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Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek Governing Body approval of the proposal for a Regional Fuel Tax for Auckland (RFT), to be submitted to the Ministers of Transport and Finance.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Auckland Council consulted on its 10-year Budget 2018–2028 (LTP), from 28 February 2018 to 28 March 2018. The council asked the community about whether it supported Auckland Council's preferred funding mechanism of introducing a Regional Fuel Tax of 10 cents per litre plus GST for a period of up to 10 years (subject to the introduction of legislation to enable this). While there was uncertainty about the government’s transport priorities, Auckland Council made clear that all funding from a RFT would be committed to transport projects and/or services and will improve the performance of Auckland’s transport network.

3. Subsequently, the Government introduced the Land Transport Management (Regional Fuel Tax) Amendment Bill (Bill) and released the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS). Council and the Government also jointly released the updated Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP).

4. On 30 April 2018 the Governing Body approved a draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal for consultation. This included a programme of fourteen projects which supported the goals and objectives of the draft GPS and aligned the council’s investment with the government’s to achieve the outcomes and programmes of ATAP as well as supporting the outcomes of the Auckland Plan and aligning with the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP).

5. Consultation ran from 1 May to 15 May 2018, with 14,820 responses being received. Public feedback showed 42% support for the RFT, 51% did not support and 7% chose “other”. If pro forma submissions are excluded from the submitter statistics, the results would be 47% in support, 44% not in support and 9% other.

6. Public feedback also indicated the level of importance given to each of the fourteen projects. Generally, those projects with a wide geographic spread had higher support than those that were perceived to be more locally focused.

7. The RFT proposal now needs to be considered and adopted before submitting to the Ministers of Transport and Finance. A report on the consultation undertaken is also required, by legislation, to be submitted to the Ministers.

8. No major changes are proposed to the projects that make up the programme in the proposal. The programme is an integral part of the delivery of ATAP which will deliver $28 billion of transport investment over the next 10 years. Major changes to the RFT programme could undermine the delivery of parts of ATAP, but public preferences and commentary can be taken into account in prioritising implementation.

9. At the time of approval of the draft RFT proposal, the Governing Body identified a couple of key issues related to the implementation of the proposal i.e. the system of rebates for non-road use of fuel and the potential for exclusion of parts of the region from the fuel tax.

10. In response to the Council’s submission to the Finance and Expenditure Select Committee on the Bill, the Committee has recommended a number of changes to the Bill that reflect many of the concerns raised by the Council. This includes that the legislation should provide for a regional council to propose an exclusion of part of the region from the RFT scheme. In the Council’s consultation on the RFT proposal, it proposed to exclude Aotea Great Barrier Island subject to the legislation being amended to provide for this.
11. The Mayor, on behalf of the council, wrote to the Minister of Transport on the issue of rebates for non-road use of fuel. The Minister has responded positively indicating his support for regulations that provide for a broad entitlement to claim a rebate when fuel has been subject to RFT and is subsequently used off-road, and that eligibility should extend to private individuals. This reflects the Council’s view on the scope of rebate regulations.

12. The Select Committee has also recommended that the legislation provide that, when making regulations, Ministers must have regard to the principle that the tax is intended to be paid by users of public roads, which is consistent with the Council’s submission. Cabinet will determine these regulations through a separate process.

13. Some minor changes have been made to the RFT proposal in response to: changes to the legislation recommended by the Finance and Expenditure Select Committee that considered the Bill; some improved information on projects; discussions with government officials.

14. In order to achieve any required final edits resulting from feedback from the meeting, a delegation is sought for the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Chief Financial Officer.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Governing Body:

a) approve the Regional Fuel Tax proposal (Attachment A of the agenda report) and the report on consultation on the Regional Fuel Tax proposal (Attachment B of the agenda report) to be submitted to the Ministers of Transport and Finance.

b) delegate to the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Chief Financial Officer responsibility for minor edits to the Regional Fuel Tax proposal and associated consultation report.

Horopaki / Context

15. Auckland Council consulted on its 10-year Budget 2018–2028 (LTP), from 28 February 2018 to 28 March 2018. At the time, it was clear that without additional transport funding, the Council would have little ability to do anything other than projects already committed and renewals of existing works. The Council asked the community about whether it supported the Council’s preferred funding mechanism of introducing a Regional Fuel Tax of 10 cents per litre plus GST for a period of up to 10 years (subject to the introduction of legislation to enable this).

16. While there was uncertainty around the government’s transport priorities (as the consultation preceded the release of the GPS and the release of the updated ATAP), the Council made clear that all funding from a RFT would be committed to transport projects and/or services that will improve the performance of Auckland’s transport network. The Consultation Document indicated that the programme of projects to be funded by a RFT were likely to focus on public transport infrastructure, active transport infrastructure, safety projects, and high priority roading projects to ease congestion and support growth. The Council indicated that following the completion of the ATAP review, Council would consult with the community again on the specific transport programme proposed to be funded from the RFT.

17. Subsequently, the Government introduced the Land Transport Management (Regional Fuel Tax) Amendment Bill and released the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS). The Council and the Government also jointly released the updated Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP) which sets the framework and priorities for the council’s investment in transport.

18. On 30 April 2018, the Governing Body approved a draft proposal for a RFT as the basis for consultation with the public. The proposal was prepared based on the Bill as introduced and included projects that aligned with ATAP, the GPS, the Auckland Plan and the RLTP.

19. Consultation took place from 1 May 2018 to 15 May 2018.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Public Feedback

20. Public consultation sought community views on both, general support for using a Regional Fuel Tax to fund additional transport investment, and the relative importance of the projects that are proposed to be funded by the RFT.

21. The council received 14,820 responses, across all channels, to the question of using a RFT to fund additional transport projects. Of these, 14,549 were written responses, 182 comments were provided through Have Your Say events and 89 comments were provided via social media.

22. Of these total responses 42% supported the RFT, 51% did not support and 7% chose “other”.

23. The written responses included 1751 pro forma submissions. If these pro forma submissions were excluded from submitter statistics, the responses would be 48% in support, 44% not in support and 8% other. More detailed information on feedback is contained in Attachment C and D.

24. Common themes from comments were:
   
   In support
   - Strong support for improving public transport
   - Support for use of fuel tax as a user pays system
   - A fuel tax would encourage use of public transport
   
   Did not support and Other
   - Concerns about affordability
   - Preferences for other funding mechanisms such as reducing council expenditure or congestion charges
   - The increased government excise taxes should provide enough funding
   - An unfair impact on rural communities
   - Improved public transport options should be in place before introducing a fuel tax.
25. As set out above, as part of the 10-year Budget consultation, the Council also sought the community’s views on the introduction of an RFT of 10 cents per litre plus GST to fund transport infrastructure in Auckland. Colmar Brunton were also used to conduct a representative survey of the key questions in the LTP, one of which was the RFT. Written responses to the public consultation on the RFT showed 46 per cent support, 48 per cent did not support and 6 per cent chose other. When these statistics were adjusted by excluding all pro forma submissions, the results were 48 per cent support, 43 per cent did not support and 9 per cent other. The Colmar Brunton survey found 52 per cent support for the RFT, 43 per cent did not support and 5 per cent chose other. More detail on both the public feedback and the Colmar Brunton survey is publicly available on the Council website.

26. It is noted that both of these results preceded the government’s announcement of an increase in fuel excise duty, however, the results of public consultation, after adjusting for pro formas, is very similar.

27. The RFT consultation also asked the community to indicate, for each of the fourteen projects to be funded by the RFT, their relative importance i.e. very important, moderately important, less important. The chart below shows how the individual projects rank based on this feedback.
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28. Projects that have the highest level of “very important”/”moderately important” ranking, generally also have a wide geographic benefit. Projects that could be perceived as having a benefit to a more local area are generally ranked much lower. This becomes more apparent through the analysis of submitters by local board area (see Attachment C for more detailed analysis of feedback by project). The Eastern Busway is the highest ranked project only in Howick local board area and Mill Road only in the Papakura area.

29. As part of the communication campaign six Facebook polls were held to raise awareness of the consultation. The poll questions were intended to be broad and not directly tied to the consultation questions e.g. “are you affected by congestion in Auckland”. The poll question “Do you agree with a regional fuel tax to improve our transport network?” was posted in error and widely shared attracting over 10,000 “votes”. 74% of these “votes” were opposed to the RFT. The receipt of this feedback is acknowledged, but caution must be applied to interpreting feedback through social media channels as it is not possible to determine the extent to which the feedback is demographically or geographically representative of the Auckland population, or in fact whether the feedback came from outside of Auckland.
Considerations

30. The Governing Body now needs to consider the draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and finalise the proposal to be submitted to the Ministers of Transport and Finance.

