What is the value of urban design?**

Quality urban design is important for everybody because our lives are connected through our common built environment. We all live and work in buildings, and use streets, public spaces, transport systems, and other forms of urban infrastructure.

Quality urban design creates places that work and places that we use and value.

Urban design has economic, environmental, cultural and social dimensions. Increasingly we are recognising the economic importance of our towns and cities to the national economy. Quality of infrastructure and quality of life are key factors in creating successful towns and cities. Urban design can have significant positive effects on both.

Quality urban design also increases economic value with higher returns on investment, reduced management and maintenance costs, more productive workplaces, and enhanced image and prestige.

Quality urban design values and protects the cultural identity and heritage of our towns and cities and provides for creativity. It reinforces New Zealand's distinctive identity. Quality urban design also adds social, environmental and cultural benefits by creating well-connected, inclusive and accessible places, and by delivering the mix of houses, uses and facilities that we need. It can enhance safety, reduce crime and fear of crime and enhance energy efficiency. Quality urban design can provide us with more and better opportunities for physical activity resulting in improved physical and social wellbeing.

Quality urban design produces benefits at a city-wide level as well as at the scale of neighbourhoods and individual buildings or spaces. For example, a well-designed transport network integrated with land use improves accessibility and mobility, contributes to a better quality of life.
encourages healthier lifestyles, uses less non-renewable energy, and contributes to improved economic performance.

A well designed building and adjacent spaces produce higher capital values and rental returns, lower long term maintenance costs, increased productivity from its occupants, better security and less crime and fear of crime, and increased civic pride.

The benefits of quality urban design accrue to businesses through increased productivity and prestige to communities in improved urban environments and safer, healthier places, and to developers and investors in better returns on investment.

Research has found no evidence that quality urban design necessarily increases development costs. Indeed good design is fundamental to achieving value for money, because it creates functional, productive, robust and attractive environments. Design costs are typically a very small proportion of whole life costs (less than 0.5 percent), yet design choices have a significant impact on construction and operating costs and on the wider community.

The Value Case (see Section 4) contains our research and examples that support this.

Urban settlement in New Zealand

Urban settlement in New Zealand has occurred relatively recently, especially when compared to Europe and Asia. Our first urban areas were Maori settlements sited strategically to take advantage of a natural food source or an easily defendable position. Patterns of previous Maori settlement and the relationships of tangata whenua with the land remain important aspects of urban design.

The colonial pattern of European settlement has strongly influenced the development of our towns and cities. It is no accident that most of our towns and cities are located on or near the coast, as a sheltered harbour was a prerequisite for access by coastal transport before the development of the road and rail networks.

The founders of new towns in New Zealand sought to provide residents with the amenities perceived to be lacking in large industrial British cities. Because land was readily available and towns relatively small, many more people could aspire to suburban living in a detached house with a garden. The prevalent mode of transport had a significant impact on the pattern, size and form of our towns and cities. Suburbs initially grew around horse-drawn vehicles, but the introduction first of trams and then of private motor vehicles saw rapid suburban expansion into outer areas. Today our larger cities have extensive, low-density housing on their suburban edges with inner areas typically having a more varied mix of housing densities and uses, often laid out in a traditional grid pattern.

Our towns and cities are characterised by their distinct natural topographies and often dramatic landscape settings. For example: Auckland's volcanic cones, Rotorua's geothermal features, Wellington's faultlines and harbour, Christchurch's floodplain and mountain backdrop, and Queenstown's spectacular lake and mountains. These landscapes create the uniqueness of our urban areas but they can also dictate growth patterns and present obstacles to infrastructure development.
WHAT CAN URBAN DESIGN DO FOR NEW ZEALAND?

Our towns and cities are experiencing significant growth pressures, ranging from the massive population growth of Auckland and continued urban expansion in Wellington and Christchurch to growth in smaller regional towns that offer desirable lifestyle opportunities like Queenstown, Nelson and lauranga. How we manage this growth and the quality of development will have a significant influence on the liveability and sustainability of where most New Zealanders live.

The growth issues we have to deal with include how to design better suburbs on the edge of towns and cities, how to successfully intensify in our inner suburbs, and how to design liveable apartments in city centres.

Quality urban design can help us avoid some of the problems of poorly designed low-density developments that we have experienced in the past. These problems have included: traffic congestion, unsustainable energy use, overloaded urban infrastructure, a lack of distinctive identity, social isolation, and reduced physical activity with its associated problems such as obesity, diabetes and heart disease.

In many of our cities we have seen a trend towards multi-unit developments (these accounted for 20-30 percent of all building permits approved in Auckland over the past five years). Quality urban design can help ensure multi-unit developments provide attractive, liveable and affordable options, without impacting on our heritage and distinctive identity, our privacy, or overloading our urban infrastructure.

In some of our smaller towns, we are experiencing different issues associated with stagnant or declining populations. Some of the issues we have to deal with include the declining quality of the building stock, insufficient funding base to maintain and renew urban infrastructure, and pressure to accept poor quality design to secure economic development opportunities. A proactive strategy to ensure quality urban design can help address some of these issues.

The costs of poor design fall on all of us when we have to live or work in poorly designed buildings, when we have to use dysfunctional or unsafe public spaces, when we are cut off from essential services, and when, as property owners, businesses or ratepayers, we have to pay for long term maintenance.

The message we can learn from overseas is that addressing these issues requires co-ordinated thinking and a more structured approach to management of our urban areas. Managing the effects of individual activities is not enough on its own, we also need to manage urban systems and their interconnections. Quality urban design is an approach that can help us achieve this.

A co-ordinated approach

Creating quality urban design requires action across a wide range of sectors, groups and professions. Professionals in all disciplines need to work together in a ‘common space’, as no one profession can understand the full complexity of a town or city.
**Each group can make an important contribution to realising the vision.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Government</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead at a national level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate quality urban design through its own development and activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinate policies and actions across whole of government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop appropriate legislation and policy guidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set appropriate national standards and policy statements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote national awareness of urban design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support local government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinate urban design research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with education institutes to improve urban design education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead at a regional/local level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate quality urban design through its own development and activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop appropriate statutory policies, rules and guidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage statutory decision-making processes to ensure quality urban design outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote regional/local awareness of urban design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share research and ‘best practice’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate urban management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work collaboratively with the private sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developers and Investors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate quality urban design in every development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work collaboratively with local government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve communities in projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognise the public interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Champion quality urban design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote quality urban design to clients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in local decision-making and design advisory processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and promote ‘best practice’ approaches and tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PROFESSIONAL INSTITUTES | Champion quality urban design  
| | Develop and promote 'best practice' approaches and tools  
| | Improve skills and knowledge through education and training  
| | Work collaboratively with other professional institutes  
| EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTES | Lead research on urban design  
| | Work collaboratively with the public and private sectors  
| | Participate in local decision-making and design advisory processes  
| | Develop training courses to improve understanding and application of urban design  
| SECTOR ORGANISATIONS | Work with their sector to improve understanding and application of urban design  
| | Advocate for quality urban design  
| | Work collaboratively with the public and private sectors  
| COMMUNITY | Recognise the stewardship roles and responsibilities with urban environments  
| | Demand quality urban design  
| | Develop community action projects  
| | Participate in community engagement forums  
| | Lead proactive neighbourhood projects  
| INI AND INI AUTHORITIES | Recognise the kaitiaki roles and responsibilities with urban environments  
| | Advocate for quality urban design  
| | Develop community action projects  
| | Participate in community engagement forums |
Attributes of Successful Towns and Cities

Successful towns and cities are increasingly being recognised as vital to the health of our national economy. Success does not happen by chance but as a result of good planning based on a long term vision and co-ordinated implementation.

This section identifies six essential attributes that successful towns and cities share. Drawing on the Sustainable Development Programme of Action, they incorporate economic, environmental, social and cultural factors. It is the combination of all these attributes that leads to success.

Quality urban design is an important contributing factor to all six attributes. Well designed urban spaces, places, buildings and networks are essential building blocks upon which many other attributes of successful towns and cities are built.
Successful towns and cities are:

**Competitive, thriving, creative, and innovative**

Successful towns and cities are competitive centres and economic hubs for New Zealand. They provide platforms for growth, especially in advanced business services, creative industries, hi-tech industries, and as centres of learning and innovation.

Competitive and thriving towns and cities attract dynamic and innovative knowledge workers, entrepreneurs, and companies. They appeal to talented people because they offer a high quality of life, effective transport systems, high environmental quality, good leisure and recreation opportunities, thriving cultural centres, arts and historic heritage, and a distinctive cultural identity.

Creativity is a hallmark of successful towns and cities. Creative towns and cities facilitate new ways of thinking and innovative ways of solving problems. They foster new partnerships and support centres of learning. Creative cities have a strong identity, a rich cultural life, and are well connected regionally and internationally. They have a culture of innovation and they invest in people. Creative cities connected to global markets are a primary source of innovation, technological development and wealth creation in modern economies.

**Liveable**

Successful towns and cities provide a high quality of life where people choose to live and work. They provide attractive living environments, they offer good leisure and recreational opportunities, and they support a thriving cultural life.

Liveable places provide choices in housing, work, transport and lifestyle. They are easy to move around, with accessible services and a variety of integrated transport options that include walking and cycling. Their public spaces are accessible, well used and safe. Liveable places are healthy places to live, and they have low levels of crime.

Images from left to right:
1. George Street, Dunedin
2. Tauranga waterfront.
   - Photo courtesy of Tauranga City Council.
ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIBLE

Successful towns and cities maintain, celebrate and add to their best environmental attributes. They recognise the role that landscape and the natural environment play in making their urban areas great places to live and work, and they value the contribution they make to their identity, liveability and quality of life. They enhance these qualities by maintaining and sometimes recreating natural networks throughout their urban areas, and by designing new buildings, transport services and infrastructure that meet the highest standards of sustainable design and construction.

Environmentally responsible towns and cities manage resources to take account of the needs of present and future generations. Growth and economic development is sympathetic to the natural environment and cultural heritage and minimises the city's environmental footprint. Environmentally responsible towns and cities constantly seek ways to minimise adverse impacts on human health and natural and cultural systems, including air quality and water quality. They minimise waste production, energy and water use, and maximise the efficiency of land use and infrastructure.

Images from left to right
1. Remuera Footbridge, Waitakere City
2. Northwood, Christchurch.
Successful towns and cities have:

**Opportunities for all**
Successful towns and cities accommodate all citizens and offer opportunities for young and old, people on low incomes and people with disabilities. The benefits of urban life are widely shared. They provide access to jobs, affordable homes, services and community facilities. Successful towns and cities are inclusive societies that respect and celebrate diversity and care for the disadvantaged. They build a strong sense of community, and encourage people to participate in making decisions that affect them. A successful town or city is equitable and everyone feels a sense of ownership, which is reflected in their safe and dynamic public spaces.

**Distinctive identity**
Successful towns and cities have a strong and locally distinctive identity that builds on the unique strengths and characteristics of each place and the cultural identity of New Zealand. They reflect our heritage and culture in their built form, in the landscape, and in the way spaces are organised and used. Successful towns and cities reflect our increasingly diverse ethnic mix, including all people who have made New Zealand their home — indigenous Maori, Europeans, Pacific Islanders, and Asians. Recognising and promoting a town's or city's identity encourages diversity of cultural expression through design that recognises distinctive use of space, form and materials. It fosters local pride, civic engagement and confidence, and it stimulates innovation, creativity and economic opportunities.

Images from left to right

1. The Strand, Tauranga.
   Photo courtesy of Tauranga City Council.
2. NZC Building and Protogenia (sculpture), Wellington.
   Photo courtesy of Wellington City Council.
SHARED VISION AND GOOD GOVERNANCE

A successful town or city has a clear sense of direction and a widely shared vision. There is genuine engagement with communities and leadership at many levels. Creative ideas are encouraged and freely exchanged between people and government.

In a successful town or city, local governance is effective, efficient and confident. Leaders are prepared to take risks to deliver the best outcomes, but priorities and trade-offs are made explicit, and the benefits and costs of decisions are understood. Decision-makers think holistically and creatively, and they learn from mistakes. They work in partnership with businesses, iwi and other local communities to reach shared goals.

Images from left to right
1. Newmarket Futures Workshop.
   Photo courtesy of Auckland City Council.

   Photo courtesy of Wellington City Council.
Key Urban Design Qualities - the Seven Cs

The Urban Design Protocol identifies seven essential design qualities that create quality urban design: the seven Cs. They are: Context, Character, Choice, Connections, Creativity, Custodianship and Collaboration. These are a combination of design processes and outcomes.

The seven Cs:

- provide a checklist of qualities that contribute to quality urban design
- are based on sound urban design principles recognised and demonstrated throughout the world
- explain these qualities in simple language, providing a common basis for discussing urban issues and objectives
- provide core concepts to use in urban design projects and policies
- can be adapted for use in towns and cities throughout New Zealand.


**CONTEXT**

Quality urban design sees buildings, places and spaces not as isolated elements but as part of the whole town or city. For example, a building is connected to its street, the street to its neighbourhood, the neighbourhood to its city, and the city to its region. Urban design has a strong spatial dimension and optimises relationships between buildings, places, spaces, activities and networks. It also recognises that towns and cities are part of a constantly evolving relationship between people, land, culture and the wider environment.

Quality urban design:
- takes a long term view
- recognises and builds on landscape context and character
- results in buildings and places that are adapted to local climatic conditions
- examines each project in relation to its setting and ensures that each development fits in with and enhances its surroundings
- understands the social, cultural and economic context as well as physical elements and relationships
- considers the impact on the health of the population who live and work there
- celebrates cultural identity and recognises the heritage values of a place
- ensures incremental development contributes to an agreed and coherent overall result.

Images from left to right:
1. Hermitage Street Trust. Hastings. Photo courtesy of Ohrmus Group
2. Mt Victoria, Wellington
Character

Quality urban design reflects and enhances the distinctive character and culture of our urban environment, and recognises that character is dynamic and evolving, not static. It ensures new buildings and spaces are unique, are appropriate to their location and complement their historic identity, adding value to our towns and cities by increasing tourism, investment and community pride.

Quality urban design:

- reflects the unique identity of each town, city and neighbourhood and strengthens the positive characteristics that make each place distinctive
- protects and manages our heritage, including buildings, places and landscapes
- protects and enhances distinctive landforms, water bodies and indigenous plants and animals
- creates locally appropriate and inspiring architecture, spaces and places
- reflects and celebrates our unique New Zealand culture and identity and celebrates our multi-cultural society.
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1. West Quay, Whakarewarewa
   Photo courtesy of Inithmus Group
2. The Deck, Ponsonby Road, Auckland
   Photo courtesy of Auckland City Council
CHOICE

Quality urban design fosters diversity and offers people choice in the urban form of our towns and cities, and choice in densities, building types, transport options, and activities. Flexible and adaptable design provides for unforeseen uses, and creates resilient and robust towns and cities.

