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Attachment A Item 4.1
Victoria Quarter?

City Centre Master Plan (Move 2 - East-West Stitch)

Victoria Quarter becomes a vibrant urban community, with housing catering for families seeking an inner-city lifestyle, as well as singles, couples and students. Some development will be mixed-use, providing work and living spaces under one roof.

Outcomes defined, including

SC3 Meeting the Needs of its Residential Population
SC5 An Exemplar of Urban Living
SC7 Walkable and Accessible
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The Petition

- 50,000 residents, ~20,000 in Victoria Quarter
- Unsafe for all residents, but especially children, the disabled and the elderly
- Poor state reflects an ongoing lack of care and interest in these residents’
- City residents reduced congestion on roads and pressure on transit
- City residents reduced load on the health system due to inherently active lifestyles
- Low impact lifestyles that help to meet Auckland and New Zealand’s targets for reducing Carbon emissions
- More residents than car commuters, lets start acting like it
The Petition

1. A change in mind-set from NZTA and Auckland Transport with regards to how pedestrians are prioritised

2. Allocation of City Centre Targeted Rate funding and Auckland Transport Walking & Cycling Funding

3. Provision of a safe, all-age-friendly crossing of Cook Street in alignment with residents’ desire lines down the hill towards Victoria Park and Wynyard Quarter

4. The Nelson Street slip-lane must be prioritised as a safe, pleasant route for residents with good urban design that reflects the ambitions of Auckland, rather than its car oriented past

5. The current prioritisation of Union and Wellington Streets as motorway on-ramps for cars to the Northern, Southern and Western Motorways must be scaled back and re-prioritised to meet the growing needs of rapidly increasing numbers of local residents, especially children going to and from school

6. Nelson and Hobson Streets must be re-calibrated to reflect the new reality of the City Centre, where place, walkability and community matter more than traffic flows
The Petition

7. Rectify the degraded and hazardous footpaths, and maintain their quality and compliance to ensure universal access for all ages and abilities across the inner city, not just the needs of those travelling to and from the city for all future transit plans and projects

8. Take meaningful measures to ensure that illegal parking, vehicle speeding, vehicle noise and widespread red light running are tackled

9. Create new public spaces in this area that are targeted towards residents and not focused around commercial uses and car parking

10. Take action to progress the City Centre Master Plan objectives for the area

11. Consider the needs of residents moving within and

12. The recently agreed Roads and Streets Framework must be meaningfully implemented
Goings on

- Victoria Street Linear Park
- Wellesley Street Busway
- AT Safety Improvements
- Nelson\Hobson streetscape upgrade

Tactical, not strategic
Everyone agrees that there is a problem

But now what?
Why Trains to Huapai?

www.PTUA.ORG.NZ
Rail faster to key Western points

www.PTUA.ORG.NZ
ATTACHMENT A

Trains to Huapai within 12 months
Our Solution

- Frequent SINGLE passenger train (railcar) shuttle providing hourly services Huapai – Swanson (Similar to the current Papakura – Pukekohe railcar shuttles)

- 14 return services daily, 6am – 8pm

- Connects with new electric train network at Swanson

- Reliable **Congestion Free** route

- Not impacted by delays from Britomart

- Connect with buses from Helensville / Waimauku...and Riverhead

- **Waitakere station returned** to the Auckland rail network

[www.PTUA.ORG.NZ]
Advantages

- No double tracking required

- No upgrades required to Swanson, Waitakere Stations. Car park added to Huapai station in medium term (Kiss and Ride initially).