31. Two key elements need decision:
   a) Regional Fuel Tax as a mechanism for funding; and
   b) The mix of projects included within the proposal.

Regional Fuel Tax as a mechanism for funding

32. The 10-year Budget has been constructed on the assumption of a Regional Fuel Tax providing the necessary revenue for a significant portion of the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP).

33. Without additional funding the transport capital programme will deliver only renewals and committed projects. The current challenges of escalating congestion, rising deaths and serious injuries on the roading network, negative environmental impacts from transport and supporting housing growth will not be addressed.

34. Auckland Council and the government have also recently agreed on the outcomes and programmes of the Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP). ATAP delivers $28 billion of transport investment over 10 years. Without the RFT (or equivalent funding), Council would not be able to deliver its commitments to ATAP which could jeopardise the overall programme significantly. The projects within the RFT programme alone leverage additional funding of $2.8 billion against the revenue generated by the RFT ($1.5 billion).

35. Other options for funding that have been considered are - extending the existing Interim Transport Levy (ITL) or a general rates increase. The funding raised by the ITL is far short of what is needed for the identified programme ($60 million per annum compared to $150 million per annum from the RFT). The cost of the ITL also falls equally on all ratepayers rather than users of the transport system, who will benefit from the investment.

36. Equivalent funding raised from a general rates increase would result in a 10-11 per cent increase, in addition to any other general rates increase (currently proposed at 2.5% for years 1 and 2 of the 10-year Budget).

The mix of projects included within the proposal

37. The projects included in the draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal for consultation were guided by the draft GPS, ATAP, the Auckland Plan and the RLTP. They represent the appropriate mix of projects to address Auckland’s key transport challenges:
   - Escalating congestion and its significant negative impact on both individuals and business
   - Poor transport choice beyond private vehicles, especially in low income areas
   - A near doubling of deaths and serious injuries on roads since 2012
   - Growing recognition of the need to reduce the transport system’s environmental impact
   - Enabling and supporting a rapid acceleration in the rate of housing construction
   - The need for streets to pay a growing role in creating vibrant and inclusive places.

38. Public feedback shows a high level of support for those projects that have a wide geographic impact. Those that are perceived to have a more local benefit are more likely to be supported by submitters in the area of benefit.
39. However, the RFT funded projects are complemented by a programme of government funded projects (through NZTA and Kiwirail). This total mix of projects is designed to provide an integrated regional solution focused on the key challenges, as well providing benefits across all communities. There does not seem to be any compelling reasons to change the mix of projects from the draft proposal, but public preferences and commentary can be taken into account in prioritising implementation.

Other issues

40. At the time of approval of the draft RFT proposal, the Governing Body identified some key issues related to the Bill and the implementation of the proposal.

41. Key issues relating to the Bill were addressed in the Council’s submission to the Finance and Expenditure Select Committee (approved by Governing Body on 19 April 2018). This submission was supported by a presentation to the select committee on the 2 May 2018 by the Mayor and Deputy Mayor.

42. On 21 May 2018, the Finance and Expenditure Select Committee reported back to the House on the Bill, and has recommended changes to the Bill that reflect a number of the issues raised in the Council’s submission. The recommendations include: that the legislation should allow parts of a region to be excluded from a scheme; that operating expenditure related to interest does not need to be recognised at a project level; that Ministers must consult with a council before setting a limit on NZTA’s recoverable costs; that formal variations to a scheme should only be required for material changes to the programme of capital projects; and that if the maximum rate of RFT is to be changed the Minister must set out his/her reasons for doing so.

43. Issues relating to exemptions and rebates, including the potential for regulations exempting parts of the region from the fuel tax, were addressed separately in a letter to the Minister of Transport, signed by the Mayor and Deputy Mayor on behalf of council.

44. The Minister’s response indicates that the council’s view on these issues was positively received. In particular, the Minister has indicated his support for regulations that provide for a broad entitlement to claim a rebate when fuel has been subject to RFT and is subsequently used off-road, and that eligibility should extend to private individuals. The Minister also indicated that NZTA is developing an on-line rebate system with a focus on ease of use.

45. Of further note, the Select Committee has recommended changes to the Bill to make clear that when making exemption regulations the Minister must have regard to the principle that regional fuel tax is intended to be borne only by those who use fuel on public roads. In relation to regulations for rebate eligibility, the Select Committee has recommended that eligibility should be when a supplier has not been paid for the fuel, when there has been a double-payment or in any other circumstance where it would be unjust or contrary to the policy of the Bill for regional fuel tax to be collected or kept.

46. The RFT proposal which the Council consulted on, proposed to exclude Aotea Great Barrier from the RFT. Given the Select Committee’s recommendations on the Bill, the Council can now propose to exclude Aotea Great Barrier Island from the RFT scheme in its final proposal. The final proposal which Governing Body is considering for adoption, proposes to exclude Great Barrier as the projects will have little benefit to residents of the island, the proportion of non-road use of fuel is high, and as physical separation enables a relatively simply administration of the exclusion of the island.
Proposed changes to Regional Fuel Tax proposal

47. A final version of the Regional Fuel Tax proposal is attached (Attachment A). A number of changes, of a less significant nature, are included from the draft proposal that was part of the consultation. These changes have been driven by:
   a) Potential changes to the legislation recommended by the Select Committee
   b) Improved/more detailed information on projects
   c) Feedback from government officials.

48. Some additional changes were also made to better align wording with ATAP. A marked-up copy showing the changes has been made available to councillors.

Report to the Ministers

49. As well as the formal proposal for a Regional Fuel Tax, a report on consultation undertaken on the proposal also needs to be provided to the Ministers. This report is attached at Attachment B.

Transparency and reporting

50. The new legislation requires that a regional council must include in its Annual Report:
   - The revenue received
   - How the revenue has been applied - to which projects and for what purpose (capital expenditure, debt repayment, operational expenditure)
   - Progress on delivery of the capital programme supported by the RFT.

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

51. The incidence of the RFT costs are not geographic but based on individual circumstances. Costs will be determined by the extent of fuel use which in turn is reliant on kilometres driven in private vehicles and fuel efficiency of those vehicles. However, the impact of the RFT will vary according to the ability of different communities to absorb that cost.

52. Local Boards have raised the issue of affordability consistently through their feedback. Other issues that were common across many Local Boards were the need to look at other charging mechanisms such as congestion charging and reducing, or at least not raising, public transport charges.

53. Local Boards gave their feedback on the RFT alongside their feedback on the RLTP. There was a range of detailed feedback on the various projects and outcomes of both the RFT and the RLTP. Boards were generally supportive of all or large parts of the programmes. Particular support was given to specific projects that were of interest to individual Local Boards. In many cases the addition of projects to the RLTP was also sought. Local Board feedback and resolutions set out in Attachment E.

54. Fifteen Local Boards supported the RFT as a charging mechanism.

55. Two Local Boards specifically did not support the RFT. Howick Local Board supported prioritisation of the AMETI Eastern Busway project ahead of light rail, but sought that it be funded through cost savings and higher contribution from alternative funding sources. Manurewa Local Board supported the position of their community, which did not give majority support through the public submission process. They also expressed concerns about affordability for their community.
56. Four Local Boards did not specifically state support or no support for the RFT:
   - Great Barrier Local Board sought to be exempted from the RFT.
   - Papakura Local Board agreed additional revenue is needed but questioned whether other alternatives had been fully explored.
   - Upper Harbour Local Board supported the outcomes of the RFT but expressed concern about the reliability of the public feedback in the 10-year Budget consultation because the impact of the government’s excise duty was not known at that time.
   - Waiheke Local Board expressed its concern about the impact of the RFT on island residents but recognised that the projects included Matiatia’s Park and Ride facility.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

57. The introduction of a RFT will negatively impact some lower socio-economic communities who do not have access to alternative transport options and rely on their private vehicles. Maori tend to represent a high proportion of these communities. However, many of the projects that will be funded by the RFT are targeted at improving transport access to jobs and education for these communities as well as providing greater public transport alternatives. In the longer term this should have a positive impact for these communities.