Quality urban design:

- ensures urban environments provide opportunities for all, especially the disadvantaged
- allows people to choose different sustainable lifestyle options, locations, modes of transport, types of buildings and forms of tenure
- encourages a diversity of activities within mixed use developments and neighbourhoods
- supports designs which are flexible and adaptable and which will remain useful over the long term
- ensures public spaces are accessible by everybody, including people with disabilities.

Images from left to right

   Photo courtesy of Sthema Group.
2. The Strand, Tauranga.
   Photo courtesy of Tauranga City Council.
Connections

Good connections enhance choice, support social cohesion, make places lively and safe, and facilitate contact among people. Quality urban design recognises how all networks - streets, railways, walking and cycling routes, services, infrastructure, and communication networks - connect and support healthy neighbourhoods, towns and cities. Places with good connections between activities and with careful placement of facilities benefit from reduced travel times and lower environmental impacts. Where physical layouts and activity patterns are easily understood, residents and visitors can navigate around the city easily.

Quality urban design:

- creates safe, attractive and secure pathways and links between centres, landmarks and neighbourhoods
- facilitates green networks that link public and private open space
- places a high priority on walking, cycling and public transport
- anticipates travel demands and provides a sustainable choice of integrated transport modes
- improves accessibility to public services and facilities
- treats streets and other thoroughfares as positive spaces with multiple functions
- provides formal and informal opportunities for social and cultural interaction
- facilitates access to services and efficient movement of goods and people
- provides environments that encourage people to become more physically active.

Images from left to right

1. Transport Interchange, Wellington.
2. Britomart Rail Terminal, Auckland.
   Photo courtesy of Auckland City Council.
CREATIVITY

Quality urban design encourages creative and innovative approaches. Creativity adds richness and diversity, and turns a functional place into a memorable place. Creativity facilitates new ways of thinking and willingness to think through problems afresh, to experiment and rewrite rules, to harness new technology, and to visualise new futures. Creative urban design supports a dynamic urban cultural life and fosters strong urban identities.

Quality urban design:
- emphasises innovative and imaginative solutions
- combines processes and design responses that enhance the experience we have of urban environments
- incorporates art and artists in the design process at an early stage to contribute to creative approaches
- values public art that is integrated into a building, space or place
- builds a strong and distinctive local identity
- utilises new technology
- incorporates different cultural perspectives.

Images from left to right
   Photo courtesy of Auckland City Council.
   Photo courtesy of Wellington City Council.
Custodianship

Quality urban design reduces the environmental impacts of our towns and cities through environmentally sustainable and responsive design solutions. Custodianship recognises the lifetime costs of buildings and infrastructure, and aims to hand on places to the next generation in as good or better condition. Stewardship of our towns includes the concept of kaitiakitanga. It creates enjoyable, safe public spaces, a quality environment that is cared for, and a sense of ownership and responsibility in all residents and visitors.

Quality urban design:
- protects landscapes, ecological systems and cultural heritage values
- manages the use of resources carefully, through environmentally responsive and sustainable design solutions
- manages land wisely
- utilises ‘green’ technology in the design and construction of buildings and infrastructure
- incorporates renewable energy sources and passive solar gain
- creates buildings, spaces, places and transport networks that are safer, with less crime and fear of crime
- avoids or mitigates the effects of natural and man-made hazards
- considers the on-going care and maintenance of buildings, spaces, places and networks
- uses design to improve the environmental performance of infrastructure
- considers the impact of design on people’s health.

Images from left to right
1. Community planting at Whenua Rangatira, Auckland. Photo courtesy of Auckland City Council
2. Mount Roskill School, Manukau City
**Collaboration**

Towns and cities are designed incrementally as we make decisions on individual projects. Quality urban design requires good communication and co-ordinated actions from all decision-makers; central government, local government, professionals, transport operators, developers and users. To improve our urban design capability we need integrated training, adequately funded research and shared examples of best practice.

**Quality urban design:**
- supports a common vision that can be achieved over time
- depends on leadership at many levels
- uses a collaborative approach to design that acknowledges the contributions of many different disciplines and perspectives
- involves communities in meaningful decision-making processes
- acknowledges and celebrates examples of good practice
- recognises the importance of training in urban design and research at national, regional and local levels.

---
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1. Out for a walk
   Photo courtesy of Auckland City Council
2. Newmarket Futures Workshop, Auckland
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Making it Happen

The Urban Design Protocol is more than just a statement of the importance of quality urban design. It seeks to make a real difference to the quality of New Zealand’s towns and cities through concerted action by all stakeholders. Making it happen requires action by the signatories to the Urban Design Protocol, leadership from central government, the development of resources to support its implementation, and raising awareness across New Zealand of the value of quality urban design.
SIGNATORIES TO THE URBAN DESIGN PROTOCOL

The leading signatories to this Urban Design Protocol come from a wide range of organisations spanning central government, local government, the private sector, educational institutes, professional bodies and other sector groups. They represent many of our major towns and cities, infrastructure providers, decision-makers and influencers. Each of these organisations has made a commitment to create quality urban design through their own actions. By setting an example for others to follow, they will make a real difference to the quality of our urban areas.

To maximise the impact of this Urban Design Protocol, we need to increase the number of signatories over time. We are aiming for commitment from all local governments, including those that represent our smaller towns, from all relevant government departments and crown entities, and from all sector groups involved in the design of our towns and cities. Setting this commitment will require a concerted effort across New Zealand to raise awareness of the importance of urban design, and the example set by the leading signatories will be instrumental in achieving this.

A register will be kept of all signatories to the Urban Design Protocol and will be updated regularly.

BENEFITS OF BEING A SIGNATORY

Becoming a signatory to the Urban Design Protocol signifies an organisation’s commitment to continuous improvement of its urban areas, and recognises its role in helping set an example for others in their sector.

Signatory organisations will have exclusive access to the ‘Design Champions Network’, providing a valuable forum for sharing information and experiences in developing policy and actions on urban design issues. Nominated design champions will be able to attend training sessions and workshops and meet high level representatives from both their own sector and other sectors.

Signatories also have access to the package of resources developed to support the Urban Design Protocol, to help them develop and implement their action programmes.

Signatory organisations will be eligible for special categories of award within the overall ‘National Urban Design Awards’ for relevant programmes, projects and developments. Signatories will also be given preference in future funding or support programmes developed as part of the Protocol implementation package.
Actions by Signatories

Signatories commit to putting the Urban Design Protocol into effect by developing, monitoring and reporting on a set of actions specific to their organisation. Over time these actions will change the way our towns and cities are managed, and will ensure that the commitment to quality urban design is carried out throughout the work of each organisation.

The 'Action Pack' provides examples of actions an organisation might take to implement the Urban Design Protocol. Ideas are provided for local government, central government, developers and investors, and other organisations. Actions can be targeted across all aspects of an organisation's activities, from strategy development to decision-making to research and staff training. The ideas are grouped in categories, including:

- championing urban design and raising awareness
- developing strategy and policy
- planning futures
- being a good client
- making decisions
- exchanging information and research
- integrating management
- building capacity.

Signatory organisations select their chosen actions and report them to the Ministry for the Environment within six months of the date of signing up to the Urban Design Protocol. The choice of actions is at the discretion of the signatory organisation, however they are expected to be challenging and ambitious. The Ministry for the Environment will prepare and keep up-to-date a publicly available list of actions.

There is only one mandatory action: each signatory must appoint a 'Design Champion' - someone influential at a senior level who can promote and champion urban design, and who can challenge existing approaches throughout the organisation.

Monitoring and Reporting

As part of their commitment to the Urban Design Protocol, signatories monitor and report on the implementation of their specific set of actions. They will develop a monitoring plan and submit this to Ministry for the Environment alongside their set of actions. The plan will outline how the implementation and outcomes of the actions will be monitored and reported. Guidance on how and what to monitor will be provided.

Each signatory will be required to submit a report to the Ministry for the Environment on the implementation of their set of actions. The first report back will be 31 August 2006, and thereafter every two years. These reports will be collated into a national report on the implementation of the Protocol and progress in achieving quality urban design in New Zealand. This will track:

- implementation of Urban Design Protocol actions across New Zealand
- lessons learnt from implementing the Urban Design Protocol actions
- awareness of urban design
- significant changes to urban design processes
- demonstrable urban design outcomes.
Urban Design Toolkit - the toolkit provides a compendium of tools and techniques that can be used to create quality urban design. It includes a set of common terms to describe the tools and processes, outlines their purpose, advantages and disadvantages, gives examples of where in New Zealand they have been used, and provides links to further information. The tools are linked to common categories of work to make finding information easy.

Urban Design Case Studies - the case studies provide 16 examples of built developments that demonstrate some of the urban design qualities outlined in the Urban Design Protocol. They come from a range of locations and land uses throughout New Zealand. Each case study is analysed against the Urban Design Protocol’s seven Cs, the benefits that urban design has added, and the lessons learnt from the design process. The case studies demonstrate the practical application of urban design principles in New Zealand, the resulting benefits, and areas where improvements could be made. Over time, new case studies will be added to this database, including those carried out by signatories as part of their programme of actions.

Urban Design Value Case - the value case presents a rationale and evidence for the link between quality urban design and economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits. It demonstrates the value that urban design adds at the site and city-wide scales. Qualitative and quantitative examples and scenarios show the contribution that good urban design makes to successful towns and cities. It is particularly relevant to property investors and developers and to key decision-makers.

Leadership by Central Government

The Government recognises its role in providing leadership to improve the quality of urban design across New Zealand. It supports the Urban Design Protocol and will ensure that central government departments and relevant crown entities become signatories and participate fully in its implementation.

The Government has developed a suite of supporting resources and a programme of action to support the Urban Design Protocol. These aim to build capacity and knowledge across all sectors, providing further guidance, raising community awareness, and ensuring that the important messages of the Urban Design Protocol are fully embedded and put into action.

(a) Supporting Resources

A number of resources have been developed to help signatories and other key decision-makers with realising the vision of the Urban Design Protocol. They are relevant to public and private sector organisations, professionals in all the design disciplines (e.g., planning, engineering, architecture, landscape architecture and surveying), as well as other sector and community groups.
Theme: Championing Urban Design and Raising Awareness

As part of its commitment to the Urban Design Protocol, the Government will undertake the following initiatives:

- National Urban Design Awards
  National awards for quality urban design developments, projects and programmes. To be developed in conjunction with professional institutes and the Property Council.

- Year of the Built Environment 2005
  2005 has been declared the Year of the Built Environment, and there will be a co-ordinated programme of events to raise community awareness of built environment issues and how they affect people's lives. This is being undertaken in conjunction with the New Zealand Institute of Architects and a steering group of other organisations.

Theme: Developing Strategy and Policy

- National Policy Statement
  Actively investigating whether a national policy statement on urban design could provide guidance to councils making decisions under the RMA. A work programme for developing national policy statements will be determined in early 2005.

Theme: Being a Good Client

- Best Practice Urban Design Guidelines (government departments)
  Guidelines on how government departments can ensure that their direct development activities achieve quality urban design.

Theme: Exchanging Information and Research

- Urban Design Research
  Working with research funders to revise target outcomes for urban-related research as part of investment strategy reviews.

Theme: Integrating Management

- Government Precinct Demonstration Project
  Development of a framework plan and implementation programme for a 'Government Precinct' in Thorndon, Wellington. This will be developed in conjunction with the Wellington City Council as an urban design demonstration project under the Urban Design Protocol.

Theme: Building Capacity

- Urban Design Champions Programme
  A programme to provide shared learning and networking across sectors for design champions identified by signatories to the Urban Design Protocol.

- Continuing Professional Development Training
  A programme of urban design continuing professional development training for architects, planners, landscape architects, engineers and surveyors.
(c) FURTHER INITIATIVES TO BE INVESTIGATED

In addition to this programme, the Government (in conjunction with key partners) will investigate the feasibility and suitability of other initiatives to increase the take-up and delivery of quality urban design. Many of these were proposed in feedback on the draft Urban Design Protocol. The implementation of these further initiatives would be subject to resources being available.

- **National Urban Design Guidelines**
  Developing national guidance on achieving and assessing the quality of urban design in the development and re-development of urban areas, possibly including performance criteria and best practice tools and techniques. This could become a pivotal resource to help decision-makers, particularly those involved in Resource Management Act decisions, and would be especially useful where more detailed local guidelines are not available.

- **New Zealand Centre of Urban Design Excellence**
  Creating a national centre of excellence in urban design to promote good practice, co-ordinate and disseminate research and develop training and skills. This could start as a virtual centre and might grow into a physical resource. It could be developed as a collaborative venture between several partners.

- **National Urban Design Advisory Panel**
  Forming a national advisory panel to provide advice and comment on development proposals. The panel could comprise design professionals and representatives from the property sector. It could provide voluntary advice on projects of national importance and projects undertaken by government departments. This could be particularly helpful for smaller local governments who are facing major development pressures.

- **Urban Design Initiatives Fund**
  Creating a funding pool to provide matched funding for urban design projects and programmes undertaken by local government, professional bodies, sector and community groups. This could accelerate the uptake of urban design across New Zealand.

- **Capacity Support for Local Government**
  Forming a pool of urban design experts to be made available to smaller local governments to support the development of agreed urban design projects and initiatives. This could provide access to expert skills not otherwise available for resourcing or locational reasons. It might also help address the critical shortage of skilled urban design resources in New Zealand through providing flexible part-time work attractive to retired or non-working professionals.

- **Addressing Skills Shortages**
  Addressing the current shortage of professionals with skills in urban design and urban management through a programme to identify skills shortages, and work with other agencies (eg, tertiary education institutes, the New Zealand Immigration Service and professional institutes) to find solutions to address them.