- No new rolling stock, rail lines or signal upgrades required (Waikatere station limits could be extended to Huapai station, or use existing Track Warrant Control

- Freight trains can be time tabled to cross at Waitakere Station

- No electrification required, Waitakere tunnel not an issue

- Utilises under used existing infrastructure and AT rolling stock assets

- Operating costs marginal in comparison to rest of rail network

- Opex excluding fare revenue approximately $1.5 million per annum

www.PTUA.ORG.NZ
Advantages Over Light Rail (Tram)

- Delivered within 12 months vs 8+ years
- Connects to entire existing Auckland rail network
- Trains To Huapai CAPEX $4 million VS $5? Billion for Light Rail
- Will connect to future Light Rail network
- Serves different routes and passenger capture points to Light Rail
- New Government is investing in upgrading North Auckland Rail line

www.PTUA.ORG.NZ
Survey Results

- 660 responses
- Would you use a train service 86.5% said yes
- 54.84% for work, 11.61% for education, 11.13 for shopping, 22.42 for entertainment
- 54.22 said they'd use the train daily, 29.87 said they'd use it weekly
- 15.91% said they'd use it monthly

Petition - 1062 have signed
Huapai – Waitakere - Swanson

www.PTUA.ORG.NZ
Item 5.2 Public Input Changda International NZ Ltd

PRESENTATION NOTES

1. Changda are committed to delivering 570 Housing units in a connected development exhibiting excellent adoption of urban design principles within the West Hoe Heights Special Housing Area as quickly as possible. It is being developed over three stages and are mid-way through one of the largest private earthworks contracts ever let in New Zealand. The earthworks consent provides for approx. 1.3 million cubic meters of earthworks. Due to the scale of these earthworks and associated settlement time required following completion of them, the fastest we can get Stage 3 complete will be 5 years.

2. The earthworks are also required across half of the footprint of the former West Hoe Heights municipal landfill which closed in 1979. This area within 207 West Hoe Heights Road was specifically added to the Special Housing Area in 2016 to provide for a road between the two ridgelines to support the housing development in accordance with both the former Rodney District Plan which was carried into the Unitary Plan and to provide for the buttressing of the two ridgelines to enable grades suitable for residential development.

3. Following the enactment of the Resource Management Act, Auckland Regional Council and their closed landfill team obtained a closed landfill discharge consent and have been administering this consent until we took possession of the site to deliver the housing works in late 2016.

4. During 2016 our Design consultant, Beqa, worked closely with Auckland Council’s Closed Landfill team to design a significantly improved landfill management infrastructure that was acceptable to the Auckland Council Closed Landfill team. Prior to the current development the landfill drained via a pond direct into the tributary of the Nukumea Stream, being one with among the highest ecological value in North Auckland.

5. The proposal was that Changda would take over managing the landfill during the construction phase and then once new system was established in accordance with the new discharge consent and shown to work would be handed back to the Auckland Council’s Closed Landfill Team.

6. The new design caps and buries the landfill under up to 12m of fill. This will reduce water in and therefore water out, additionally it collects the landfill leachate and directs it to a constructed wetland prior to discharge. All infrastructure elements have been given vehicular access. The weight of the significant fill and 3 years of settlement before the road and other elements established will provide a geotechnically sound basis for this work.

7. A condition of consent is bonding for this 90m section of road over landfill so that in the event of unexpected settlement of the road, the road could be rebuilt at no cost to Auckland Council.

8. Additionally Changda have proposed that in the event Council is concerned at the approx. $70,000 cost per annum associated with managing the closed landfill infrastructure, which is higher than before, Changda propose a targeted rate for this aspect.

9. The consent conditions provided in November 2016 require that in the event Auckland Council do not accept the landfill then it shall be managed by an incorporated society made up by all of the expected 570 units within the development.

10. While an Incorporated Society is possible and Changda acknowledge there is no legal requirement for Auckland Council to accept the land we believe vesting with Council is the best outcome long term for the community in particular we note that vesting of the land with Council will:

   a. Provide for an extended public reserve land extending all the way from West Hoe Heights Road to the Nukumea Stream.
b. Auckland Council have agreed to purchase the adjoining lot for a higher order park – acceptance of the landfill footprint will allow this area to significantly increase in size as an active public reserve.

c. Provide for a public road in accordance with long established planning for the area. We understand Auckland will not accept the land if the landfill is not accepted by Auckland Council.

d. Despite it being closed for 40 years it still requires environmental management and the Closed Landfill Team who manages hundreds of closed landfills in Auckland will be better than an incorporated society, which includes 57 affordable housing units, to ensure good outcomes.

e. Given the unique characteristics including the areas status as a Special Housing Area this will not create precedent for Council. Landfill development is not usually necessary to unlock adjoining land for residential development.