58. Submissions from iwi authorities reflected the concern of the additional cost that a RFT places on low income families. Suggestions ranged from lowering the fuel tax (and extending implementation timeframes of the projects) through to rebates for low income families (see Attachment C for more detail). The Mana Whenua forum provided conditional support and asked to work with the council and government to address the impacts on low income households.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

59. The 10-year Budget consultation clearly signalled to the community the need to invest more heavily in transport infrastructure and the options for funding this. The RFT was the council preferred option for addressing the funding shortfall.

60. Without a RFT, Council would need to either:
   a) Utilise another of the currently available funding mechanisms (general rates or an Interim Transport Levy); or
   b) Fund transport at the level of renewals and committed projects only.

61. As set out earlier in this report, the rating options would result in ratepayers facing significant increases (10-11%), in addition to the general rates increase, and paying according to their property value rather than based on their use of the transport system. To fund the transport budget at the level of renewals and committed projects only will have significant impacts on the growth and economy of Auckland.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

62. The key risks associated with this decision are:
   a) Financial – as set out above, should the RFT not proceed the Council faces either a significant rate rise to fund transport infrastructure or reducing the transport budget to the level of renewals and committed projects only.
   b) Strategic – should the RFT, or alternative equivalent funding, not proceed, there will be a significant barrier to achieving the outcomes that council is seeking in terms of supporting growth, reducing deaths and serious injuries on roads, reducing congestion and its economic and social impacts, reducing the negative environmental impact of transport.
c) Political – ATAP has created alignment of transport investment between central government and Auckland Council. Funding from the RFT enables Council’s transport programme, as well as leveraging of government subsidy and government funded projects. Without this funding the political alignment achieved through ATAP is jeopardised.

d) Legislative – implementation of the RFT proposal requires legislation to be passed and in force by 1 July 2018. The Council understands that the intention is for the legislation to be in force by 1 July 2018, however, the Bill is yet to be passed and is currently awaiting its second reading (parliament is in recess until 12 June).

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

63. Should the Governing Body approve the Regional Fuel Tax proposal it will be forwarded, along with the report on consultation, to the Ministers of Transport and Finance.

64. Approval of the proposal and passing of the Land Transport Management (Regional Fuel Tax) Amendment Bill in the expected timeframes will allow implementation of the Regional Fuel Tax on 1 July 2018.
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PROPOSAL FOR A REGIONAL FUEL TAX

Introduction

A combination of rapid growth and a history of underinvestment in transport infrastructure, particularly public transport, means that Auckland’s transport system does not adequately meet Auckland’s needs. Congestion costs the region well over $1 billion a year and other major transport challenges include:

- Poor travel options, especially in lower income areas
- A near doubling of deaths and serious injuries on roads since 2012
- The need to reduce the transport system’s environmental impact
- Enabling and supporting a rapid acceleration in the rate of housing construction
- The need for streets to play a growing role in creating vibrant and inclusive places.

Addressing these transport issues has been a major focus of Auckland Council since its formation in 2010. Progress has been made in some areas, for example public transport use has grown by around 50% since Auckland Council was formed. However, congestion continues to grow, reducing Auckland’s economic productivity and lowering the quality of life for those with long and unreliable commutes. Without major new investment, the transport network will struggle to provide sufficient capacity and travel choice to address current issues, let alone keep pace with the 300,000 extra people projected to live in Auckland over the next decade. Road safety also continues to deteriorate with a 65% increase in road deaths and serious injuries in Auckland since 2013.

To unlock the benefits of its growth Auckland needs a transport system that provides safe, reliable and sustainable access. This means:

- Easily connecting people, goods and services to where they need to go
- Providing high quality and affordable travel choices for people of all ages and abilities
- Seeking to eliminate harm to people and the environment
- Supporting and shaping Auckland’s growth
- Creating a prosperous, vibrant and inclusive city.

The role of transport in enabling, supporting and shaping the way Auckland grows is also critical to addressing the housing challenge.

Achieving this vision for transport in Auckland will require transformational change, not just to the investment priorities, but also to where and how the city grows, and how existing infrastructure is optimised – including through policies like road pricing and making the most of new technology.

Through the Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP), agreement has been reached between Auckland Council and government on the key outcomes, focus areas and a package of projects and programmes to achieve those outcomes. Auckland Council’s existing funding tools constrain the ability to deliver the package identified by ATAP. It is proposed to introduce a Regional Fuel Tax for Auckland of 10 cents per litre (plus GST)

---

for 10 years, raising an estimated total of $1.5 billion. The Regional Fuel Tax enables a significant increase in
the funding available to Auckland Council to realise the ATAP outcomes.

This proposal is prepared conditional on the enactment of the Land Transport Management (Regional Fuel Tax)
Amendment Bill which is currently progressing through the Parliamentary process.

Proposed transport programme
The proposed transport programme has been developed following the reviews of the Auckland Transport
Alignment Project (ATAP) and the Draft Government Policy Statement (GPS) on land transport. These strategic
documents have guided the development of a programme that will create a step-change improvement to
transport in Auckland.

Through prioritisation of the projects in the Regional Land Transport Plan and identification of those that could
not be implemented without the additional funding enabled by a Regional Fuel Tax, a programme of projects
has been developed. The key objectives of this programme are to:

- Support substantial growth in key rapid transit corridors, especially where these are now being
  accelerated. This investment greatly enhances the potential for further housing growth around rapid
  transit corridors and realising this growth potential will be critical to ensure the whole transport network
  can function effectively as Auckland grows to around two million people by 2028.

- Provide for and encourage a step-change in public transport and cycling mode-share in Auckland. This
  mode shift will deliver significant safety, environmental, health and congestion benefits and leave
  Auckland much better placed for the introduction of road pricing over time.

- Continue to enable growth in greenfield areas, where around 30% of new homes are forecast to be
  located over the next decade.

- Improve access as a result of the provision of more congestion-free alternatives for travel and changes
  in land use enabled by rapid transit investment.

- Improve safety outcomes with an expected significant reduction in deaths and serious injuries each
  year.

- Reduce the transport system’s environmental impacts by improving the attractiveness, reliability and
  safety of more sustainable travel options (walking, cycling, public transport, carpooling).

The key elements of the programme are to:

- increase capacity and use of the existing public transport network, with particular focus on high growth
  areas and those with poor existing travel choices

- continue to encourage active transport options through the extension of the walking and cycling network

- increase the capacity of the existing road network to improve overall performance

- increase investment in road safety initiatives

- support key growth areas with appropriate transport infrastructure
Summary of projects in the overall programme

The table below summarises the projects included in the overall programme. Some of these projects are already planned but at a much lower level of investment e.g. Road Safety initiatives, Walking and Cycling infrastructure. The table sets out the total cost of each project along with the direct contribution of the Regional Fuel Tax and additional investment that will be enabled by that direct contribution. The additional funding comprises development contributions collected by Auckland Council for growth related infrastructure and subsidies received from NZTA.

While this is based on the best information currently available, it is likely as time progresses and projects are developed that both the costs and timing could change. Similarly, the council will continue to explore commercial opportunities to partially fund some projects where appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Additional capital investment</th>
<th>Additional operating cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>RFT contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bus priority improvements</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 City Centre bus infrastructure</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Improving Airport Access</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Eastern Busway (formerly AM/ETI)</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Park and Rides</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Electric trains and stabilising</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Downtown ferry redevelopment</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Road Safety</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Active transport</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Penlink</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Mill Road corridor</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Road corridor improvements</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Network Capacity and Performance improvements</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Growth related transport infrastructure</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,271</td>
<td>1,385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Operating costs included in the above table do not include interest as the net cost of interest over the 10 years is expected to be nil.

Strategic Alignment

The strategies and plans that guide investment in transport include: ATAP, the GPS, the Auckland Plan and the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP).

The recent review of both the GPS and ATAP have enabled the development of a programme for Auckland that aligns the policy objectives of the draft GPS with an agreed programme of transport investment for both Government and Auckland Council, which is captured in ATAP. The ATAP programme has directly influenced the prioritisation of projects in the RLTP. The base, currently funded programme in the RLTP delivers only committed projects (such as City Rail Link) and renewals of existing assets.

The additional transport programme enabled by the Regional Fuel Tax contributes to the key strategies and plans as follows:
GPS

Safety – The GPS seeks a significant reduction in deaths and serious injuries in the 10 year period, with an overall objective of a system that is free of death and serious injury. The Regional Fuel Tax programme has a specific project focused on safety on both rural and urban roads with a target of reducing deaths and serious injuries by 60% by the end of the 10 year period. In addition a number of the other projects such as Road Corridor improvements will improve safety.