(c) URBAN AFFAIRS

The Government, led by the Ministry for the Environment, is also preparing a Statement of Urban Affairs Priorities that will define the focus of the urban affairs portfolio and identify the Government's priorities for further action. Improving the quality of urban design is likely to be one of the initial priorities of this programme. Some of the initiatives suggested as part of the feedback on the draft Urban Design Protocol, but which fall outside the scope of urban design, will be considered in the wider context of urban affairs.
Signatories to the Urban Design Protocol
We are committed to creating quality urban design and we recognise our role and responsibility in achieving this. Within six months of signing we will develop a set of actions to implement our commitment, and we will monitor and report by 31 August 2018 to the Ministry for the Environment on these actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CENTRAL GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>LOCAL GOVERNMENT New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Regional Public Health Service</td>
<td>North Shore City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Building and Housing</td>
<td>Rodney District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing New Zealand</td>
<td>Waitakere City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Transport New Zealand</td>
<td>Wellington City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landcare Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry for Culture and Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry for the Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Defence Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Historic Places Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Te Ora Public Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Regional Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin City Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Waikato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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Guiding Documents

The Urban Design Protocol is part of a growing framework of national policy guidance around successful towns and cities and quality urban design.
SAFER COMMUNITIES ACTION PLAN TO REDUCE COMMUNITY VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE (JUNE 2004)

This action plan sets out a range of initiatives to combat community violence and sexual violence. The action plan consists of four priority areas:

- attitudes to violence
- alcohol related violence
- violence in public places
- sexual violence.

The violence in public places priority area focuses on establishing and supporting national 'Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design' guidelines to be used by local government and other urban design practitioners.


BUILDING THE FUTURE TOWARDS A NEW ZEALAND HOUSING STRATEGY (APRIL 2004)

The draft strategy sets out a direction for housing for the next 10 years. It recognises that housing plays a major role in creating healthy, strong and cohesive communities as well as contributing to our national economic wealth. Six action areas are proposed, including improving housing quality and improving housing affordability.

www.nzherz.org.nz/rehousingstrategy/index.htm

HERITAGE MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PRACTITIONERS (2004)

Guidelines to promote the sustainable management of historic heritage and to assist local government, owners and developers through the resource management process.

www.historic.org.nz/publications/\HM_guidelines.html

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME OF ACTION (JANUARY 2003)

A programme of action for sustainable development. This programme is based on four initial action areas, one of which is ‘Sustainable Cities’. The overall goal for sustainable cities is - our cities are healthy, safe and attractive places where business, social and cultural life can flourish.

The key government goals to guide the public sector in achieving sustainable development are:

- strengthen national identity and uphold the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi
- grow an inclusive, innovative economy for the benefit of all
- maintain trust in government and provide strong social services
- improve New Zealanders’ skills
- reduce inequalities in health, education, employment and housing
- protect and enhance the environment.

www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/sus-dev/sus-dev-programme-of-action/jan03.html

NEW ZEALAND TRANSPORT STRATEGY (DECEMBER 2002)

The strategy calls for transport to be integrated with other urban issues and identifies the key role transport must play in helping New Zealand develop economically and socially in a sustainable way.

Five key objectives are identified:

1. Assisting economic development
2. Assisting safety and personal security
3. Improving access and mobility
4. Protecting and promoting public health
5. Insuring environmental sustainability.
The strategy covers all modes of transport and recognises that transport is integral to every community and is a principal determinant of urban form.

www.behive.govt.nz/nts/home.cfm

Creating Great Places to Live + Work + Play (June 2002)

A practical guide for local government and others on the processes and tools to create liveable urban environments.


The Growth and Innovation Framework (February 2002)

A framework to achieve higher levels of economic growth through sustainable development. It acknowledges the important role cities play in economic growth and it recognises that a key factor in international competitiveness is the ability to retain and attract talented people partly through the quality of our urban environments. It also recognises the importance of working in partnership with other sectors to achieve sustainable growth.

www.govmed.govt.nz


A design guide for urban New Zealand. This document supports the Urban Design Protocol and provides detailed guidance on urban design principles and how to create better urban design at a project level.


New Zealand Disability Strategy (April 2001)

The strategy provides a framework to begin removing the barriers that prevent disabled people from participating fully in society and ensures the needs of disabled people are considered by government before making decisions.


New Zealand Health Strategy (December 2000)

The strategy forms the strategic framework for the health and disability sector in New Zealand and outlines the goals and objectives for health gain. It identifies the priority areas the Government wishes to concentrate on. It outlines 13 health objectives, including some relating to the built environment and increasing physical activity.

www.moh.govt.nz/nzhs.html
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The Auckland Design Office (ADO)...enabling a design-led city strategy

As our population grows, the way Aucklanders think about urban living and transport will need to change if we are to protect, preserve and enhance the things we love and cherish about Auckland. This will require a significant shift in mindset and behaviour.

This mindset change is fast happening and there is a growing sense of optimism, excitement and pride about what’s been achieved to date. The Design-led City Story appended to this report by way of a hyperlink (http://bit.ly/2BKCUsL) outlines our Design-led City Strategy and progress to date. The article from Seattle’s Runstad Affiliate Fellows entitled A City to Love (Auckland’s Vision of a Public Realm) exemplifies Auckland’s growing global reputation for its urban design ambitions and achievement.

There is heightened excitement about Auckland’s urban future but a realistic and growing concern that within this fast-paced changing environment quality urban design and place-making must be upheld. The Auckland public (including the design and development industry) is becoming more discerning and the market is demanding far better urban design. Auckland Council has a key role to play.

During the Auckland Unitary Plan deliberations Auckland Council made a promise to Aucklanders. We need quality, not just quantity.

As a team, the role of Auckland Council’s Auckland Design Office is to bring its collective expertise and influence on city-shaping projects and initiatives to improve urban design outcomes for the city region. This includes: major private developments and broader regeneration and infrastructure initiatives across the region, as well as working hard to ensure that Auckland Council itself leads by example, in lifting the bar of quality urban design across the organisation. This includes the Council Controlled Organisations such as Auckland Transport, Regional Facilities Auckland and Panuku Development Auckland in particular.

Cities are highly complex and it’s so important that we work collaboratively to embrace the expertise of architects, urban designers, planners, traffic engineers, landscape architects, lawyers, sociologists, psychologists and even occupational therapists to create well performing, safe, healthy and inclusive places that people can fall in love with.

The Auckland Design Office is a tactical department of around 40+ passionate design professionals spread across three units: 1) City Centre Design Unit, 2) Design Review Unit and 3) Urban Design Strategy Unit.

“We are small but we cast a big shadow!”

The units work collaboratively, influencing the quality of council-led projects, private developers and individuals, as well as large-scale infrastructure projects.

The City Centre Design Unit (CCDU):

- The CCDU is focused on working alongside the Development Programme Office, Auckland Transport and Pānuku Development Auckland in implementing the vision for the City Centre Masterplan 2012 and the Waterfront Plan 2012.
- A priority is to refresh this to reflect the progress made to date and set the new agenda for the further growth of the City Centre.
- The City Centre Place Activation team sits within this unit. They have two main workstreams: 1) Place Activation and 2) Development Response.
- A key action of the Activation Strategy is to provide resource that will enable ‘Place Partners’ (businesses, residents and place-users) to celebrate place through interventions and activities, create positive place-based experiences and in doing so foster an understanding and connection between communities and council. While a key action of the Development Response Strategy is to provide resource that will enable “Place Partners” (Council family, City Rail Link Limited, Business Improvement Districts, businesses, contractors, visitors, residents and all place users) to respond to...
the development in the city centre through facilitating cross-council family teams to support Business Improvement Districts to survive and thrive through major disruption.

The Design Review Unit (DRU):

- The DRU is working closely with the council’s Resource Consents Department within the Operations Division.
- The unit of 22 urban designers, landscape architects and architects work with other built environment experts to provide advice on approximately 1400 of the most significant schemes per year (approximately 7 per cent of all resource consents).
- The work is complementary to the expertise offered by the various design review panels which include the internationally-recognised Auckland Urban Design Panel (https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/about-auckland-council/how-auckland-council-works/advisory-panels/Pages/auckland-urban-design-panel.aspx) and the Council Projects Design Review Panel as well as specialist dedicated panels for catalytic or city-shaping projects, such as Hobsonville Land, Tamaki Regeneration and Pānuku Development.

The Urban Design Strategy Unit (UDSU):

- As well as setting the overall direction for urban design, the UDSU works on major strategic projects such as Rapid Transit spatial planning, options for development following changes at the Ports of Auckland, design input on Structure and Local Plans, the Auckland Design Manual (http://www.aucklanddesignmanual.co.nz/) and is leading the council’s design response to Universal Access and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design.
- A vital part of the programme is the formation, dissemination and grounding of Māori Design through the Te Aranga Design Principles and the Māori Design hub on the Auckland Design Manual (http://www.aucklanddesignmanual.co.nz/design-thinking/marori-design)

An Auckland Community of Urban Design Practice

- Aside from the Auckland Design Office, other council agencies employ urban design professionals. Urban Designers in Panuku Development Auckland and Auckland Transport assist with raising the quality of public sector-led projects. The Auckland Design Office is a focus for the design professionals in these organisations in the promotion of better practice in design.
- Consideration of the use of more design-led approaches to planning can also be explored as the place-based spatial planning programme continues. The Plans and Places Department within the Planning Division incorporates urban design analysis and outcomes in their local spatial planning projects including area plans, centre plans and structure plans. Plans and Places project leaders include Auckland Design Office staff in their project teams and are very familiar with the application of the principles of good urban design to the local context.
- The Auckland Design Office also supports the wider urban design community of practice. For example, outside council, but closely associated with the Auckland Design Office, the Tamaki Makaurau Design Alliance is a built environment profession advisory body representing 11 organisations providing a focal point for the Auckland urban design community of practice and a source of advice and support for the Auckland Design Office. It is proposed that the Auckland Design Office utilise the Tamaki Makaurau Design Alliance in a customer advisory capacity.
- It is important to acknowledge the role of design leadership and advocacy and this requires a stronger framework within which the key stakeholders and partners can work together to promote quality urban design.

Auckland Design Office, Feb 2018
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To provide an update on the Congestion Question Project (the project), formerly known as the Auckland Smarter Transport Pricing Project, at the conclusion of Phase One.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. The Auckland Transport Alignment Project recommended establishing a smarter transport pricing project (a pricing system that reflects the actual cost of travel) to substantially improve Auckland’s transport network performance and reduce congestion.

3. The Governing Body supported this recommendation and terms of reference establishing the project were agreed and signed by participating agencies in mid-2017.

4. An update on the project was provided to the 4 July 2017 Planning Committee meeting where the committee confirmed delegation to the Mayor and Deputy Mayor to lead council’s political input into the project.

5. Phase One of the project included:
   - the preparation of baseline evidence
   - the evaluation methodology
   - an engagement plan.

6. Phase One was completed and, as a key milestone, is now being reported back to the Planning Committee.

7. The outcomes of this work are included in the Phase One Report. The following are among the main conclusions of the report:
   - Due to high population and economic growth, Auckland’s congestion has worsened over recent years, and is expected to become more widespread. Foreseeable transport network investments will be insufficient to avoid increased congestion. Aucklanders’ access to jobs, education and other opportunities is therefore expected to deteriorate.
   - Internationally, congestion pricing is being used successfully; however, a bespoke approach reflecting Auckland’s specific characteristics will be required to replicate such success.
   - While a scheme that applies across the entire road network may be the best long-term solution, a staged implementation starting with smaller scale options and evolving over time is likely to be the best approach.

8. The report includes a high level analytical framework that sets out how each pricing option will be assessed against the objectives and key considerations in the terms of reference.

9. The report also includes an outline of a communication and engagement strategy to guide public involvement in subsequent phases.

10. On balance, the report concludes that smarter transport pricing has the potential to reduce congestion in Auckland. The Mayor and Deputy Mayor have, in accordance with their delegation, reviewed and signed-off the report and, in concert with the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Transport, have agreed that the project should proceed to phase two.

11. The focus of Phase Two of the project is to develop options for smarter transport pricing. Staff will engage with the Planning Committee and local board chairs at appropriate points and again report back to the Planning Committee at the end of Phase Two.
Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Planning Committee:

a) receive the Phase One Report of the Auckland Smarter Transport Pricing Project, pursuant to resolution PLA/2017/74 c) of the 4 July 2017 Planning Committee.

b) note that the Congestion Question Project, formerly known as the Auckland Smarter Transport Pricing Project, has been approved to proceed to Phase Two.

Horopaki / Context

Background

12. The Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP) was jointly done by Auckland Council and Central Government during 2015 and 2016. ATAP outlined a recommended strategic approach to develop Auckland’s transport system over the next 30 years.

13. ATAP modelling showed that if motorists paid closer to the actual cost of their travel through a smarter transport pricing system, this would generate a step-change in Auckland’s transport network performance.

14. Smarter transport pricing was found to have a greater potential impact on Auckland’s transport network performance than any transport infrastructure project modelled. ATAP therefore recommended establishing a dedicated project to examine whether smarter transport pricing should be applied in Auckland.

15. A multi-agency project, consisting of the Auckland Council, Auckland Transport, the NZ Transport Agency, State Services Commission, Treasury and the Ministry of Transport was formally established in mid-2017. As outlined in its terms of reference, the purpose of the project is:

   “to undertake a thorough investigation sufficient to support a decision on whether or not to proceed with introducing pricing for demand management purposes in Auckland”.

16. Local board chairs were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the terms of reference and on 4 July 2017 the Planning Committee resolved to (Resolution number PLA/2017/74):

   “a) note that the Terms of Reference for the Auckland Smarter Transport Pricing Project have been agreed, giving effect to the Auckland Transport Alignment Project’s recommendation.

   b) confirm the delegation to the Mayor and Deputy Mayor to provide political oversight and to make formal decisions to progress through the various phases of the Smarter Transport Pricing Project (in accordance with section 6.1 of the Smarter Transport Pricing Project Terms of Reference), consistent with the model used for the development of the Auckland Transport Alignment Project and the implementation of the City Rail Link Heads of Agreement.

   c) request that key project milestones be reported to the Planning Committee.”

17. With the completion of the Phase One Report in December 2017, the project has reached a key milestone and is consequently being reported to committee.
Note on project naming

18. The project was originally known as the ‘Auckland Smarter Transport Pricing Project’. As part of the project’s communications and engagement workstream, a public facing name and brand for the project was developed: “The Congestion Question”. The project will be referred to as “The Congestion Question” from hereon to align with the public facing branding of the project.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Conclusions of the Phase One Report

19. The project is being undertaken in three phases with the Phase One Report setting out, as defined in the terms of reference, the:

“baseline evidence, evaluation and analytical methodology for assessing different options against the project objectives, a comprehensive plan for engagement with the public and stakeholders, and recommendations for the appropriate timing and nature of possible demonstrations and pilots.”