11. The closed West Hoe Heights Landfill is a relic of the Rodney District Council’s practices in the 1970’s, as part of this development it has been well managed and carefully designed as an asset that can be readily handed to Auckland Council’s Closed Landfill Team. The vesting will:

a. improve urban design of the area through the creation of a road;

b. add to the usability of the already agreed Auckland Council open space network;

and

c. deliver robust environmental outcomes at no ongoing cost to Auckland Council through the use of a targeted rate.

12. We look forward to your decision so we can move forward and finalise the 100 presales contracts already entered into for Stage 1 of our development at Pacific Heights.
Planning Committee Suggested Recommendations 3 April 2018
Managing and Protecting Trees in Auckland

1. Request a report presenting analysis of LIDAR data for 2013 and 2016 to demonstrate loss of tree cover across the Auckland region.
2. Request a report reviewing the collection of data relating to consents regarding trees, the ability to provide quantitative and qualitative data regarding the issuing of consents to remove trees and recommendations to address deficiencies in this area.
3. Request a review of the criteria for scheduling trees to enable more trees to be included on the schedule.
4. Use the upcoming “errors and anomalies” plan change to correct inaccuracies in the schedule for notable trees.
5. Notify a region-wide plan change and call for nominations based on the new criteria for scheduling to enable more of the regions large and important trees to be included on the schedule for notable trees.
6. Request that the consents department stops issuing non-notified consents to remove trees.
7. Request that the Government changes the Resource Management Act to reinstate general tree protection.
8. Label all protected trees within 12 months and celebrate heritage trees across the region during the Auckland Heritage Festival.
9. Request a report to promote incentives for landowners to retain and protect trees on private land.
10. Fully fund and implement the Urban Forest Strategy and include this in the Auckland Plan as Council policy.
Albert-Eden Local Board Minutes 28 March 2018

23 Chairperson’s Report

Resolution number AE/2018/158

MOVED by Chairperson P Haynes, seconded by Deputy Chairperson G Fryer:

That the Albert-Eden Local Board:


b) Delegates authority to the Chairperson to present to the Governing Body Planning Committee on the 3 April 2018 on the need for Auckland Council urgently to seek an amendment to the Resource Management Act to restore a form of general tree protection that prevents the rapid further decline in the urban forest which is reported to have resulted from the elimination of general tree protections under the 2009 and 2013 amending legislation.

c) Seeks urgent clarification on the scope and consequences of the resource consent granted and any other concerns raised by the Eden Park Neighbours Association and seeks a meeting with the Mayor to discuss the implications of the decision, if the concerns raised by Eden Park Neighbours Association are found to have substance.

CARRIED
The past few years have already shown that urban trees are at risk and the continued decline in the urban forest is almost inevitable unless strong and effective protective measures are put in place.

The Waitakere Ranges Local Board has taken a keen interest in this issue since inception. Tree coverage in the local board area totals some (75%), the most of any urban area in the region. Trees are highly valuable and this makes us even more appreciative of the beneficial effect of trees and aware of the loss that occurs when they are removed.

The Waitakere Ranges Local Board would like to provide the following feedback in terms of the proposal:

1. We urge the committee to consider advocating to Central Government a simple change to the Resource Management Act, that is the revocation of section 76(4A)- (4D) and section 152 and the associated changes to part 1 of Schedule 12 so that the previous Government’s removal of urban tree protection can be reversed.

2. Urban Trees on residential sections, unless someone applies to schedule them AND they meet very stringent criteria, are the only part of nature that cannot be protected under the provisions of a District Plan. And trees in SEAs are not guaranteed protection.

3. The inconsistency of the existing provisions is highlighted by consideration of section 5 of the RMA which says this:

5 Purpose

(1) The purpose of this Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. [emphasis added].

(2) In this Act, sustainable management means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while—

(a) sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and

(b) safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and

(c) avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.