Access – The GPS objectives are to provide increased access for economic and social opportunities, enabling greater transport choice (including a shift from private vehicles to public transport and active transport) and greater network resilience. The Regional Fuel Tax programme has a significant emphasis on improving public transport, particularly in those areas that are poorly served currently; are forecast for significant housing growth; and also with a focus on improved access to employment and education opportunities. The Road Corridor project and Network Capacity and Performance improvement projects are also focused on improving travel times on major routes, while Active Transport is a key project with an initial focus on improved cycling networks.

Environment – The GPS objectives are focused on reducing the impact of transport on the global climate, local environment and public health. A major shift to public transport and active transport is the focus of the investment in a number of the projects in the Regional Fuel Tax programme. The consequent reduction in private vehicle use will be a significant contributor to the positive impacts on climate, environment and public health. Improvements to the efficiency of the road network through several other projects in the programme will also help in the reduction of congestion and its negative environmental and health impacts.

Value for money – The GPS seeks to ensure best value for money from investment decisions and improved returns from investments. The projects in the Regional Fuel Tax programme are at different stages of development but usual business case practices, including value for money review, will apply as part of project approval. In addition several of the projects in the programme are focused on extending the capacity and efficiency of existing infrastructure.

ATAP and the RLTP

As already mentioned above, work on ATAP has been underway for several months and has resulted in agreement between government and Auckland Council on the key transport outcomes, focus areas and a package of projects and programmes for the next 10 years. That agreed programme has directly guided the prioritisation of projects in the RLTP. Delivery of the RLTP programme is constrained by current council funding. The Regional Fuel Tax is Auckland Council’s opportunity to deliver the outcomes and projects of ATAP and the RLTP by raising $1.5 billion and thereby enabling an additional $4.3 billion of investment in transport. Essentially the Regional Fuel Tax proposal represents the otherwise unfunded, priority projects of the RLTP and ATAP.

Auckland Plan

The programme also supports the Council’s long-term outcomes (Auckland Plan review 2018) in the focus areas of:

- Make better use of existing transport networks
- Target new transport investment to the most significant challenges
- Maximise the benefits from transport technology
- Make walking, cycling and public transport preferred travel choices for many more Aucklanders
- Better integrate land-use and transport
- Move to a safe transport network, free from death and serious injury
- Develop a sustainable and resilient transport system.
Positive and Negative effects

The proposed programme has been designed to achieve a number of positive outcomes i.e.

- Improved road safety through supporting a substantial reduction in deaths and serious injuries
- Increased availability and use of public transport, which enables more efficient use of existing infrastructure, provides travel options free from congestion and supports improved economic, environmental and social outcomes from less pollution, and from people and business traffic spending less time in congestion
- More active transport options (walking and cycling) with resultant health benefits and a positive impact on congestion
- Improving access to employment areas which will enable improved economic and social outcomes
- Enabling growth and housing development to address the current shortfall in housing stock.

However, while the overall impact of the programme will be positive, individual projects are likely to have negative impacts (primarily in the immediate area) both during construction and ongoing i.e.

- Noise of construction and/or additional traffic
- Impact on the amenity or character in the local area
- Disruption of services or traffic flows during construction
- Increases in property value in certain areas leading to affordability issues
- Increased fuel prices leading to more costly travel for private and commercial vehicles.
Why a Regional Fuel tax should be a funding source

Auckland Council’s usual approach to funding investment in long-life assets, such as transport infrastructure, is from borrowing. However, the capacity to borrow sustainably is limited, as we reach our prudential limits.

Without additional funding sources the Council will be delivering a 10 year transport programme that will include only renewals of existing assets and currently committed projects.

The expected revenue from a regional fuel tax ($1.5 billion over 10 years) can be used by the council to enable an additional $4.3 billion of transport capital investment. This programme includes a number of high priority transport projects that would qualify for NZTA subsidies and development contribution funding but would not be able to be delivered as the council cannot support the remaining funding required.

The Council has considered other options for funding transport such as:

- Continuing with the Interim Transport Levy (ITL), which is due to expire in June 2018. However, there are two issues with this approach – firstly the funding raised is far short of what is needed, and secondly the ITL costs fall equally on all ratepayers regardless of how much they use the transport system.

- Increasing general rates. This option would require rate increases of 10% to 11% (on top of any other general rate increases) to fund a similar level of investment as a Regional Fuel Tax. Based on previous public consultations this would be unacceptable to Auckland ratepayers. The amount paid by each ratepayer would be in proportion to their property value and bear no relationship to their use of the transport system.

Of the current options available, the Council believes that the Regional Fuel Tax is the fairest as transport users would pay for the additional transport investment according to the amount they travel rather than every ratepayer – some of whom may be very low users of the transport system.

Application of the Regional Fuel Tax scheme

The Regional Fuel Tax scheme is to be applied to the geographic area covered by Auckland Council with the exception of Aotea Great Barrier Island.

Aotea Great Barrier Island is physically separate from the rest of the Auckland region and is proposed to be excluded for the following reasons:

- The projects funded by the Regional Fuel Tax will have little benefit to residents of the island. No specific projects will be delivered on the island and, due to physical distance, residents do not typically commute and use transport infrastructure in the rest of Auckland.

- The proportion of non-road use of fuel is high, with power supply being largely generator provided and boats being a common form of transport. Although a rebate scheme is expected to be available, this would require many island residents to be claiming rebates for most or all of their use.

- Physical separation also enables a relatively simple administration of the exclusion of the island and the that distance, along with the already high cost of fuel on the island, means “cross-border shopping” is unlikely to be an issue.
Projects

Information on the projects that make-up the overall programme is detailed below. Some projects represent a collection of initiatives that, together, contribute to an overall outcome. As the projects will be delivered over a 10 year timeframe, some information is still high level and fuller information such as business cases, benefit cost ratios and alternatives will be prepared closer to project implementation. This forms part of the normal operating procedure for Auckland Transport, particularly for those projects that would qualify for NZTA subsidy.

Project 1: Bus Priority Improvements

Description

To cope with forecast growth in the population of Auckland, public transport needs to become a preferred transport choice for more Aucklanders. Increasing bus patronage will assist in reducing congestion, and the impacts resulting from congestion, and will lead to greater utilisation and productivity of arterial corridors.

The most important enablers of increased patronage are, reliability, frequency and coverage. To attract more people to choose public transport the service offering needs to provide:

- convenience and minimal stress from uncertainty: customers turn-up-and-go without reliance on a timetable - enabled by high frequency services that turn up on time
- a personal time saving for customers: the service needs to be reliable and arrive when it is expected, and the service needs to offer a combination of one or both of;
  - reduced travel times relative to alternatives, and/or
  - improved utilisation of personal time

The roll-out of AT’s public transport ‘New Network’ seeks to provide an effective public transport option, through delivery of modern, reliable and integrated public transport services. A key component of the new bus network is the delivery of the Frequent Service Network (FSN); a core network of about 30 high frequency bus services designed so that customers do not need to rely on timetables for most of the day, and that work together to provide easy service connections.

The implementation of bus priority improvements (including bus lanes, T2 / T3 transit lanes\(^2\) and signal pre-emption) are essential bus priority mechanisms that enhance overall road network usage, increase bus network reliability, improve bus travel times and reduce bus operating costs. The funding provided in this proposal will allow Auckland Transport to begin capital works required to roll out a new ‘whole of route’ bus priority programme. The investment is designed to deliver a step change in bus priority along selected FSN routes. The proposed funding would deliver approximately 200km of bus priority improvements. It aims to deliver greater corridor productivity (i.e. carrying capacity and average speed) through the provision of enhanced bus priority and resilience. Immediate routes that have been prioritised in the first five years, subject to business cases and NZTA funding requirements are:

- Sandringham Road (Sandringham shops to Victoria Park)
- New North Road (Avondale to Victoria Park)
- Mt Eden Road (Three Kings to Britomart)
- Remuera Road (Glen Innes to Wynyard Quarter)
- Manukau Road (Onehunga to City Centre).

Double decker buses are also being introduced on a number of key and well-patronised bus routes due to the need to increase capacity on the network. Prior to the buses operating, the routes are surveyed to identify

\(^2\) T2/T3 lanes provide priority for vehicles with 2/3 or more occupants. Buses are able to use these lanes when no dedicated bus lanes are available.
obstacles within the road corridor, such as trees, verandas and poles, which may compromise safety and the mitigation capital works required are part of the project.