20. The report fulfils these requirements and is included as Attachment A. Its main conclusions are that:

- Auckland’s congestion has worsened over recent years, and is expected to become more widespread over the next 30 years even after the significant programme of investments in public transport, roading and active modes recommended in the ATAP refresh report of August 2017
- without congestion pricing, Aucklanders’ access to jobs, education and other opportunities is projected to deteriorate
- internationally, congestion pricing is being used successfully to influence travel demand and ease congestion. There are many lessons to be learned from overseas (a full list is included in section 3.2 of the report), such as the importance of:
  o establishing clear objectives
  o the availability of complementary measures, such as public transport
  o public understanding and communications
  o balancing the competing design demands of a simple, easy to understand scheme with one which targets congestion
- a bespoke approach reflecting Auckland’s geographic, social and transportation characteristics will be required to replicate international successes. Consequently, it will not be possible to simply replicate an existing international scheme in Auckland
- technology is not a constraint to implementation in Auckland, but any scheme design will need to be flexible to adapt to future technology changes.

21. A high level analytical framework setting out how each potential smarter transport pricing option will be assessed against the objectives and key considerations in the terms of reference is included in the Phase One Report. This framework will be refined and applied in more detail as phases two and three progress, and the possible scheme options themselves are developed and become more detailed.

22. The evaluation framework will be an important tool in terms of identifying the potential advantages, disadvantages and impacts of any smarter transport pricing option.

23. The report noted that a shift to a form of smarter transport pricing could increase the cost of travel for some users and reduce it for others, depending on the time and location of their travel.

24. In developing possible smarter transport pricing schemes, it will be important to fully understand where travel cost increases occur so that equity impacts can be assessed and compared to the relative equity of the current system.
25. The terms of reference state that Phase One includes “recommendations for the appropriate timing and nature of possible demonstrations and pilots”. However, work to date indicated that this cannot occur until the possible options are better understood. Any recommendations on demonstrations and pilots would therefore be made at a later stage of the project.

26. On balance, the report concludes that smarter transport pricing has the potential to reduce congestion in Auckland and that there is no compelling reason not to undertake further evaluation of possible options. It therefore recommends that the project proceeds to Phase Two.

27. As provided for by the delegation of the Planning Committee, the Mayor and Deputy Mayor have reviewed and signed-off the report and, in concert with the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Transport, have agreed that the project should proceed to Phase Two.

28. As mentioned above, building public understanding and acceptance is critical to successfully implement any congestion pricing solution. The report includes an outline of a communication and engagement strategy to guide public and stakeholders involvement.

29. It is anticipated that during Phase Two stakeholders will provide input/feedback on findings of the evaluation process. Benchmarking research also may be undertaken to gauge the public understanding and acceptability of smarter transport pricing.

**Future phases**

30. The focus of Phase Two is to develop, evaluate and narrow down smarter transport pricing options.

31. Key activities of Phase Two include:
   - identification, design and assessment of potential pricing options for demand management purposes in Auckland
   - high level identification of scheme components including development, indicative timeframes for implementation, capital and operating costs
   - any demonstrations and pilots as appropriate
   - assessment of shortlist of options based on evaluation results (including cost benefit analysis)
   - recommendations of options to take to Phase Three.

32. The project will seek to engage with the Planning Committee and local board chairs at appropriate points and formally report back to the Planning Committee at the conclusion of Phase Two.

**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views**

33. There may be different sub-regional impacts from smarter transport pricing options.

34. As Phase Two of the project proceeds, the views of relevant local board chairs (or their delegates) will be canvassed on the options identified.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

35. As a smarter transport pricing scheme may increase the cost of travel at different times and in different places, there are important equity and household cost implications that will need to be considered. These may impact upon Auckland’s Māori population.

36. These factors are important elements of the project’s evaluation framework and will be initially evaluated in Phase Two and comprehensively evaluated in Phase Three.

37. The project will seek to engage with Māori during phases two and three.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

38. The project will continue to require council staff resourcing over the next year. It is not anticipated that there will be any other significant additional budget implications for council as it is primarily an evaluation project.

39. Phase Three of the project would identify the likely cost implications (and revenue generation) of implementing any recommended smarter transport pricing scheme, and this would be reported as part of any final recommendation.

40. Implementing any smarter transport pricing scheme depends upon decisions made at the conclusion of the project and would depend on recommendations made and subsequently adopted.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

41. There are no risks of the recommendation to receive the report and note the project proceeding to Phase Two.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

42. The project will proceed to Phase Two and undertake the work previously outlined in paragraph 31 of this committee report.

43. Implementing any smarter transport pricing scheme would require legislative change and would be a significant new project in its own right in terms of resourcing and budgetary requirements.
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Executive summary

This report summarises the findings from the first phase of a joint project between Auckland Council and the Government to investigate congestion pricing for Auckland.

This phase has involved establishing baseline data, background information and our communications and engagement approach to provide a foundation for the rest of the project.

Congestion pricing is a method used to ease congestion by charging road users at different times and/or locations to encourage some users to change the time, route or way in which they travel.

This investigation builds on the findings of the Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP), which set out a 30-year vision for Auckland’s transport system. This vision comprised three integrated elements: targeting investment to the most significant challenges, making better use out of the existing network and focusing more on managing travel demand.

ATAP identified pricing as having significant potential to manage travel demand and reduce congestion, in conjunction with implementing the wider strategic approach. The work we have undertaken in this project to date reaffirms this.

Our analysis shows Auckland’s congestion across the network has worsened over the past few years. An average weekday motorway trip now takes almost 10 percent more time than it did four years ago, and motorists now need to allow an additional 40 to 55 percent longer for their trips to be assured of arriving on time. Congestion is also increasingly a problem throughout the day and at weekends, not just in the peak times.

Without congestion pricing, our analysis shows that congestion is expected to become more widespread, even after a significant programme of investment in roading, public transport and active modes. The proportion of car travel in severe congestion is projected to increase by around 30 percent in the morning and afternoon peak, and 50 percent in the interpeak. This means that Aucklanders’ access to jobs, education and other opportunities will become more difficult, negatively impacting both the productivity and liveability of the city.

International evidence from a number of cities shows congestion pricing is being used successfully to influence travel demand and ease congestion. However, Auckland’s widespread congestion, heavy car dependency and dispersed commuting patterns represent unchartered territory when it comes to developing and implementing a congestion pricing solution.

Our review shows technology is not a constraint to implementation, but we need to be flexible to adapt to future technology changes. Automatic number plate recognition technology is likely to be the best immediate technology solution, but satellite-based technologies could offer a more sophisticated solution in the near future.
ATAP envisaged a progressive move to a pricing system that would apply across the entire road network, reflecting the actual cost of each trip (‘smarter’ transport pricing). The evidence to date suggests smaller scale options, used as stepping stones, are the best starting point. This would enable a scheme to be monitored for any distributional or equity issues and evolve over time, managed throughout staged implementation.

Building public understanding and acceptance will be critical to successfully implementing any congestion pricing solution. We will need to ensure meaningful and appropriate public involvement in the project.

We know congestion pricing can improve things, but we need to do further work to understand whether it might work in Auckland and if so, how. Our analysis in phase one of this project has built a compelling case for continuing the work we have done so far, so we can better understand the social, economic and environmental costs and benefits of congestion pricing for Auckland.
## Definitions and abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term/Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active modes</td>
<td>Walking and cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANPR</td>
<td>Automatic Number Plate Recognition. Technology to identify vehicles based on video technology to read their number plates and match that number to a  database of vehicle owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area-based charging</td>
<td>Charging vehicles for crossing a ring or driving within that ring at specific times of days, typically to manage demand. London's Congestion Charge is an area charge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial network</td>
<td>Arterial roads are defined as high capacity local roads that connect suburbs in urban areas, and play a critical role in moving people and goods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATAP</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Alignment Project – a joint project between the Government and Auckland Council to develop a strategic approach to addressing Auckland’s transport challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous vehicles</td>
<td>Vehicles where little to no human intervention is required to drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpooling</td>
<td>A carpool is when two or more people share the ride to a similar or nearby destination (also called ridesharing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>Congestion can be defined in different ways, but generally relates to vehicles travelling at slower speeds than they would otherwise be able to travel due to increased traffic on the roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion pricing</td>
<td>Charging vehicles for use of specific roads during specific times and days, in order to reduce the severity and duration of congestion on the network. Revenues from such charging are not necessarily linked to any road or transport infrastructure costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected vehicles</td>
<td>Connected vehicle technologies let vehicles and infrastructure communicate directly with each other using wireless connections, which has the potential to bring safety and efficiency benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordon pricing</td>
<td>Charging vehicles for crossing a ring or line of charge points across a series of roads at specific times of day, typically to manage demand. Cordon pricing does not charge for traffic movements within the cordon. Stockholm's congestion pricing is a cordon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor-based charging</td>
<td>Charging vehicles to use all of the roads in a corridor (main highway and secondary routes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>In the context of road charging, a live trial of a series of possible policy/technology options for implementing a road charging system. A demonstration is time-limited, includes a limited set of participants and tests a range of technology and product options to assess whether one or more of them have sufficient merit for more detailed consideration. A road charging demonstration does not collect revenue, although it may operate a simulation of how much revenue might have been collected for illustrative purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSRC</td>
<td>Dedicated Short Range Communications. Also known as tag and beacon road charging, whereby a small battery powered device is installed in a vehicle to enable identification in a toll system. Not used in New Zealand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eRUC</td>
<td>Electronic Road User Charging – the electronic system offered by some providers in New Zealand (currently Enroad and Context) to provide GNSS platform to charge RUC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERP</td>
<td>Electronic Road Pricing – the congestion pricing system operational in Singapore (the same terminology is also used for proposals in Hong Kong and Jakarta).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemption</td>
<td>Legal exemption from having to pay in a road charging scheme, based on vehicle or vehicle owner characteristics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3. The Congestion Question
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure plans</td>
<td>The expenditure plans profile maintenance expenditure and capital investments planned by all levels of government on key road segments over the next four years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network-based charging</td>
<td>Charging all vehicles on a road network varying by time, location and vehicle type, typically by some form of metering of distance or time spent on the network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNSS</td>
<td>Global Navigation Satellite System. A generic term for such systems which includes GPS, GALILEO and GLONASS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Global Positioning System, the US-Government provided GNSS system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy vehicles</td>
<td>Vehicles 3.5 tonnes and over – typically rigid and articulated trucks and buses as well as special purpose vehicles such as cranes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOT lane</td>
<td>High Occupancy Toll lane. A highway lane that is exclusively for use of buses and high occupancy (i.e. one or more passenger) cars, or for single occupancy vehicles if they pay a toll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light vehicles</td>
<td>Light vehicles include cars, motorcycles, mopeds, vans, people-movers, trailers with a total weight of less than 3.5 tonnes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility as a service</td>
<td>A new approach to transport that combines journey options from transport providers into a single mobile service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode share</td>
<td>Proportion of travel undertaken by a certain mode (for example, car, public transport, or walking).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTA</td>
<td>New Zealand Transport Agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>A live trial of the proposed policy/technology option as an initial small-scale implementation of a road pricing system. A pilot may or may not be time-limited and may or may not be limited by number of participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridesharing</td>
<td>Two or more people share the ride to a similar or nearby destination (also called carpooling).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road charging</td>
<td>Direct charging of road users for the use of the road network, distinct from tolls in that charging is not applied to a single part of the network to recover the infrastructure costs for that part of the network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUC</td>
<td>Road User Charge. The New Zealand weight/distance road charging system applicable to heavy vehicles and light diesel vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe congestion</td>
<td>In this report, severe congestion is defined as a volume to capacity ratio of 0.8 or over – which equates to stop start traffic and significant delay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolls/toll roads</td>
<td>Direct user charges in the form of regulated, facility-based tolls for use of specific road corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toll lane</td>
<td>One or more lanes on a highway that may only be accessed by paying a toll, typically physically segregated from other untolled lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trials</td>
<td>Demonstrations and pilots. Any form of application of technology or systems in a form primarily to obtain information, data and feedback about its performance in advance of full implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 1: About the project
In 2016, central and local government officials worked together on a strategy for the development of Auckland’s transport system over the next 30 years. The results are set out in the Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP) – Recommended Strategic Approach.

The core finding of ATAP was that a new approach is needed if we are to keep pace with the growth anticipated in Auckland. We need to target investment to the most significant challenges, but also need to increasingly focus on maximising opportunities to influence travel demand, and making better use of existing networks.

ATAP developed an indicative investment package that illustrated the kinds of investments that may be required to implement the strategic approach. This was updated in August 2017 following the release by Statistics NZ of new, higher than expected population projections1.

Over the last year, a lot of work has been underway to implement ATAP’s recommendations. One recommendation was to establish a dedicated project to explore whether congestion pricing in Auckland was one part of the solution to influence travel demand and ease congestion, which led to the Government and Auckland Council establishing this project.

The project’s Terms of Reference were agreed in April 2017 (see appendix) and outline the project’s purpose, objective, and deliverables. The final deliverable will be a recommendation to the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Transport and the Auckland Mayor on whether to implement congestion pricing in Auckland.

This is the first of three project reports, prepared by officials from the six agencies involved (the Ministry of Transport, Auckland Council, NZ Transport Agency, Auckland Transport, the Treasury and the State Services Commission).

During this first phase of the project we have developed baseline data, background information and analytical tools to be able to evaluate and test pricing options, and a comprehensive communications and engagement strategy.

---

1Statistics NZ Subnational Population Projections. February 2017

2The Congestion Question
This report shares the findings and insights gained from the work to date. It includes:

- an overview of the challenge Auckland’s transport system faces over the next 30 years, and what the future without congestion pricing is projected to look like
- how congestion pricing could be one part of a solution to address these challenges, based on international evidence
- our process for developing and evaluating different pricing options, including how we propose to involve the Auckland public.
Part 2: 
The challenge
2.1
Where are we now?

Rapid growth and rising vehicle ownership
Auckland’s population has increased by 10 percent in the last four years – this is an increase of roughly 170,000 more people, more than the population of Hamilton.
This significant growth in population, combined with a buoyant economy, is driving a rapid increase in the demand for travel, for both private vehicles and public transport. Aucklanders now drive an average of 1.6 billion kilometres a year further than they did in 2013 and own more cars on a per capita basis than ever before. Over 700 additional cars are being registered in Auckland every week.
Although private vehicles provide for the significant majority of trips in Auckland, public transport plays a critical role in efficiently moving large numbers of people to major employment areas at peak times. Recent years have seen record growth in public transport use in Auckland, with annual public transport boardings increasing by almost 30 percent over the last four years.

Government and Auckland Council are investing
Investment in Auckland’s transport system has also increased significantly over recent years. Over $2 billion is now being invested annually in roading, public transport and active modes infrastructure and services. The results of this can be seen in the delivery of projects such as the widening of the Northwestern motorway, the upgrade and electrification of the metro rail network, and the under-construction City Rail Link.
Even with this level of investment, increased demand has led to a substantial decline in network performance. A key issue is the impact of congestion on the motorway and primary arterial road network. These roads make up only 27 percent of the road network, but carry 53 percent of morning peak traffic and account for 63 percent of severely congested\(^\text{4}\) conditions.