4. The amendments made to the RMA in 2012 and 2013 significantly weakened the ability of the Act to deliver on its purpose with its ruling that urban trees on residential properties cannot be protected at least as far as District Plan provisions are concerned.

5. Unless it has the benefit of protection as a Significant Ecological Area the current law requires a tree to be scheduled if it is to be protected, at least in urban areas. This works very poorly in places like Titirangi which is a bush covered urban area. There could be as many as a million trees in Titirangi. The extensive forest cover makes scheduling individual trees impractical.
6. If these changes are made, then the District Plan can again be changed to provide for meaningful tree protection. The consent application process to then fell a tree need not be unduly complicated, and council could look to streamline the process.

7. The Waitakere Ranges Local Board, therefore, urges the committee to support local government to have a say in tree protection by proposing these changes to the RMA to Central Government.

Ngā mihi
## Item 12

### Managing and Protecting Trees in Auckland

**Planning Committee**

3 April 2018
Current status of tree protection in Auckland and what we are doing

- About half of Auckland’s trees have a degree of protection
- Suite of rules in the Auckland Unitary Plan incorporate a number of regulatory tree protection measures including:
  - Schedule of Notable Trees (almost 3000 line items representing approximately 6000 trees across the region)
  - Urban Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs - representing approximately 3600 hectares of vegetation, many including large trees and habitats)
  - Most larger (4m+) trees in open space and road reserves are protected
  - Most trees around urban lakes, within 25m of mean high water spring and on certain slopes/cliffs are protected
  - Many trees are also captured as part of overlays which extend into the urban area, such as Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, and the Heritage extent of place overlay
Current status of tree protection in Auckland and what we are doing

- All trees captured by these rules require resource consent to remove or significantly alter
- The resource consent process provides an opportunity to consider the value of the tree (or trees) and impose mitigation in the form of replanting conditions
- Conversations with resource consents staff indicate that in many instances applications may be made for removal of a tree or trees but negotiation with applicants result in alternatives with less effect such as pruning or alteration
Urban forest strategy

- Adopted by the Environment and Community Committee in February this year
- An important vehicle for the comprehensive management of Auckland’s trees
- Aims to increase the overall canopy cover in the urban environment
- Consolidates and strengthens the numerous policies, plans and guidelines already in place
- Recognises the tension between maintaining a treed environment and the various pressures on the city, including development pressure through increased population
- The Urban Forest Strategy will be linked to the monitoring work currently being developed for the Auckland Unitary Plan
Options for regulatory tree protection

Option 1 - Status quo

- Preferred option at the moment because it gives an opportunity for the Auckland Unitary Plan to be monitored and for targeted changes to be made at a later date if appropriate
- It would mean no additional expense for council until we have a robust picture of the situation
Options for regulatory tree protection

Option 2 - Add new trees to the Schedule of Notable Trees after a call for nominations

- Provides a process for adding trees that may increase the overall number protected
- However, there are many ‘unknowns’ in this process, including anticipating the final number of trees that would meet the criteria for inclusion
- Nominated trees are also often skewed toward certain areas of the city
- The benefits of a relatively small number of additional trees on the Schedule needs to be considered in the context of the costs of adding them
- Specialist assessment of each nominated tree would be in the vicinity of $500, meaning that if 500 nominations were received, the professional assessment alone would be $250,000
Options for regulatory tree protection

Option 3 - Request the Government to change the Resource Management Act to allow for general tree protection

- Council would need to work closely with the Government
- Outcome is uncertain, and should amendments be re-introduced, the process may take a long time (possibly several years)
- Costs again should be considered in terms of not only the process, but the potential expense to the council and property-owners
Conclusion

- Any change to the regulatory approach for tree protection needs to be considered in the context of what is in place currently (both regulatory and non-regulatory)
- Auckland Unitary Plan is recent and needs time to be implemented and monitored
- Urban Forest Strategy also needs time to be implemented and its outcomes measured
- No new or revised regulatory technique for tree protection would be a quick process
- Preferred option is to continue with the status quo and monitor and measure what we have so that any change to the existing regulatory approach is based on facts and up to date data
- This means that any future change can be tailored to get the most appropriate results