In addition, the bus priority improvements project will deliver a new bus station and route at Sylvia Park. The new bus station will be located adjacent to the Sylvia Park rail station and provide convenient and direct transfers between services. A new route will also be provided to the station which allows buses to avoid the more congested Mt Wellington Highway intersections.

The Regional Fuel Tax will also provide operational funding for additional bus services, increasing the frequency of buses on the newly improved routes. The additional services will optimise the investment in bus priority by providing extra capacity, improved customer service and reduced wait times.

Costs and benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Indicative RFT contribution</th>
<th>Timing of project</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Whole of route bus priority improvements for approximately 200km of high priority routes. Initial indicative priorities:</td>
<td>$135 million +/- 10%</td>
<td>2018-2026</td>
<td>• Bus travel time savings of up to 30% on completed routes&lt;br&gt;• Increased patronage&lt;br&gt;• Improved service reliability&lt;br&gt;• Reduced operating costs through more efficient use of the bus fleet&lt;br&gt;• Double deckers provide increased passenger capacity without increasing vehicle numbers and the frequency of services&lt;br&gt;• Improved transfer and waiting environment at Sylvia Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Sandringham Road&lt;br&gt;   o New North Road&lt;br&gt;   o Mt Eden Road&lt;br&gt;   o Remuera Road&lt;br&gt;   o Manukau Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Double decker mitigation works&lt;br&gt; • Sylvia Park bus improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value for money

Bus priority improvements, double decker mitigation and the new Sylvia Park bus station are designed to increase productivity of the public transport network. These initiatives are intended to provide faster and more reliable bus services, provide additional capacity on busy routes and improve transfer and customer service levels at Sylvia Park. The improvements are expected to drive patronage growth, which results in increased revenue.

Project 2: City Centre Bus infrastructure

Description

The city centre is currently the destination (or interchange point) for approximately 80,000 commuters each morning. This is expected to grow to 130,000 by 2046. Bus travel is a significant component (at least 31%) of all journeys during peak times and much of the investment in public transport over the next 10 years will increase the number of bus patrons e.g. the rollout of the new bus network across the region and initiatives such as the Eastern busway. This growth will place significant pressure on city centre bus infrastructure.

While light rail, when implemented, will provide an alternative to bus in some parts of the city, there will still be significant growth in bus journeys into the city centre and two key focus areas have been identified for investment – Downtown and the Wellesley Street corridor.

In the Downtown area, two components are required – a bus interchange in Lower Albert Street for the North Shore busway, and a similar bus interchange in Quay St East for Isthmus and Eastern services. These
initiatives will allow for ongoing growth in bus customers connecting with nearby ferry and rail services, as well as the extensive commercial and residential development in the area. A key outcome is the ability to bring in significant volumes of people to the area by bus from around the region during major waterfront events, which from time to time result in the closure of the core of Quay St and Lower Queen St.

The Wellesley Street bus improvements initiative specifically serves the significant demand for bus travel to the two universities in the Learning Quarter. Currently 69% of students travel by public transport, mostly by bus, and there is strong bus travel growth expected in the Midtown area due to the New Network roll out, private developments and the opening of the City Rail Link. This initiative will include improvements for bus operations and customer facilities (primarily for North Shore and Eastern services) along Wellesley Street between Victoria Park and Grafton Gully. There will also be improved provision for people walking and cycling along Wellesley Street. A station in the vicinity of Grafton Gully is being investigated, to be integrated into the surrounding land uses and with further development potential, providing a regionally significant passenger interchange.

Downtown bus improvements (Quay Street, Lower Albert Street) will be delivered by 2020 so they are complete prior to the Americas Cup AC36. Midtown bus improvements (Wellesley Street, Learning Quarter / Grafton Gully) are scheduled for delivery later in the ten year period.

**Costs and benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Indicative RFT contribution</th>
<th>Timing of project</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown bus infrastructure</td>
<td>$62 million +/- 10%</td>
<td>2018-2027</td>
<td>Enables increasing numbers of buses from across Auckland to effectively access, circulate and terminate in the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley Street bus corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faster and more reliable travel times through provision of city centre bus priority initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved customer transfer and waiting environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced congestion as more people access the city via public transport rather than private car</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Value for money**

The need for these initiatives is driven by the ongoing increase in public transport mode share into the city centre (which is now starting to exceed private vehicle mode share) and resultant requirement for bus and customer facilities. Other options for dealing with this growth were evaluated, however no additional traffic capacity is possible (or desirable) and alternative public transport modes are supplemental rather than replacements. The selected options have been extensively workedshopped with stakeholders, and are considered to be both the most cost effective and integrated with other city centre plans.

**Project 3: Improving Airport access**

**Description**

Auckland Airport and the surrounding area play an important part in the economy of Auckland and New Zealand. The airport’s activities are projected to grow substantially (Auckland Airport Masterplan 2014). Since 2014 the number of airport passengers has increased from 14 million to over 20 million. This rapid growth is expected to continue, with annual passengers projected to reach 40 million by 2044. It is projected this will enable up to 27,000 more jobs and result in an increase of daily trips to/from the area from 63,000 currently to around 140,000 in the next 30 years.
Currently, journeys to the airport are unreliable and getting worse for all transport modes. A long term programme has been developed with a number of interventions. Some of the short term, implementable initiatives are already underway (e.g. improved bus services, improved information at airport terminals, staff parking alternatives). The next significant projects focus on improved access from across the city but with particular focus on the east and south of Auckland. East Auckland has one of the lowest levels of public transport usage in the region due to a lack of viable public transport options and South Auckland, as one of the most socio economically deprived areas of Auckland, would be offered significantly better access to employment and education opportunities at Manukau and the Airport.

The initiatives to be delivered in this programme include:

- Airport access public transport improvements – a range of medium term capital improvements to support the provision of enhanced bus services from New Lynn, Mt Roskill, Onehunga and Botany to the airport precinct. Improvements are designed to be in place by 2021/22
- Puhinui bus/rail interchange – provision of a new interchange at Puhinui Station to provide a high quality connection between the rail network and buses accessing Auckland International Airport. This initiative complements NZTA’s airport to Puhinui link project.

Public transport airport access improvements and the Puhinui bus/rail interchange have both been scheduled for completion by 2021.

**Costs and benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Indicative RFT contribution</th>
<th>Timing of project</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport access public transport improvements</td>
<td>$26 million +/- 10%</td>
<td>2018-2021</td>
<td>Improved public transport access and services to the airport from the Isthmus, West, and East Auckland by 2020/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puhinui Bus-Rail interchange upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New high quality bus/rail interchange at Puhinui Station to substantially improve airport access from the rail network by reducing transfer times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced congestion as more people have ability to use public transport rather than the private car</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Value for money**

These initiatives complement and maximise the benefits from recent and planned investment in infrastructure, including the Eastern Busway and Manukau bus interchanges, and the proposed upgrade of SH20 by the New Zealand Transport Agency. Collectively they provide a significant improvement in access to the education and employment opportunities for communities in east and south Auckland.

**Project 4: Eastern Busway (formerly known as AMETI)**

**Description**

The Eastern suburbs of Auckland have grown rapidly and currently have a population of 130,000 – similar to the size of Dunedin. Based on 2013 census information, the area has the highest level of trips to work by car and the lowest level of public transport use. This is partly due to low density land use but also poor bus reliability as the buses are caught in the same congestion as general traffic. The lack of cycle facilities and low urban amenity on main roads also makes cycling and walking unattractive.
This project is focused on developing an integrated multi-modal transport system to support population and economic growth in east Auckland. By investing in public transport and walking and cycling infrastructure, these options will become more viable and attractive to commuters. Increased use of public and active transport by commuters will, in turn, free up road capacity for freight and business traffic. However, the project also recognises that some key congestion points along primary vehicle routes still need to be unlocked via targeted road improvements or new connections.

While the Eastern Busway project is primarily focused on delivering transport solutions it also presents significant opportunities for transport investment to drive land-use change through high-quality redevelopment along the busway and around the new stations.

The Regional Fuel Tax would enable stages 2, 3 and 4 of the project to be accelerated. These stages consist of several major pieces of infrastructure including completing the urban busway between Panmure and Botany; associated key stations at Pakuranga and Botany; the Reeves Road flyover at Pakuranga town centre; and new / improved pedestrian and cycle facilities.