\(^\text{4}\) Based on results from Auckland’s Macro Strategic Model. Severe congestion is defined as a volume to capacity ratio of 0.8 or over – which equates to stop start traffic and significant delay.

\(^\text{3}\) The Congestion Question
Congestion is spreading

Peak period congestion has increased significantly – 33 percent more of the arterial network is now congested\(^4\) during the morning peak hour than in 2014\(^4\) (see figure 01). Peak period congestion is not confined to the CBD and surrounds, but now spreads more widely from the north to the south of Auckland’s urban area.

Interpeak congestion has also grown at a similar rate to the peak, albeit from a lower base. Key parts of the network, such as State Highway One between the CBD and Penrose, are often congested throughout the day. This growth in interpeak congestion is increasingly affecting business and freight travel, which mainly occurs during the middle of the day. Congestion at weekends is also increasing.

The general trend of increasing regional average congestion levels does appear to have stabilised recently with the opening of the Waterview Tunnel in late June 2017 – highlighting the positive impact of the Western Ring Route on the surrounding network. The full impact will become clearer as trends develop in the coming months, and is likely to be supported as new projects open on the Northern and Southern motorways. However, we expect that continued growth in demand for travel will see congestion trends resume, although from a lower base than before the Waterview Tunnel opened.

---

\(^4\) Congestion is defined here as average travel speeds of less than 50 percent of the posted speed.

\(^4\) The average proportion of the arterial network subject to congestion was 24.3 percent for the year to September 2017, compared to 18.2 percent for the year to September 2014.
Overall, the impact of growing congestion is increased travel times and unreliability, and ultimately higher cost. In Auckland, this impact can be seen in significantly reduced average travel speeds on the motorway network (see figure 02), meaning that an average weekday motorway trip now takes almost 10 percent longer than it did only four years ago. Meanwhile, increasing unreliability means that motorists now need to allow an additional 40 to 55 percent more time for their trips to be assured of arriving on time.

These delays and costs are affecting people’s ability to access work and education opportunities. They have a resulting negative impact on Auckland’s productivity – which given Auckland produces 37 percent of national GDP, has implications for the whole of New Zealand’s economy. They also make Auckland a less attractive place to live and affect the quality of life for many Aucklanders, reducing the time available to spend on leisure activities and with friends and family.

Figure 02:
Average weekday speed on the motorway network

Source: NZ Transport Agency
2.2  
Auckland’s future growth

Auckland is growing at a rapid pace

Looking ahead, Auckland’s rapid population growth is projected to continue. Recently revised medium population projections by Statistics NZ have Auckland’s population reaching 2 million people in 2028, four years earlier than in the previous projections used by ATAP.

Beyond 2028, Auckland’s population is projected to reach between 2.4 million by 2046 — an increase of 800,000 on current figures. The number of employees is expected to grow by 40 percent over the same period. This is shown in figure 03.

Auckland’s growing population and labour market provide many opportunities and benefits, such as the potential to increase innovation, productivity and prosperity. Its increasing diversity makes Auckland a more exciting and attractive place to live. However, the travel demands of a growing population will continue to place pressure on Auckland’s transport networks, increasing travel times, and reducing reliability and access.

Figure 05.  
Forecasted growth in population and employment 2016 (base)—2046

Source: Statistics New Zealand and Auckland Forecasting Centre

---

1 Taken from the Statistics NZ February 2017 projections (see footnote 11). These do not take into account any potential future changes to immigration policies.
2.3

The strategic approach to addressing Auckland’s transport challenges

Congestion pricing could have a major impact

ATAP identified congestion pricing as having significant potential to influence travel demand and reduce congestion in Auckland. However, this was only one of range of measures recommended to address the challenges of Auckland’s transport system.

The ATAP strategic approach contains three integrated elements:

1. Maximise new opportunities to influence travel demand
2. Make better use of existing networks
3. Target investment to the most significant challenges

Figure 04: The ATAP Recommended Strategic Approach
This acknowledges that we need to continue to invest significantly in transport infrastructure, services and technology – roading, public transport and active modes – as Auckland continues to grow. Our current understanding of what these investments might entail is detailed in the August 2017 ATAP update report, which proposed expanding the original investment package in response to higher population projections.

ATAP recognised that it is becoming increasingly expensive to build new roads or expand existing ones due to land availability constraints and the high costs of purchasing land. To maximise the benefits of our investments, we need to get more out of the existing network by increasing throughput of people and goods.

This could be achieved through smarter and more active traffic management, increasing availability of real-time travel information, and interventions such as intersection upgrades, minor road layout changes, street space reallocation and traffic light optimisation. In the longer term, developing technologies such as autonomous and connected vehicles offer further potential to get more out of the existing network.

We also need a greater focus on influencing travel demand to actively inform and shape people’s travel decisions. This includes better integrating land use and transport planning including through urban design, and encouraging increased vehicle occupancy through shared mobility technologies such as ridesharing and carpooling.

ATAP found that congestion pricing has the potential to be a powerful tool to influence travel demand and significantly improve network performance. However, it will be most effective if it is implemented alongside these other initiatives, many of which are already underway.
2.4 What does a future without congestion pricing look like?

Since the original ATAP report came out in 2016, new information has been released and further work has been undertaken on how Auckland’s transport system is likely to evolve over the next 30 years. To understand whether these changes impact on the case for congestion pricing, we have modelled future network performance using the Auckland Forecasting Centre’s Macro Strategic Model, which has been updated and validated to a base year of 2016. As outputs from this model have only recently become available, the results reported below represent an initial assessment.

The modelling scenario does not include congestion pricing, and is based on:

- the most recent population and employment projections⁶
- the indicative package of transport investments recommended in the ATAP Update report⁷.

Under this scenario, continued rapid population growth is projected to lead to increases in demand for travel, with total daily trips by all modes rising from 5.4 million in 2016 to 7.3 million by 2046. Public transport and active mode share (walking and cycling) improves significantly over this period, but the distance travelled by private vehicles is still expected to grow by 50 percent – increasing the pressure on the road network.

While the major investment programme proposed in the ATAP Update report provides significant new public transport and greenfield roading capacity in response to this growth, the scale of increased demand means that further declines in road network performance are still projected. The main effect predicted by the modelling is that congestion becomes more widespread on the existing road network, with the length of lane kilometres subject to severe congestion increasing by 40 percent over the next 30 years. This can be seen in figure 05 which provides a comparison of severe congestion during the morning peak in 2016 and 2046. The motorway system is heavily affected, with the number of lane kilometres subject to severe congestion more than doubling and congestion spreading from the Bombay Hills in the south to Redvale in the North.

⁶ Scenario 11, based on Statistics New Zealand’s Sub-national population projections issued February 2017.
⁷ Auckland Transport Alignment Plan report
Figure 05.
The growth of severe congestion in the morning peak: 2016 compared to 2046

- Yellow: 40-49% of speed limit
- Red: 30-36% of speed limit
- Black: Less than 36% of speed limit

Source: Auckland Forecasting Centre, Macro Strategic Model outputs
The modelling indicates that by 2046:

- the proportion of car travel in severe congestion increases by 29 percent in the morning and afternoon peaks and by 38 percent in the interpeak.
- severe congestion on the freight network during both the morning peak and interpeak will increase by 50 percent.

Figure 06 below shows the change in proportion of vehicle travel subject to severe congestion over time. These regional average performance figures include the effect of construction of new road capacity to support greenfields growth and uncongested rural roads. As a result, they are likely to mask higher congestion impacts at a subregional level. As the maps in figure 05 indicate, conditions within the existing urban area are likely to become much worse than the regional average figures suggest.

Figure 06: Proportion of regional vehicle kilometres travelled in severe congestion

Source: Auckland Forecasting Centre, Macro Strategic Model outputs

Note: The congestion question
The modelling indicates that in 2015 only 39 percent of the potential labour force was available to employers within a 30 minute car journey. This is a significant decline compared to the 51 percent availability calculated for 2013 — suggesting that congestion has exacerbated skills shortages, even with population growth.

Looking forward, Auckland’s total labour force is projected to increase by around 280,000, or 40 percent, over 30 years. However, the congestion levels mean that the potential number of employees available to a business within a 30-minute car trip only increases by 87,000, or 34 percent, over the next 30 years (see figure 07). Although access to the labour force by public transport improves, cars are expected to remain the main mode by which people get to work, accounting for 69 percent of commuting trips in 2046.

Consequently, the increases in congestion and slower travel times mean that many of the potential benefits from Auckland’s growth, such as the increased productivity that would arise from a larger and more connected labour force, are likely to be limited.

In summary, our analysis shows that Auckland’s congestion has worsened over the past few years. Although future investment is expected to make a critical contribution, without some form of congestion pricing, congestion will continue to increase and overall network performance will deteriorate further. The result is that Aucklanders access to jobs, education and other opportunities will become more difficult and the benefits of growth will be limited.

---

**Figure 07**
Access to the labour pool in the morning peak

![Image of charts showing access to the labour pool over time](attachment:Auckland Smarter Transport Pricing Project - Phase One Report)
Part 3:
What is congestion pricing and how does it work?
3.1 Definition

What is congestion pricing?

Currently, motorists pay for the use of roads through a range of methods: petrol taxes, road user charges, vehicle registration fees and rates. These charges do not take into account the time or location of travel – for example, driving on a congested motorway in rush hour versus driving along a quiet road late at night. However, the true costs of these two journeys are very different – driving at peak times adds to the congestion on the road, which affects (or has a ‘cost’ to) other road users. These costs affect both the economy (for example, by adding to freight travel times and costs) and individuals (for example, people have less time at home with family).

Congestion pricing is a method used to ease congestion by charging road users at different times and/or locations to encourage some users to change the time, route or way in which they travel.

Implementing a congestion pricing scheme would more accurately reflect where the cost of using the roads is higher, thereby encouraging people to think about travelling in different ways – this is an example of influencing travel demand. Having a higher cost where the roads are congested, in order to manage demand, can increase the number of vehicles that can move along a road in any given time, as it increases the average speed of traffic. Even a relatively small reduction in traffic can have a big impact on congestion.
There are conceptually four types of congestion pricing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area-based</th>
<th>Charging vehicles for crossing a boundary or driving within that boundary at specific times of day. Example: London (figure 08)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cordon-based</td>
<td>Charging vehicles for crossing a ring or line of charge points across a series of roads at specific times of day. Unlike area-based schemes, cordon-based schemes do not charge for traffic movement solely within the cordon. Example: Stockholm (figure 09), Gothenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor-based</td>
<td>Charging vehicles to use one or more of the roads in a specific congested corridor or corridors (main highway and secondary routes). Example: Dubai (figure 10), Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network-based</td>
<td>Charging vehicles for travel on all congested roads in a defined geographical area. Example: Singapore from 2020, proposed for London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 08: Area scheme London

Figure 09: Cordon scheme Stockholm

Figure 10: Corridor scheme Dubai
3.2

How has congestion pricing been used internationally?

Our review of international experiences demonstrates that congestion pricing can influence travel demand and ease congestion⁶. Some jurisdictions have used congestion pricing to reduce congestion within the targeted areas at peak periods by 15-30 percent. This is similar to the reduction in morning peak congestion levels associated with school holiday periods in Auckland.

While some overseas jurisdictions have successfully introduced a congestion pricing scheme, many others have attempted but not proceeded. We can learn lessons from both successful and unsuccessful attempts, and it is important we tailor these to Auckland’s specific challenges.

---

Why is Auckland different?

No ‘New World’ city with dispersed trip patterns and relatively low density of housing has yet introduced congestion pricing⁶. The widespread nature of Auckland’s congestion means that schemes that have worked well elsewhere may not be as effective in improving congestion across Auckland.

Auckland’s geography, urban form, trip patterns, and governance require bespoke policies, public involvement, design and delivery that build incrementally to address the most widely acknowledged challenges.

---

⁶ Review of international pricing initiatives, previous reports and technologies for demand management purposes – D’Artagnan Consulting

⁶ In the United States, some cities have developed networks of high occupancy/toll lanes that enable motorists willing to pay for priority lanes to bypass congested part of the highway network. They are not, strictly speaking, congestion pricing schemes as they do not relieve congestion, but provide a congestion-free alternative.
The international review has provided the following lessons to inform our consideration of whether congestion pricing is right for Auckland and what it should look like. The case studies below also identify the key points of difference between Auckland and the city being discussed.

**Policy lessons**

- **Establish clear objectives** that address an agreed problem. Diverse and competing interests can lead to too many objectives and subsequent public scepticism.

- **Focus on the most obvious broadly recognised problems** and design a solution that persuasively addresses them.

- **Lead with policy, not technology** – let policy lead technology choices, even if technology choices may provide limits around what is achievable on a step-by-step basis.

- **Ensuring clarity** on how revenue will be used is critical to building public acceptance. It helps for at least some of the revenue to be applied to roads, demonstrating a clear benefit to those paying to use the roads.

- **Ensure the scheme design considers distributional impacts** – with the right information, economic appraisal can identify how social benefits and costs of reduced congestion are distributed. Such information can help in designing more targeted congestion charging, and in identifying any remedy needed to address any distributional impacts.

- **Consider complementary measures** – core to successful schemes internationally has been the availability of sufficient high quality public transport to support modal shift where this has been a viable alternative. There is also a need to ensure bypass routes around charging locations can manage increased demand for changes to traffic patterns.

- **Poorly designed schemes can disproportionately affect those least able to pay**, particularly in areas with high private vehicle use by people on low incomes. For users heavily affected by the scheme, exemptions or discounts or some other measure to mitigate negative impacts may need to be considered, but care should be taken not to undermine the scheme’s effectiveness.
Case study: Stockholm and Gothenburg

Stockholm introduced a cordon charge in 2007, with prices varying between peak and off-peak. This came after a comprehensive pilot, which effectively trialled the full scheme for six months, exposing the public to the impacts of the scheme. It was followed by a referendum providing a narrow mandate to proceed. Today the scheme has a high degree of public acceptance and has largely sustained the benefits of its introduction, with charges increased once and an expansion of the scheme to charge through-traffic. Most of the net revenues have been used to fund major urban road improvements (including a bypass route to the charging zone), but more recently have also been used to fund public transport and cycling infrastructure.