The Regional Fuel Tax will also provide operational funding for additional bus services, increasing the frequency of buses along the Eastern Busway and feeding into the surrounding area. The additional services will optimise the investment in the Eastern Busway by providing extra capacity, improved customer service and reduced wait times.

The Panmure to Pakuranga stage of AMETI is scheduled for completion in 2021. The remaining components (Reeves Road Flyover, Ti Rakau Busway, Botany Bus Interchange) will be delivered over the remaining period.

Costs and benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Indicative RFT contribution</th>
<th>Timing of project</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panmure to Pakuranga busway</td>
<td>$201 million +/- 10%</td>
<td>2018-2025</td>
<td>Increase public transport usage from 5.8% to 13% of journeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakuranga bus station and Reeves Road flyover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce bus journey time (Panmure to Botany) by approximately 15 minutes at peak times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti Rakau busway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced congestion from higher public transport use and improvements to local roads at key bottlenecks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany bus station and Park’n’Ride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value for money

The Eastern Busway programme was initiated in 2006. In the intervening period it has been though many iterations and option refinement to deliver the best value set of initiatives to achieve the objectives of the project.

Project 5: Park and Rides

Description

Park and Ride facilities are an integral part of the public transport network. They provide access to the Rapid Transit Network and Frequent Transit Network, along with feeder bus services, walking and cycling. Auckland currently has approximately 5,500 park and ride carpark spaces across the network which provides for approximately 16% of the daily 39,000 peak commuters on the network. Approximately 85% of available Park and Ride car parks are occupied by 7.30am and nearly 100% by 8.30am. At least half of the facilities have a
significant overflow onto surrounding streets affecting amenity and accessibility of town centres and residential areas. The lack of sufficient capacity in some locations can lead to users driving to other locations and creating additional road traffic.

Although overall the demand for Park and Ride facilities significantly exceeds supply, there are some facilities that are over capacity and others that could be replaced or complemented by improvements to feeder bus services or improved walking and cycling infrastructure. The Park and Ride project seeks to take a systematic approach to investment in new facilities which will maximise access to the Rapid Transit Network and Frequent Transport Network, particularly in rural-urban fringe locations which are less likely to be well served by feeder bus services and have limited opportunities for walking and cycling.

The project is expected to add approximately 1900 new parking spaces and deliver benefits associated with increased public transport and lower private vehicle usage, including:

- improved safety through a reduction in private vehicle trips / kms travelled;
- reduced emissions from fewer private vehicle trips / kms travelled;
- increased economic productivity from a more effective/efficient transport system.

Park and ride improvements will be delivered at a number of sites across the Auckland Region using the funding provided by the Regional Fuel Tax. The specific location and timing of new and improved Park and Ride facilities will be the subject of future business cases and are part of the wider transport system that supports access to the rapid transit network. A number of sites are under consideration, with a more regional focus.

These include but are not limited to:

- North – Hibiscus Coast area
- Northwest – Westgate / Kumeu area
- South – Drury and/or Paerata areas

Other sites that may be delivered after further prioritisation include:

- East e.g. Pine Harbour, Highland Park/Howick
- New or expanded facilities along the southern rail line – Pukekohe. Puhinui

The Matiatia initiative is considered separately to the more integrated approach of the other Park and Rides. Matiatia is the primary transport gateway for Whaiheke, serving residents, tourists, freight movements, and services. However, growth is now making it difficult to accommodate these alternative users and the proposal aims to improve transport provision at Matiatia to accommodate this continued growth.

The bulk of the improvements are scheduled for delivery later in the ten-year period.
Costs and benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Indicative RFT contribution</th>
<th>Timing of project</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride programme – sites currently under consideration:</td>
<td>$24 million</td>
<td>2018-2027</td>
<td>Enables 31,000 additional PT passenger kms per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o North – Hibiscus Coast area</td>
<td>+/- 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved public transport accessibility in areas difficult to service using feeder buses or walking and cycling infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Northwest – Westgate / Kumeu area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced congestion by enabling greater public transport use and less private car use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o South – Drury and/or Paerata areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved amenity and accessibility of surrounding streets and town centres by reducing parking overflow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matiatia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value for money

The Park and Ride programme will be focused on those areas where parking facilities will provide access to public transport for a significant number of commuters more cost effectively than feeder bus services and/or walking and cycling infrastructure, and where additional public transport patronage will have the most impact on optimising the transport system.

Project 6: Electric trains and stabling

Description

The heavy rail network forms the backbone of the current Rapid Transit Network in the west, inner east and south of the region. Past local and central government investment has succeeded in delivering the objectives of rail business cases developed in the early 2000’s and, combined with historically high population growth, has generated sustained growth in patronage at unprecedented levels (approximately 20% per annum).

The Unitary Plan envisages significant greenfield growth in the south of Auckland and assumes maximum use of the rail corridor to provide greater access to jobs and services and relieve pressure on already congested State Highways. This will lead to continued growth in rail patronage. In addition, the opening of the City Rail Link (CRL) will significantly improve accessibility to the city centre and enable increases in train frequencies that will in turn generate more demand for rail services.

To accommodate this growth prior to CRL opening, a further 15 electric trains are on order. Post CRL opening and along with other significant rail improvements such as the electrification to Pukekohe, further capacity will be required to run more frequent and higher capacity train services. The Regional Fuel Tax will fund operating and capital expenditure associated with the purchase of 20 additional trains and the construction of associated facilities to house and maintain the trains. A new heavy maintenance facility to overhaul the existing fleet is also required. The operating expenditure will provide funding to run additional services (utilising the new trains) along the Eastern, Western and Southern lines. The additional trains will allow enable more frequent and longer services to be operated, which will provide additional capacity to avoid overcrowding during peak periods.

The exact timing of these requirements will depend upon future rail patronage growth.
Costs and benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Indicative RFT contribution</th>
<th>Timing of project</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electric trains and stabling</td>
<td>$213 million +/- 10%</td>
<td>2021-2026</td>
<td>• Approximately 30% increase in total fleet capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supports development and population growth in the Southern Growth Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Enables more and longer train services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Generates additional rail patronage growth, reducing congestion and emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides necessary facilities to house and maintain the trains.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value for money

This project seeks to optimise usage of the existing rail network and maximise the benefits achieved from current and planned investments (e.g. City Rail Link, extension of electrification to Pukekohe, Pukekohe bus/rail interchange etc).

Project 7: Downtown Ferry Redevelopment

Description

Ferry services form a key part of the public transport network. They are essential to commuters from the gulf islands but also offer a direct and reliable alternative to commuters from coastal suburbs to the CBD. Auckland has a mature ferry network, where the majority of essential and complementary ferry routes are already operating. The demand for ferry services continues to grow (more than 20% over the last 3 years).

Ongoing growth is expected to result in increased demand from areas such as Beachlands, Gulf Harbour, Hobsonville and West Harbour. The Downtown Ferry Terminal (DTFT) is nearing capacity in the peak based on its current configuration and use. To facilitate growth in peak ferry services the supporting infrastructure will need upgrading. DTFT is one of the busiest public transport hubs within the Auckland public transport network along with the adjacent Britomart Transport Centre. It is the hub for ferry services and part of the gateway into Auckland for visitors arriving on cruise ships.

Currently, all berths at DTFT are utilised during both the morning and evening peaks. There is little capacity for the expected 40% growth in services over the next 10 years. There is an opportunity to upgrade the ferry terminal through a design which:

- Increases capacity of the terminal
- Increases the ease and speed at which vessels can berth
- Improves the customer experience
- Enhances revenue protection capability through the placement of additional Auckland Transport HOP ticketing controls
- Reduces congestion in the ferry basin by providing efficient, standardised berthing infrastructure.

The upgrade of piers three and four is scheduled to be delivered in 2020 to provide immediate improvements. The wider redevelopment of the Downtown Ferry Basin is scheduled for completion after the conclusion of Americas Cup AC36.
Costs and benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Indicative RFT contribution</th>
<th>Timing of project</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Ferry Terminal Piers 3 and 4</td>
<td>$28 million</td>
<td>2018-2024</td>
<td>• Reduction in end-to-end journey times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provision of additional capacity to allow for increases in service provision and increased patronage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Ferry Basin Redevelopment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provision of infrastructure redundancy to allow for service disruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A purpose built facility which delivers an improved customer experience for users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduced congestion as increased ferry usage replaces private cars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value for money

Value for money will be ensured through the normal better business case process, including development and testing of procurement and commercial models.

Project 8: Road Safety

Description

The Road Safety Programme 2018/28 includes expenditure to deliver both transformational and low cost safety projects at high-risk locations to reduce road deaths and serious injuries (DSI) in Auckland. It is an important part of an overall approach to improving safety outcomes that also includes vehicle safety, enforcement, education and regulation.

Improving road safety is one of the key strategies for ensuring increased public and active transport in urban areas, as well as supporting significant health, access and environmental benefits. Speed management and safe walking facilities in town centres, neighbourhoods and schools are central to this, as are improvements to high speed, high-risk rural roads.

In the last five years (2013 to 2017) Aucklanders have experienced a 65% increase in road deaths and serious injuries. In 2017 this equated to 64 deaths and 749 serious injuries, a level of road trauma that was last seen over twenty years ago in 1996. The social cost for 2017 road deaths and injuries in Auckland is estimated at $1.13 billion and does not include the considerable congestion-related costs from increasing peak-hour crash delays.

The Auckland Road Safety Programme 2018/28 will use proven designs to build a protective road network that prevents death and serious injury when inevitable human error occurs. Existing Auckland Transport safety engineering investment is at a level of approximately $13 million per annum and currently addresses two to three of the 300 high-risk intersections and 10kms of the 1,000kms of high-risk roads per annum. It is clear from the last three year DSI results that this existing level of funding has been unable to make an impact on growing road trauma.

Additional investment of $500m over 10 years is proposed. This will enable safety improvements to a larger number of high-risk intersections and routes, including:

• Roundabout construction
- Pedestrian and cycling crossing grade separation
- Red Light Camera installation

The five highest risk corridors in the urban areas are Karangahape Road, Dominion Road, Queen Street, Symonds Street, Lincoln Road, while the five highest risk intersections are Karangahape Road/Mercury Lane, Upper Queen Street/Karangahape Road, Botany Road/Ti Rakau Drive, Blockhouse Bay Road/Chalmers Street and Trugood Drive/Ti Rakau Drive.

In the Rodney, Franklin and Waitakere areas, additional funding will improve high-risk rural routes and will deliver:
- Signage and lane marking improvements
- Skid resistance road surface upgrades
- Roadside and median barriers.

The five highest risk corridors in the rural area are Whitford Road, Old North Road, Murphy’s Road, Dairy Flat Highway, Heights Road while the five highest risk intersections are Popes Road/Portchester Road, Waiuku Road/Attewell Road, Old North Road/Old Railway Drive, Murphy’s Road/Redoubt Road and Coatesville-Riverhead Highway/Dairy Flat Highway.

The speed management programme will also be expanded to cover more of the network, in particular on routes to and from schools, public transport facilities and town centres. Funding will be applied to:
- Speed limit changes and signage
- Traffic calming measures, including speed humps
- Safety cameras
- Crossing safety improvements

The combined impact of these accelerated programmes is estimated to reduce DSI by 60% over ten years from the 2017 baseline, as well as contribute towards additional congestion reduction benefits and increased health and environment benefits. This project is part of a wider, multi-agency approach to road safety and two key elements of the project are enabling investigation resource of $30 million over ten years as well as the ability to install and operate a greater number of safety cameras.

The Regional Fuel Tax will fund operating and capital expenditure associated with the accelerated safety programme. Operating expenditure is required in the early stages of project development to fund:
- Investigations and analysis
- Project development
- Early community and stakeholder engagement

The accelerated road safety programme will be delivered across the ten years covered by this proposal.
Costs and benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Indicative RFT contribution</th>
<th>Timing of project</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Road Safety Programme</td>
<td>$225 million +/- 10%</td>
<td>2018-2028</td>
<td>Road deaths and serious injuries reduced by 488 over ten years or 60% from the 2017 baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Road Safety Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Congestion reduction from reduced crash-delays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above road safety programmes will address:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health and environmental benefits from increased active transport and reduced emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 12 High-risk intersections per annum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200km high-risk routes per annum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% of the high-risk speed network per annum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer communities and speed management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Safety Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety cameras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value for money

This project is part of a wider, multi-agency approach to road safety. The accelerated safety programme has been informed by international best practice and successful implementation in similar jurisdictions. On this basis, it is considered that the programme will deliver high value for money.

Project 9: Active Transport

Description

A very small proportion of people in Auckland have access to a completed part of the cycle network to take them safely and comfortably to the places they travel the most often. As a result, just 1.2% of people ride to work and just 3% cycle to school. The lack of connectivity in the network means that cycling does not currently play the significant role it could in moving people around Auckland. Nearly half of peak time vehicle trips are less than six kilometres, a distance that can be travelled in 25 minutes by bike. Over half of Aucklanders live within a 15 minute bike ride of Auckland’s rapid transport network. While there has been an increase in investment in the cycling network in recent years, only a small proportion of the protected cycle network is in place.

The initial focus of the ten-year walking and cycling programme is to complete the current Urban Cycleways Programme. The Regional Fuel Tax will enable the Ōrākei shared path to also be completed by 2021. Investigation, design and pre-implementation work on the next generation of projects will also be undertaken during this time so that construction can begin from 2021.

The walking and cycling programme will focus on supporting short trips to the city centre, public transport interchanges, schools and local and metropolitan centres. By the end of the ten-year period, major improvements will have been delivered across Auckland, including the central isthmus, west, north and south. Eastern areas will have walking and cycling programmes delivered through the Eastern Busway project.
Costs and benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Indicative RFT contribution</th>
<th>Timing of project</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Walking and cycling programme with priority in the following areas  
  o city centre/fringe, inner west, Glen Innes, Onehunga, central isthmus, Sandringham  
  o Henderson and Te Atatu Peninsula  
  o Devonport, Northcote and Takapuna  
  o Manukau, Māngere East, Māngere Bridge and Papatoetoe | $112 million +/- 10% | 2018-2028 | • Ongoing delivery of the next generation of walking and cycling improvements  
• Increase cycling as a share of peak time travel from 1.2% to 4-5%  
• Improved health and environmental outcomes through increased active trips and fewer private vehicle trips  
• Improved safety outcomes  
• Reductions in congestion from increased walking and cycling and less private car use. |

• Ōrākei shared path

Value for money

By focusing on short trips to the city centre, public transit interchanges, schools and local and metropolitan centres, maximum impact on the overall transport system is achieved for the investment made. Investment priorities have been guided by a Programme Business Case for cycling, which indicates strong value for money with cost benefit ratios of between 1.9 and 4.6.3

Project 10: Penlink

Description

The Penlink project provides a new connection between the Northern Motorway at Redvale and the Whangaparāoa Peninsula, bypassing the constrained Silverdale interchange.

Faster than expected growth and major planned development around the Silverdale interchange has accelerated the need to progress Penlink. The new route will reduce traffic through the Silverdale interchange, thereby reducing congestion on the transport network for the communities of Wainui, Silverdale, Millwater, Witi, Stillwater and the Whangaparāoa Peninsula. Reduced pressure on the Silverdale interchange will free up transport capacity to support planned housing and business development in the area.

Penlink is proposed as a toll road, as it provides significant time savings for users and an alternative route exists. It is expected that with a toll in place, there will be sufficient capacity as a two-lane road to meet foreseeable future demand.

The project will be complemented by public transport improvements (for example the planned bus shoulder lanes between Albany and Orewa) to encourage mode shift in the area and avoid adding more vehicles to the congested Northern Motorway.

---

3 Auckland Cycling Programme Business Case: [https://at.govt.nz/media/1974191/item14-auckland-cycling-programme-for-investmentfinal.pdf](https://at.govt.nz/media/1974191/item14-auckland-cycling-programme-for-investmentfinal.pdf)
Costs and benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Indicative RFT contribution</th>
<th>Timing of project</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penlink project</td>
<td>$66 million +/- 10%</td>
<td>2025-2028</td>
<td>• Travel time savings of 12-18 minutes for Penlink toll road users, and 5 minutes for commuters who continue to use the free alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Travel time savings of 20+ minutes for bus passengers commuting from the Whangaparāoa Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provision of pedestrian and cyclist facilities between Whangaparāoa and Silverdale Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduced congestion at the Silverdale interchange and along the Hibiscus Coast Highway and Whangaparāoa Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supports economic activity and planned growth in the Hibiscus Coast.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value for money

As a toll road project, Penlink will require seed funding but a significant proportion of the costs will be funded from tolls. The project has a high benefit cost ratio due to the significant travel time savings it provides Whangaparāoa residents, and its overall impact on congestion in the Hibiscus Coast area. Substantial business case work has been undertaken on Penlink over a number of years, indicating excellent value for money with a cost benefit ratio of 3.5-5.7.