An attempt to replicate the success of Stockholm's scheme in Gothenburg provides a cautionary tale. Gothenburg introduced congestion pricing in 2013, which makes it the most recent jurisdiction to introduce such a scheme. However, it has much lower levels of public acceptance. This is because Gothenburg has much less serious congestion than Stockholm, much lower mode share for public transport, and the scheme was designed principally to maximise revenue, rather than to target congestion.

It was intended to use the revenue raised from the Gothenburg scheme to fund a package of transport investments, the biggest of which is an underground rail tunnel which has yet to be completed. Research shows that users do not perceive any major benefits from the scheme. Although congestion was largely concentrated in one location during peak periods, the scheme operates all day across a cordon. This has created concerns about community severance and unfairness.

Auckland’s points of difference

A key point of difference between Auckland and Stockholm is the higher use of public transport in Stockholm and higher density of trips into the central area. Gothenburg has a higher car dependency than Auckland, but unlike Auckland, its congestion highly concentrated in a few areas rather than widespread.
Public acceptance and communications lessons

- **Lack of public acceptance** is the single biggest factor that has halted development of urban congestion pricing schemes internationally. Successful schemes have achieved synergy between policy, design and communications with the public, particularly those most likely to pay the charge.

- **Take charge of communications** by leading the public narrative on the purpose of the scheme and the benefits to road users.

- **Provide plenty of information and be responsive** by ensuring the public has access to all the information it needs, and have answers for as many questions as possible. The more responsive the communications and information, the greater public confidence will be. Have a strategic engagement strategy for all parts of the scheme.

- **Use demonstrations/pilots to engage with the public** as these can be valuable in building public confidence by focusing people on a real-life application and engaging public opinion on different policy and user options. Trials can be used for a variety of purposes, including testing technology, proving the impact of the scheme on demand, testing interfaces between customer service and account management, or obtaining feedback on options from participants.
Singapore

Singapore was the first jurisdiction to introduce congestion pricing and it currently operates by far the most sophisticated and effective system. It started using a paper-based area licensing scheme in the CBD in 1975 and progressed to today’s cordon, arterial and expressway-based scheme in 1998. This involves around 80 charging points covering two adjacent cordon and some strategic corridors. The prices at each charging point are reviewed every three months to ensure speeds on the routes that are charged are within ranges of 45-65 kilometres per hour for expressways, and 20-30 kilometres per hour for local streets. When the average speed drops below the bottom of the target range, the price is increased, and if the average speed exceeds the top of the range it is reduced. The gantries used to detect and process payment are some of the largest and most expensive used for urban congestion pricing anywhere, taking up 11m of road length.

By 2020, Singapore will be the first to introduce a Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) urban congestion pricing scheme. This will be capable of enabling full network-based (distance, time and location and vehicle type) pricing – but will, in the first instance, be used to replicate the existing pricing system and then evolve over time to apply charges on a more flexible basis. Some gantries (although far fewer than currently in place) will need to be retained for enforcement purposes.

---

Auckland’s points of difference

Singapore’s political culture, urban form and geography are significantly different to those of any other city. Compared to Auckland, housing density is much higher, car ownership is much lower and public transport is much more extensive.
Design lessons

- **Start small and evolve** – focus on designing a scheme that can easily be implemented and that will demonstrate clear and sustainable benefits without constraining options for scalability and flexibility to evolve further. Design a scheme that will be effective in improving conditions for the location/s targeted but don’t promise a magic bullet.

- **Don’t chase perfection first up** as complexity risks confusion, suspicion and public opposition. Singapore started with a simple, easy to understand, but effective scheme. It evolved and expanded over subsequent years into a sophisticated system.

- **Balance simplicity with a targeted approach** – target congestion where and when it occurs. The blunter the scheme, the greater the concerns about fairness and the need to mitigate equity issues.

- **Maintain momentum** – there is no ideal timeframe from conception to implementation. Long timeframes create challenges for sustaining broad agreement and maintaining scope. Early agreement can be undermined by changes in political landscape. Evidence suggests Auckland should be able to implement a pilot or small scheme within two and a half years once agreement to proceed on a chosen option is reached.

- **Minimise discounts and exemptions** – while these can be useful to avoid charging vehicles that are not intended to be deterred from travelling, they reduce the scheme’s impact on congestion, increase costs and can create opportunities for defrauding the scheme. In London, a long list of vehicles with substantial discounts or exemptions has undermined its core objective. Today it is estimated that 50 percent of vehicles circulating in the London charging area are subject to a discount or exemption.
London

London was the first major European city to introduce congestion pricing in 2003. It operates an area scheme that is conceptually simple, introduced under a political mandate. Initial reductions in congestion were high inside and approaching the charged area (20–30 percent). Due to growth in traffic (particularly vehicles subject to exemptions) and significant re-allocation of road space to public transport, walking and cycling, congestion is now back to levels seen before the charge was introduced. Nonetheless, the congestion pricing is still having some impact and congestion in central London would be much worse without it.

A recent report\(^1\) indicates the current scheme is no longer fit for purpose and the Mayor’s draft transport strategy 2017 proposes the eventual replacement of the scheme with full network road pricing across Greater London based on time, location and distance. In the meantime, an ultra low emission zone is proposed to cover much of inner London (around 20 percent of London by area) by 2021.

---

**Auckland’s points of difference**

Compared to Auckland, London has greater density, and higher levels of traffic congestion and public transport use. Prior to introducing the congestion charge, only 12 percent of trips into the charging zone were undertaken by car – by comparison, just under 50 percent of trips into Auckland’s CBD are by private vehicle. The congestion charging zone in London covers an area of 21 square kilometres, an area over four times larger than Auckland’s CBD (4.3 square kilometres).

\(^1\) *London Stalling – London Assembly Transport Committee*
3.3

Has congestion pricing been considered in Auckland before?

Although congestion pricing has not been introduced in New Zealand, central government and Auckland Council have looked at it several times over the past 15 years to examine the merits and consider the options to influence travel demand in Auckland. These include consideration of cordon and area schemes, motorway tolling, and parking levies.

We reviewed this previous work for any lessons for this project. Overall, we found most of the schemes previously investigated had shortcomings, either in their ability to ease congestion or in the resulting economic and social impacts.

The Ministry of Transport’s Auckland Road Pricing Evaluation Study (ARPES) 2006 and Auckland Road Pricing Study (ARPS) 2008 concluded that there could be considerable merits in introducing congestion pricing, but identified shortcomings to all the options, particularly around either local economic and social impacts, or traffic impacts.

Auckland Council’s Future Auckland Transport Funding Report looked at a motorway toll as one option to raise additional revenue for transport in Auckland (rather than to ease congestion). It found that a motorway user charge could have net positive impacts on Auckland if it encouraged behaviour change that could reduce congestion, but did not consider equity issues.
3.4

What are the technology options for congestion pricing?

We reviewed the technology options currently available to implement congestion pricing, as well as technologies that might be available in the near future\(^1\). We found that automatic number plate recognition technology is likely to be the most suitable and cost-effective solution for a congestion pricing scheme that is available today. This is already in use on New Zealand’s three toll roads and would be necessary for any scheme for enforcement purposes.

In the near future, in-vehicle technology incorporating a Global Satellite Navigation System (GNSS) could offer a more sophisticated solution, but there are a number of risks and logistical barriers to overcome before this is feasible. GNSS is not yet proven for urban congestion pricing, with Singapore expected to be the first city to introduce such a scheme by 2020.

Expansion and evolution of the current electronic Road User Charges (eRUC) system for heavy vehicles in New Zealand could be one pathway for any eventual implementation of GNSS-based systems for demand management purposes.

Given the inherent uncertainty around how transport technologies might evolve, it is important that we consider the flexibility and scalability of any pricing option for Auckland.

\(^1\) Review of international pricing initiatives, previous reports and technologies for demand management purposes – D’Artagnan Consulting.
Existing technology

- **Dedicated Short Range Communications (DSRC):** otherwise known as ‘tag and beacon’. This is very reliable (99 percent) but relatively expensive as it involves gantries or poles for antennae and beacons for each charging point, and each vehicle must be equipped with a small electronic ‘tag’ so they can be detected. Number plate recognition would still be required for enforcement. DSRC was first used for free-flow tolling in 1997, and has been used in first generation road charging schemes and extensively in Australia on toll roads. DSRC is now becoming obsolete as newer technologies mature.

- **Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR):** converts images of number plates into digital information that allow a vehicle to be identified and matched to owner accounts and charging products, as well as enabling identification through the Motor Vehicle Register. It is already used in New Zealand’s three toll roads to identify and charge vehicles. As imaging and camera technology have improved significantly in recent years, ANPR is starting to replace DSRC as a means of identifying vehicles for charging purposes, because its accuracy and reliability means the ‘tags’ used for DSRC are no longer necessary.

Costs are dependent on the number of charging points as cameras need to be located at each point for each direction of travel to capture images for all lanes. Gantry are not always required for ANPR – cameras can be fitted to poles or lamp-posts (depending on the road configuration), as is the case in London.

ANPR is an essential element of any urban road pricing scheme for enforcement purposes (proof of time and place of a vehicle). For any system that may use other technologies, ANPR would also be needed as a backup charging system for occasional users, unless any other technology were made mandatory (for example, GNSS On Board Units).

- **Electronic Road User Charges (eRUC):** used in six European countries for heavy vehicles and in Oregon (USA) for heavy and light vehicles. It is currently used in New Zealand as an option to measure road use and pay road user charges for approximately 12 percent of the heavy vehicle fleet. This is a GNSS-based charging system (see next page) based on weight, vehicle type/configuration and road type.

---

13 Tolling that does not require a vehicle to slow down or stop to pay the toll.
14 In Oregon, ORTC’s option to pay heavy vehicle weight-distance tax, similar to NZ, and an option for light vehicles choosing to pay by distance instead of fuel tax as part of the ORtGO pilot.
15 Evaluation of the new road user charges system 2015.
Emerging technology

- **Global Navigation System by Satellite (GNSS):** the only emerging technology capable of implementing a full network-based congestion pricing scheme. This would require devices to be installed in every vehicle (called an On Board Unit – OBU) that receive signals from a satellite-based navigation system to enable the OBU to identify when and where a vehicle is travelling.

  This system has the advantage of being able to charge different road segments at different times of day, to enable congested routes to be targeted directly. It does not require roadside infrastructure at each charging point.

  This is leading edge technology that has not yet been implemented for full network congestion pricing in any city to date (although it has been used for less complex forms of road pricing). The sheer volume of OBUs required in Auckland, which would need to be distributed to vehicle owners to install in each vehicle, could present logistical issues with the adoption of this technology. The technology would need to be supplemented with ANPR to service out-of-town or occasional users without OBUs in their vehicle.

- **In-vehicle telematics:** electronic, vehicle-based systems employing wireless communications that transmit data to a supplier’s system, including GNSS technologies. As connected vehicle technologies emerge, these systems are becoming more sophisticated and may have the capability to incorporate applications to enable network based charging. Currently no jurisdiction uses this technology for road charging, in part due to the lack of interest most vehicle manufacturers have shown in making such systems available for these purposes. Due to New Zealand’s slow fleet turnover it will be many years before this technology is widespread enough to become useful for congestion pricing, and would require specific agreements with individual vehicle manufacturers and telematics providers to be feasible.

- **Smartphones:** these have had GNSS technology as standard since 2009. Smartphones could have useful applications to alert drivers to impending charge zones, enable management of congestion pricing accounts, provide means for occasional users to pay for road use and advise on alternatives such as public transport and park and ride services outside the zone. However, smartphones alone cannot be used for urban road charging because they need to be reliably correlated to a specific vehicle (not a person), they lack accuracy to reliably distinguish the locations of charging points, and not everybody owns a smartphone.
Part 4:
What's next for the project?
4.1

How will we explore with Aucklanders whether congestion pricing should be part of the solution?

Public understanding is key
While there may be several approaches to congestion pricing that could be effective, they are unlikely to be successful if people do not understand or accept its potential. The key impacts of congestion pricing on those using the transport system, businesses and households, including fairness, equity and distributional impacts, will also have to be carefully considered. There may need to be trade offs between addressing these impacts, such as through mitigations or exemptions, and the effectiveness of the overall scheme in reducing congestion.

Alongside our analytical framework for assessing congestion pricing options, it will be critical for us to involve Aucklanders as we develop and evaluate options to inform our recommendations on whether to introduce congestion pricing.

Communication and engagement strategy
We have developed a communication and engagement strategy for the project. This has four objectives:

1. Stakeholders and the Auckland public understand how the project relates to them and the broader context of improvements to the transport system.
2. The Auckland public has opportunities to inform the course of the project.
3. The project’s leadership and the processes used are seen as credible.
4. Participating agencies have sufficient understanding of the position of stakeholders and the Auckland public to inform their recommendations.

The initial focus of the strategy has been on progressing the following important elements necessary to plan meaningful and appropriate public involvement in the project:

1. **Stakeholder identification, understanding and initial engagement** to ensure existing knowledge and networks are used to understand and involve a range of Auckland’s interest groups and diverse communities.
2. **A benchmarking research programme** to understand where different groups of Aucklanders are at with their thinking and understanding of congestion and solutions to address it.
3. **A visual identity** established for the project, which is public-facing, including a website as the central source of information and updates.

<< The Congestion Question
How Aucklanders can be involved

The research programme is designed to gain insights to help empower and engage key stakeholders and the Auckland public. It will be an iterative process where research is both an input (knowledge gathering and listening) and output (information sharing) of the public’s involvement.

A Stakeholder Working Group will be established as a forum to ensure key stakeholders are in a position to inform how best to involve Auckland’s diverse communities and business interest groups in the project, and to assist with this involvement.

The project website will be the initial hub for public information and involvement, supported by a social media strategy.

As the project progresses, so too will the design of public involvement, informed by the research and stakeholder engagement (including the insights of the Stakeholder Working Group).
4.2 Analytical framework

The project’s terms of reference set out the objective and key considerations for any congestion pricing option in Auckland. These are:

- improving the performance of Auckland’s transport network, in particular through improved congestion results
- ensuring key impacts of pricing on those using the transport system, businesses and households, including fairness, equity and distributional impacts, are understood and appropriately addressed
- ensuring any pricing system is cost-effective to implement, operate, administer and enforce.
- ensuring pricing is flexible and adaptable to changing circumstances, such as developing technology
- the need for transparency on the use of any net revenue raised by any pricing system for demand management purposes in Auckland
- national and regional implications including any impacts on the existing land transport funding system

We have developed an analytical framework to assess different congestion pricing options against these requirements. This framework is built on and utilises existing tools and frameworks used to assess transport interventions in New Zealand, including the Treasury’s Better Business Case framework, and the NZ Transport Agency’s Investment Assessment Framework and Economic Evaluation Manual.

We will use congestion data along with information about trip patterns in Auckland to develop an initial long list of potential options. We will then use the analytical framework along with other information and tools for:

- selecting a long list of options that meet the option design requirements
- shortlisting options using indicative (mainly qualitative) assessment
- carrying out in-depth assessment of the short-listed options.

Figure 11 covers the analytical framework, and how it will be used throughout the project in more detail. Apart from assessing options against the requirements listed above, we will consider public acceptability and any trade-off requirements throughout the analytical process to inform development of mitigation strategies.

The project’s terms of reference require us to consider whether any demonstrations or pilots could be undertaken. This could include trialling options, or demonstrating what an option might look like, in order to test technology, behaviour change, or build public understanding of what a congestion pricing option might look like.

At this stage in the project, we have concluded that demonstrations or pilots are better considered once we have developed options and after we know what information might be usefully learned from demonstrations and/or pilots.
### Figure 11. Project analytical framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment to terms of reference requirements</th>
<th>Development of options</th>
<th>Assessment of options</th>
<th>PHASE 1 - Checking against option design requirements</th>
<th>PHASE 2 - Indicative assessment of long list of options</th>
<th>PHASE 3 - Final (quantitative where possible) assessment of shortlisted options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project objective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative assessment of the potential to achieve objectives</td>
<td>Indicative assessment of congestion improvement and network performance</td>
<td>Percentage of arterial network in congested conditions during peak hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Travel time (non-moneysised)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability (non-moneysised)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic, social and environmental impacts</strong></td>
<td>Asses the impacts of the option on economic, social and environmental outcomes, considering:</td>
<td>qualitative assessment of the economic, social and environmental outcomes</td>
<td>Indicative assessment of the economic, social and environmental outcomes</td>
<td>Access to employment and wider economic impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>different user types and trip purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Travel time and reliability (monetised)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>User time and vehicle operating cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emissions and other external impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution of impacts</strong></td>
<td>assess the fairness, equity, and distributional impacts of the option, including how such impacts will be addressed, considering:</td>
<td>qualitative assessment of the needs and opportunities to mitigate distributional or equity impacts</td>
<td>Indicative assessment of distributional impacts across social groups and geographical locations</td>
<td>Household affordability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impacts across social groups and geographical locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social inclusion and equity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation opportunities and effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency, flexibility, wider implications</strong></td>
<td>assess the extent to which the option can be implemented, operated and enforced efficiently, considering:</td>
<td>qualitative assessment of the efficiency and practicality of implementation</td>
<td>indicative assessment of implementation, operational and enforcement efficiency</td>
<td>Cost and ease of implementation, operation, compliance and enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>financial, operational and technological aspects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other key considerations</strong></td>
<td>public acceptability and any trade-off requirements must be considered throughout the option development and assessment process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This is an indicative list of potential performance measures only. The performance measures will be developed/refined over the course of the project to ensure the most appropriate measures are used for the final assessment of the shortlisted options.
Part 5: Conclusions and next steps
We recommend that the Mayor of Auckland, Minister of Transport and Minister of Finance agree to proceed to Phase II of the project.

Our overall finding from the first phase of the project is that congestion pricing shows real promise as a means to help address Auckland’s transport challenges. We have learnt valuable lessons from international experiences of congestion pricing about the importance of public engagement and the need to take a staged approach. The work we have done so far in setting up the project means we are in a good position to start examining how different congestion pricing options could work in Auckland.

We have more work to do before we can say how congestion pricing might impact on Aucklanders and whether it is a good idea. The next two phases of the project will evaluate different pricing options before we reach a recommendation on whether or not it should be introduced and what it might look like. Throughout this, we plan to engage with the public and with stakeholders to ensure whatever we recommend is right for Auckland.
The proposed next steps for phase two and three of this project are as follows.

**Phase II includes:**

- identification, design and assessment of potential pricing options for demand management purposes in Auckland
- engagement with the public and stakeholders
- high level identification of scheme components including development, indicative timeframes for implementation, capital and operating costs
- any demonstrations and pilots as appropriate
- assessment of shortlist of options based on results of evaluation (including cost benefit analysis)
- recommendations of options to take to Phase III.

**Phase III includes:**

- further option design, refinement and assessment, including demonstrations and pilots as appropriate
- further engagement with the public and stakeholders
- indicative implementation timeframes, scale, predicted impact, constraints and main risks for the preferred scheme option(s)
- a final report setting out the preferred option(s), containing comprehensive evaluation, including benefit-cost analysis. with a clear recommendation on whether pricing for demand management purposes should be introduced in Auckland.

Phase II is expected to conclude by August 2018. At that point we expect to give an indicative end date for the project as whole.
Appendix – Terms of Reference

1. Participating Agencies
1.1. The Ministry of Transport
1.2. Auckland Council
1.3. The Treasury
1.4. State Services Commission
1.5. The New Zealand Transport Agency
1.6. Auckland Transport

2. Background
2.1. In 2016 the Government and Auckland Council agreed an aligned strategic approach for the development of Auckland’s transport system over the next 30 years. The results of this work are set out in the Auckland Transport Alignment Project – Recommended Strategic Approach report the ATAP report.
2.2. The ATAP report concluded that there is a requirement to make “a fundamental shift to a greater focus on influencing travel demand through smarter transport pricing, and accelerating the uptake and implementation of new technologies, alongside substantial ongoing transport investment, and getting more out of our existing networks.”
2.3. The ATAP report recommended the early establishment of a dedicated project to progress “smarter transport pricing” with a primary focus on influencing travel demand to address congestion. The report said that this should be progressed alongside other opportunities to influence demand, such as better integrating land use and transport, and actively encouraging increases in vehicle occupancy.
2.4. In September 2016, Cabinet noted that Ministers would receive further advice on options to develop a pathway towards smarter transport pricing in Auckland. In December 2016 Ministers agreed that plans for a multi-agency pricing project be developed to support a decision on whether to implement a form of pricing in Auckland.

3. Purpose of the Auckland Smarter Transport Pricing Project
3.1. The purpose of the project is to undertake a thorough investigation sufficient to support a decision on whether or not to proceed with introducing pricing for demand management purposes in Auckland.

4. Objective of the Auckland Smarter Transport Pricing Project
4.1. The primary objective of pricing is to improve the performance of Auckland’s transport network, in particular through improved congestion results.
4.2. As part of achieving the objective, consideration must be given to economic, social and environmental effects including the following matters:
4.2.1. Ensuring key impacts of pricing on those using the transport system, businesses and households, including fairness, equity and distributional impacts, are understood and appropriately addressed.
4.2.2. Ensuring any pricing system is cost-effective to implement, operate, administer and enforce.
4.2.3. Ensuring pricing is flexible and adaptable to changing circumstances, such as developing technology
4.2.4. The need for transparency in the use of any net revenue raised by any pricing system for demand management purposes in Auckland.
4.2.5. National and regional implications including any impacts on the existing land transport funding system.

5. Project Scope
5.1. The project will investigate pricing for demand management purposes i.e. to reduce congestion on Auckland’s road network.
5.2. The project must consider the implications of any potential pricing initiative on the current land transport funding system of fuel excise duty (FED) and road user charges (RUC). For the avoidance of doubt, this means the potential for any demand management pricing initiative in Auckland to replace or offset FED and RUC in Auckland.
5.3. The broad scope of the Project’s three phases is outlined below. While the project is set out as three phases, a degree of flexibility is likely to be needed between phases depending on the findings of individual pieces of work.

Phase I
5.4. The objective of this phase is to develop baseline data and background information, the right analytical tools to be able to evaluate and test pricing options, and a comprehensive communications and engagement plan.
5.5. Phase I includes:
5.5.1. An updated baseline case that accurately describes the existing and projected transport situation in Auckland in the absence of pricing for demand management purposes
5.5.2. A review of available and prospective pricing technology, systems and enforcement solutions
5.5.3. A review of previous Auckland and international congestion pricing proposals, schemes and lessons learnt
5.5.4. A detailed evaluation framework to guide the review and appraisal process together with appropriate analytical modelling tools
5.5.5. Preparation of a comprehensive public and stakeholder communications and engagement plan
5.5.6. Detailed scoping and planning for Phases II and III, including timescales
5.5.7. Recommendations for the appropriate timing and nature of possible demonstrations and pilots for Phases II and III of the project.

Phase II
5.6. The objective of this phase is to identify options, and analyse these based on the findings from Phase I. A shortlist will be developed, which will form the basis of recommendations on which options to progress to further design and testing in Phase III.
5.7. Phase II includes:
5.7.1. Identification, design and assessment of potential pricing options for demand management purposes in Auckland
5.7.2. Engagement with the public and stakeholders
5.7.3. High level identification of scheme components including development, indicative timeframes for implementation, capital and operating costs
5.7.4: Any demonstrations and pilots as appropriate and identified in Phase I.

5.7.5: Assessment of shortlist of options based on results of evaluation (including cost-benefit analysis).

5.7.6: Recommendations of options to take to Phase III.

Phase III

6. The objective of this phase is to undertake further design, testing and analysis of the shortlist of options, to support a decision on whether to proceed with introducing pricing for demand management purposes in Auckland.

6.1: Phase I will be undertaken in three phases, with the deliverables set out below provided to the Parties at the end of each phase.

6.2: Regular update reports will also be provided to the decision makers. The frequency and type of reporting to be provided will be agreed with the Ministers’ and Mayor’s offices.

6.2.1: Phase I: A progress report in November 2017 setting out baseline evidence, evaluation and analytical methodology for assessing different options against the project objectives, a comprehensive plan for engagement with the public and stakeholders, and recommendations for the appropriate timing and nature of possible demonstrations and pilots.

6.2.2: Phase II: Interim advice outlining a shortlist of pricing options, proposed demonstrations and pilots, analysis, recommendations and next steps.

6.2.3: Phase III: A final report containing comprehensive evaluation and benefit-cost analysis of the preferred pricing option(s), and the results of demonstrations and pilots, with recommendations and next steps.

6.3: The timing of deliverables two and three will be identified in Phase I of the project.

7. Governance of the project

7.1: The Parties agree to establish a governance structure comprising:

7.1.1: Governance group consisting of the Secretary for Transport (Chair), Chief Executive of Auckland Council, Deputy Secretary of Transport and Director for Auckland Transport, Deputy Commissioner for Auckland, State Services Commission and the Chief Executives of the NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport.

7.1.2: Steering Group consisting of nominees from the Ministry of Transport, Auckland Council, the Treasury, the NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport.

7.2: The Governance Group will:

a. consider the project deliverables and key findings of each phase

b. make recommendations to the Minister of Transport, Minister of Finance and the Auckland Mayor’s office.

7.3: The Steering Group will:

c. ensure the project is delivered to the agreed scope, budget and timeframes

d. ensure that work is coordinated with the wider ATAP implementation work programme

e. resolve issues and if necessary refer any unresolved issues to the Governance Group to address.

7.4: The project will be managed by a Project Director who will be appointed by the Ministry of Transport after consultation with the participating agencies (the agencies). The Project Director will report to the Steering Group, and be supported by a project team comprising internal agency resources and external expertise.

7.5: The Project Director, working with the project team, will:

a. be responsible for overall output and deliverables of workstreams and recommendations on key decisions

b. deliver the project to the agreed scope, budget and timeframes

8. External advice

8.1: The Project Director, in consultation with the Steering Group, will commission external advice and peer review throughout the delivery of the project to support the investigation and development of options and recommendations.

9. Communications and public engagement

9.1: Public and stakeholder engagement will be a critical element of project success as their understanding and acceptability will be a key factor in any subsequent decision to introduce pricing for demand management purposes in Auckland. As such, communications and engagement will be a key activity from the initial stages of the project.

10. Budget

10.1: A cost-sharing arrangement will be established between the agencies to cover project costs.

11. Protocols for the project

11.1: The agencies will participate in the project in good faith and will ensure information is only released by agreement or in accordance with statutory duties.

a. The Project Director, in consultation with the Steering Group, will be responsible for preparing any information for release or consultation and for ensuring there is written agreement for the proactive release of any information.

b. The Parties recognise that Ministers and Government bodies are subject to the Official Information Act 1992 and Auckland Council and Auckland Transport are subject to the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1997.

12. Amending the terms of reference

12.1: The Chair of the Governance Group will recommend any substantive proposed changes to this document for consideration and agreement.
#congestionquestion
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To receive a summary and provide a public record of memos or briefing papers that may have been distributed to committee members.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. This is a regular information-only report which aims to provide greater visibility of information circulated to committee members via memo/briefing or other means, where no decisions are required.
3. The following information items are attached:
   - Planning Committee work programme (Attachment A)
   - Schedule of workshops February and March 2018 (Attachment B)
4. The following memos have been circulated:
   - 17 January 2018 – Auckland Council’s final submission on Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) – Private Plan Change Request from Karaka and Drury Limited – Auranga B1 (Attachment C)
5. The following workshops/briefings have taken place:
   - 16 November 2017 – Auckland Plan Refresh 22 (Attachment D)
   - 1 February 2018 – Confidential Unlock Panmure High Level Project Plan (no attachment)
6. This document can be found on the Auckland Council website, at the following link: http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/
   o at the top of the page, select meeting “Planning Committee” from the drop-down tab and click ‘View’;
   o under ‘Attachments’, select either the HTML or PDF version of the document entitled ‘Extra Attachments’.
7. Note that staff will not be present to answer questions about the items referred to in this summary. Committee members should direct any questions to the authors.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) receive the Summary of Planning Committee information memos and briefings – 13 February 2018.
**Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Planning Committee forward work programme 13 February 2018 (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Schedule of February and March Planning Committee workshops (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Auckland Council final submission on Private Plan Change Request from Karaka and Drury Limited – Auranga B1 (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Auckland Plan refresh workshop 22 minutes (Under Separate Cover)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngā kaihaina / Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Kalinda Gopal - Senior Governance Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Jim Quinn - Chief of Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the Planning Committee:

a) exclude the public from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

**C1 Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) - Appeal Direction - Dilworth Terrace Houses Viewshaft**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
<td>s7(2)(g) - The withholding of the information is necessary to maintain legal professional privilege. In particular, the report contains legal advice and information that relates to an appeal.</td>
<td>s48(1)(a) The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Making most of the situation

There seems to be a bit of movement with Light Rail as Auckland Transport and Greater Auckland make the case for the Northern Airport Line (Airport to the City Centre via Dominion Road).

From Auckland Transport:

Light rail

Auckland Transport (AT) and the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) agree to progress light rail for Auckland to urgently address Auckland’s growing congestion and accessibility problems.

- Learn about the benefits.
- Get background information.

Project status: Investigation
Project zone: Central
Project overview

AT recognises the need to urgently address the worsening congestion and accessibility problems in Auckland. We continue to assess high-capacity public transport solutions that can ease congestion and provide more transport options to help make Auckland a more modern, sustainable, connected, progressive, globally-competitive city.

Our own research and analysis, as well as global case studies, show that light rail can be both a solution and a catalyst. It has great potential to improve amenities, develop communities, provide access to jobs and education and attract investment. It will support Auckland as a forward thinking, sustainable, connected, and globally competitive city.

Picture 1: Mt Roskill light rail Source: Auckland Transport

Why Auckland needs light rail

Auckland is growing, bringing diversity, vibrancy and opportunity. But growth also brings big challenges: such as current public transport reaching capacity, rising land costs, and increasing congestion. These affect our quality of life and productivity, as well as visitors’ experiences and our ability to host world-class sporting, business and cultural events.
Benefits

Light rail for Auckland is not just about reducing traffic congestion. It’s also about unlocking our City’s potential. The certainty of permanent infrastructure creates better connected neighbourhoods where people want to invest in building housing and amenities. When we improve our public transport, our city as a whole benefits, not just people using public transport:

- **Growth potential.** Permanent infrastructure like transport hubs supports urban development, increased productivity, and economic growth.
- **Moving people.** Based on its route and frequency, light rail will get more people where they need to go – to work, home, education and leisure.
- **More capacity.** Each 2-carriage, 66-metre light rail vehicle carries up to 420 people, compared to 180 double decker bus passengers in 2 buses and only 10-12 car users in the same space.
- **Better frequency.** You don’t need a timetable, simply turn up to a stop, as a light rail vehicle will be along approximately every 5-10 minutes.
- **Service reliability.** Light rail’s traffic signal priority and dedicated tracks make reliability close to 100%.
- **Sustainability.** Light rail vehicles will be electric, meaning zero emissions operation. Better public transport options mean fewer private vehicles on our roads – reducing Auckland’s carbon footprint.
- **Airport access.** This will support regional and national business and tourism, as well as employment and residential accessibility for this growing precinct.
- **Problem solving.** Light rail addresses bus congestion in the city centre and commute times along Dominion Road (New Zealand’s busiest arterial corridor).
- **Better access.** Light rail will support lower socio-economic neighbourhoods along its route by improving access to and from work and study, and attracting investment in infrastructure and amenities.
- **Room to move.** Light rail’s capacity, frequency and reliability will encourage more Aucklanders out of their cars, creating more space on our roads for all users, including private vehicles.

---

**Attachment A**
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Project details

Light rail is like a tramway, but runs on its own dedicated right-of-way. This means it’s not affected by traffic speeds. In Auckland, light rail would have fewer stops than buses, but the service would be more frequent and travel faster than buses. Light rail vehicles also have much greater capacity than buses and cars.

Source: https://at.govt.nz/projects-roadworks/light-rail/

Picture 2: Image: Artist's impression of the 2-carriage light rail. Source: Auckland Transport
And from Greater Auckland:

Build Light Rail right – Close the centres to cars

Share the placemaking love

One of the aspects I’m most looking forward to with light rail is in the city where Queen St will be turned into a pedestrian friendly transit mall. This will not only help light rail to glide through the city easier, but will also provide a lot more pedestrian space for the tens of thousands who walk along the street every day. It’s something that’s long overdue and could look similar to what’s being installed in Sydney on George St.

George Street LRT – Sydney Source: Greater Auckland
But why should the city centre to be the only location to benefit from such dramatically improved people space? The town centres on Dominion Rd would all benefit significantly from similar treatments by helping to make them into more unique destinations. Destinations that could also support a lot more people visiting and walking thanks to the building of light rail.

Parking is obviously going to be an issue that many focus on but it’s worth noting that it is likely to be removed whether there is vehicle access or not, there simply isn’t space for it. The road corridor through the town centres is too narrow and widening it isn’t an option.

The one major benefit that the current on-street parking provides is that outside of peak hours, it gives a bit of a buffer between the moving vehicles and pedestrians. With light rail having dedicated lanes and by retaining through traffic, it will mean moving vehicles right up against the footpath at all times. Not the most pleasant pedestrian environment.
As I understand it, there is one exception to this and that is where the stops are located. Due to the narrow corridor, at that those locations the plan is to build out the stops into the traffic lane. This is shown in one of the images from AT’s light rail page. As you can see, the road is narrowed but then expands back out to accommodate the traffic lanes.

Give Light Rail the priority it deserves

AT have repeatedly said that light rail will be separated from traffic, such as this statement from their website.

- Service reliability. Light rail’s traffic signal priority and dedicated tracks make reliability close to 100%.

and ... 

Light rail is like a tramway, but runs on its own dedicated right-of-way. This means it’s not affected by traffic speeds.

This raises the question of how those statements are able to be squared off against the images above. As I understand it, the plan is for vehicles and light rail to share the space in the town centres but be separated by time. In other words, when a light rail vehicle (LRV) approaches the town centre/stop, cars will be prevented by lights from driving through. If you look closely at the image above, you can actually see this with a light pole and intersection limit line just to the right of the LRV.

We think this is a poor solution for two key reasons.

1. Drivers don’t always behave like they’re meant to. One only needs to look at busy intersections to see impatient drivers entering an intersection and then blocking it when the light changes. Leaving the success of the project up to the behaviour of Auckland drivers is not something I’d risk.
2. AT say there will be service every 5-10 minutes but over time, and especially after it reaches the airport, we’d expect this to increase. Even if drivers behave perfectly like AT expect, that will mean the town centres will be closed for a lot of the time anyway. It’s also worth remembering that unlike other intersections, the light rail isn’t just passing through but it’s also stopping at a station. All up it could well take a minute or more for the LRV to clear the section, during which time no through traffic is moving anyway, and another LRV might only be a minute or so behind to repeat the process.

Closing town centres to traffic to enable light rail isn’t uncommon in many overseas systems either. Over on the Gold Coast, traffic through Surfers Paradise has been reduced to one lane only in places. Traffic in the other direction needs to find another route.

I couldn’t agree more in sharing the love. What about Light Rail to and through our largest Metropolitan Centre – Manukau?

Light Rail to the North Shore and Light Rail to Westgate Metropolitan Centre via the North Western Motorway both run primarily along their respective motorways or State Highways to their end destinations leaving transit orientated type developments limited. The two places that might get something is Takapuna Metropolitan Centre where the North Western Light Rail Line might end in one direction and Westgate Metropolitan Centre at the other end of the said line.

The Southern Airport Line from the Airport all the way to Botany or even Howick however, has opportunities for transit orientated developments and new micro Centres (some within a larger Centre) at pretty much each station along its route. This presents a very rare opportunity to share some Northern Airport Line love with its Southern Airport Line twin and get all the benefits the North does for the South:

- **Growth potential.** Permanent infrastructure like transport hubs supports urban development, increased productivity, and economic growth.
- **Moving people.** Based on its route and frequency, light rail will get more people where they need to go – to work, home, education and leisure.
- **More capacity.** Each 2-carriage, 66-metre light rail vehicle carries up to 420 people, compared to 180 double decker bus passengers in 2 buses and only 10-12 car users in the same space.
- **Better frequency.** You don’t need a timetable, simply turn up to a stop, as a light rail vehicle will be along approximately every 5-10 minutes.
- **Service reliability.** Light rail’s traffic signal priority and dedicated tracks make
reliability close to 100%.

- **Sustainability.** Light rail vehicles will be electric, meaning zero emissions operation. Better public transport options mean fewer private vehicles on our roads – reducing Auckland’s carbon footprint.

- **Airport access.** This will support regional and national business and tourism, as well as employment and residential accessibility for this growing precinct.

- **Problem solving.** Light rail addresses bus congestion in the city centre and commute times along Dominion Road (New Zealand’s busiest arterial corridor).

- **Better access.** Light rail will support lower socio-economic neighbourhoods along its route by improving access to and from work and study, and attracting investment in infrastructure and amenities.

- **Room to move.** Light rail’s capacity, frequency and reliability will encourage more Aucklanders out of their cars, creating more space on our roads for all users, including private vehicles.

---

That being from Auckland Transport as mentioned earlier on

Picture 6: Transport Movements per hour. Source: Brent Toderian
First of let’s see where Auckland Transport are looking to run the Southern Airport Line (bus or Light Rail).

I don’t like the path as it goes through Manukau (see: Trans City vs Local District Transit, #CitiesSkylines Lessons for Auckland) so I have come up with something better.
Item 5.1

First overview of the Southern Airport Line (Airport to Botany):
Attachment A

Item 5.1

Plan 11: The Southern Airport Line 2018 – Manukau to Botany

1,027.6 Kilometres
In relation to the Unitary Plan zoning for Manukau City Centre:

[Map of Manukau City Centre with different zones highlighted]

Attachment A
Manukau Rail and Bus Station would also pick up a Light Rail Station and become the Manukau Central Station for all three modes. The 800 metre catchment illustrates the reach of such a Central type station.
Closer in there are two ways the Southern Airport Line could traverse Manukau City Centre:

![Image of two possible routes](image)

*Picture 16: The two possible routes the Southern Airport Line could travel*

It depends if you want to serve speed or total accessibility. Technically given the location of the Manukau Central Station (the red dot, blue square and black diamond all huddled together representing heavy rail, light rail and a bus station all in one) and the 800 metre radius of such a station (see the Panuku picture further up) the yellow route would suffice enough for both speed and accessibility. There would still be stations on Lambie Drive to service the western flanks of the Metropolitan Centre Zone of Manukau City Centre while another station at the intersection of Manukau Station, Great South and Redoubt Roads captures Rainbows End, Lakewood Plaza and whatever redevelopments happen in the eastern mall car park.
The blue dots represent either the 33 Great South Road Bus or the 365 Manukau to Papakura via Manurewa and Takanini Stations bus that either link up southern Manukau to central Manukau or run right through the core of Manukau with frequencies of at least 20 or 15 minutes. The 33 Bus essentially links Manukau Central Station (and the Southern Airport Line) to the core and northern flanks of Manukau City Centre leaving the Southern Airport Line to run around the outside while still servicing significant areas of activity (the Lambie Drive area from Cavendish Drive to Manukau Station Road is zoned Metropolitan Centre with the land owners looking at apartments over the Manukau Supa Centre area).

None the less I have the white route for the Southern Airport Line if it is wished to bring the Line right through the middle of Manukau City Centre allowing the creation of transit malls down part of that route like seen on the Gold Coast.

![Image of the area with transit routes highlighted](image)

*Figure 17: The Southern Airport Line alternative route through Manukau creating a transit mall type environment*
Transit Orientated Developments creating Micro Centres

Like the Northern Airport Line, the Southern Airport Line offers a chance for Transit Orientated Development around each of the Lines’ stations. The beauty of the Southern Airport Line is that all of its stations along its 18km route are ripe for some good old fashion TODs! As a bonus most of the stations along the Southern Airport Line will also have cross-feeder busses running through them extending the accessibility of the Line and the viability of the TODs themselves:

As for the TODs themselves I usually work them to an 800 metre maximum radius with a 200 metre and 400 metre set of radii inside that 800m max radius.

800 metres is traditionally the walk up catchment of a station or stop thus the 800m catchment is where you would do high density developments to make most use of the that station and its catchment. However, if the station is traversing through a low or medium density area (like Te irangi Drive and Puhinui Station does) then making the entire 800 metre radius catchment dense development is going to give scale problems. Enter the 200

10.1.2 Integrated PT network

As the RTN link the LRT alignment will create the primary spine for PT in the area with a supporting bus network linking local areas to the RTN. To create a robust, integrated PT network strong bus linkages across LRT servicing local connection to LRT are required as illustrated in Figure 10.1. This may require reorganising adjacent local bus routes to interchange/shuttle to LRT stations i.e. east/west buses link to north-south LRT.

It is important to develop quality bus interchanges. Interchanging between the bus and LRT will need to be as seamless as possible for Public Transport passengers. Interchange can be at intersection, along platform or across platform, as shown in the examples in Figure 9.31.

![Image of bus connections to local areas from LRT]

Figure 10.1 Bus connections to local areas from LRT

and 400 metre radii marks. 200 metres from the station is where you would do your most dense developments with the developments scaling down between the 200 and 400m mark and again from the 400-800m as the development transitions into the surrounding urban form.

For stations inside Manukau City Centre like the Manukau Central Station where the 800m radius mark is taken from the 200, 400 and 800m rules I would work a bit differently given stations inside Manukau City Centre will have overlapping 800m radii.

Your 400m and 800m radii still mark the transition of your urban form down as the Metropolitan Centre Zone phases into lower density zoning such as General Business, Mixed Use, Terraced Housing and Apartments or Light Industry just like you word normally with any TOD. The 200m radius where some of the densest urban form might be found especially around Manukau Central Station is where I would focus niche, boutique and even artisan class types of urban form to both be a magnet to Manukau as well as give Manukau its sense of place unique to the City as a whole.

To further encourage this artisan type urban morphology around Manukau Central Station using the Gold Coast’s idea of transit malls and Panuku’s humanising of Manukau Station Road and Lambie Drive would certainly not go a miss.
Rethinking Manukau Station Road could take many forms. Here are just a few options to illustrate the potential of reallocating space to create high amenity, while continuing to meet movement demands.

Existing

Potential option 1 – Keep the median

Potential option 2 – Green the sides

Potential option 3 – Asymmetrical

Picture 21: Manukau station road redevelopment options Source: Panuku Development Auckland
And of course let’s not forget the accessibility the Southern Airport Line (422 x 12 = 5,064 potentially crossing through plus what the busses and heavy rail bring into Auckland’s largest Metropolitan Centre) would bring as well (Redesigning the Transit Network #CitiesSkylines Style Lessons for Auckland)

![Map Image](image)

*Note: Starts at 8 am at Manukau station. The travel time includes the waiting time and maximum 15 minutes of waking time.*

_Saeid Adil_ (SaeidAdil) <br> Tweaked my map and here is the catchment difference “The Manukau South Link was built” (BenRoss_All)

*Picture 23: Manukau South Link catchment close up by Saeid Adil. Link: [https://twitter.com/SaeidAdil/status/658932555961323776](https://twitter.com/SaeidAdil/status/658932555961323776)*
So let’s share the love a bit and also give Auckland’s largest Metropolitan Centre and core to our largest sub region some of that Light Rail love the Isthmus is getting. If you are not quite convinced here is a link to Manukau’s third larger hotel and apartments being built (after Lakewood Plaza and the Sebel): $25m Ramada Suites Manukau Pacific Centre to be built in south Auckland.