Project 11: Mill Road corridor

Description

The Mill Road corridor provides an additional strategic north-south corridor for southern Auckland, connecting Manukau with Drury through a new and improved corridor to the east of the Southern Motorway. It connects future residential development in the south with employment in the north, particularly around Manukau. Once complete, it will also improve access to new employment opportunities in Drury South and provide resilience in Auckland’s transport network.

The full corridor will be delivered in stages over the next few decades. Funding provided by the Regional Fuel Tax will allow the highest priority components of the corridor to be progressed over the next ten years. Key priority areas for investment include:

- Improved intersections to address the most severe congestion
- Improved parts of the northern end to address the most severe safety issues
- Construction of sections that pass directly through former Special Housing Areas at the time these areas grow
- Undertaking route protection and land purchase of the southern section.

The project is required as forecast growth in South Auckland will create chokepoints on roads around Papakura and Drury - even with the public transport network absorbing a significant share of new trips and the current / proposed Southern Motorway widening. This will reduce the area’s attractiveness for growth and disrupt freight movements.

In addition to providing capacity to reduce congestion and support growth, investing in the Mill Road corridor also helps other key routes in this part of Auckland function more effectively:

- Less pressure on the Southern Motorway means that it can function more effectively as the key route for inter-regional freight movements and other longer trips
- Less pressure on Great South Road assists plans to reallocate existing road space to bus lanes.

**Costs and benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Indicative RFT contribution</th>
<th>Timing of project</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mill Road corridor</td>
<td>$102 million +/- 10%</td>
<td>2024-2026</td>
<td>More efficient inter-regional freight movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supports future residential and business growth in the south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allows improved public transport provision on Great South Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides resilience for the Southern Motorway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety improvements along one of Auckland’s current high-risk routes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Value for money**

The Mill road project unlocks housing and business growth in the southern development area, improves network resilience and safety, and releases pressure on the Great South Road and Southern Motorway corridors.

**Project 12: Road Corridor Improvements**

**Description**

This is a collection of initiatives to improve capacity, safety, amenity and connectivity of the existing road corridors.

The Lincoln Road initiative is focused on improving safety and congestion. It includes: widening the road to provide an additional bus and transit lane on each side; installation of an on-road cycleway segregated from the transit lane on both sides of the road; upgrades of existing intersections and building a solid raised and planted median to replace the existing painted median.

The Glenvar Road and Matakana Link Road initiatives will both provide improved connectivity and access to development areas. Matakana Link Road will reduce congestion in central Warkworth by connecting Matakana Road and State Highway 1, bypassing the busy Hill Street intersection. The Glenvar Road / East Coast Road project will support the Long Bay development area and complement the current Glenvar Ridge Road project by making improvements to East Coast Road, Glenvar Road and delivering intersection improvements along the route.

The Smales / Allens intersection upgrade delivers improvements to a key bottleneck in the East Tamaki area which will, in particular, have benefits for freight movements and other business related traffic. The intersection of Smales, Allens, Springs and Harris roads will be upgraded, and Smales and Allens roads will be widened.
near the intersection. The project has a very high Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) as it delivers sizeable travel time benefits for a relatively small level of investment.

The Lake Road Improvements project aims to increase the efficiency and reliability of travel along Lake Road between Takapuna and Devonport. Lake Road is the single arterial connecting the Devonport peninsula with the rest of the North Shore and Auckland. Current congestion and travel time unpredictability is the number one issue for people living in the area, both for those in private vehicles and those using buses, also caught in the congestion. The proposal is to provide extended transit lanes along Lake and Esmonde roads and change intersections to improve traffic flow along these corridors.

Also included in this group of initiatives is funding to progress the sealing of currently unsealed roads. This will primarily address issues of dust and amenity but also has a positive benefit for motorists with improved ride quality and reduced vehicle maintenance.

The Lincoln Road and Matakana Link Road projects are due for completion by 2022, with the remaining initiatives to be delivered over the remaining years. Seal extensions are an ongoing programme and will be delivered across all ten years covered by this proposal.

### Costs and benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Indicative RFT contribution</th>
<th>Timing of project</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Road</td>
<td>$87 million +/- 10%</td>
<td>2018-2026</td>
<td>• Reduced congestion and improved reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matakana Link Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved safety and network resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenvar Road/East Coast Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supporting housing / business development at Warkworth, Long Bay and Devonport Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smales / Alvis intersection upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved walking and cycling infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Road Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Significant increase in funding for the seal extension programme improving amenity and safety outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal extensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Value for money

These initiatives leverage the existing investments in road infrastructure and provide value for money by addressing capacity constraints and improving safety and connectivity.

### Project 13: Network Capacity and Performance Improvements

**Description**

In addition to new investment to provide additional transport infrastructure, there is also the need to increase the ability of people and goods to access opportunities and markets on a day-to-day basis through small to medium-scale network capacity and performance improvements. These improvements deliver value for money opportunities to improve the return on larger scale infrastructure improvements such as City Rail Link. The project will more effectively manage congestion through capital investments to make better and more appropriate use of the existing network, and enable transport choice and access that facilitates increased mode shift to walking, cycling, public transport and sustainable modes of travel on a day-to-day basis.

For public transport this would be achieved by provision of:

- “On demand” services to enhance access to public transport
First and last leg services to provide support a more connected, accessible and liveable system

Public Transport priority movements (e.g. bus priority) to increase public transport access on key movement corridors and the wider network

Public Transport hub connectivity improvements to enable public transport access, and facilitate walking and cycling access to key termini/hubs and intersections

The reliability of the transport network will be improved by investment in:

- Real time signage and travel information to better inform travel choice opportunities
- Real-time active network management to better facilitate, intervene and prioritise appropriate access and movement of people and goods on the network
- Intersection traffic flow improvements to improve network resilience and performance
- Intelligent transport systems to support active network monitoring, efficient network management and improved customer travel choice information
- Signalling system upgrade to improve network management capabilities

Road capacity can be significantly improved through the implementation of:

- Dynamic lanes where appropriate
- T2/T3 lanes on key people movement links to increase access, enable transport choice and reduce congestion
- Freight priority on key freight connections to increase access to economic markets
- City Centre/metropolitan/town centre connectivity improvements to provide connected, accessible and liveable areas that support social prosperity and economic productivity

These initiatives would be rolled out over the 10-year period and have the advantage that, because they leverage off existing investment, they achieve improvements more quickly than some other projects.
Costs and benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Indicative RFT contribution</th>
<th>Timing of project</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT access including</td>
<td>$99 million +/- 10%</td>
<td>2018-2028</td>
<td>Travel time savings of up to 500,000 hrs/year, including improved bus travel times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o On-demand dynamic rideshare trials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable journey times including retaining good and reliable travel times for freight routes year to year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Integrating active transport with scheduled public transport services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased people and goods movement productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Traffic signal bus prioritisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement of dedicated bus and transit lanes to increase people movement throughput at peak times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network reliability e.g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved customer information being available allowing the ability to make informed travel choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Intersection improvements incl Mt Wellington, Mill Rd and Gt South Rd (Takanini)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved mode share and increase network capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repurposing existing road space e.g. Dynamic lanes –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Gt North Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Blockhouse Bay Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Patiki Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Redoubt Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o East Coast Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value for money

This project enables capacity improvements to existing public transport and road networks ensuring maximum value is extracted from investments made.

Project 14: Growth related transport infrastructure

Description

Auckland is New Zealand’s largest city - home to about a third of the nation’s population - and continues to be the country’s fastest-growing region. An additional 700,000 to one million people are expected to call Auckland home over the next 30 years, growth that will require about 400,000 new homes and create 277,000 new jobs.

While most of Auckland’s growth will take place within the existing urban areas, around 15,000 hectares of greenfield (mainly rural) land has been identified for development in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part). This includes areas zoned ‘future urban’ (rural land zoned for future urban development), as well rural land that has been ‘live zoned’ (zoned for immediate urban development).

Over the next decade around 32,000 new homes housing up to 100,000 people are expected to be built in the major greenfield growth areas in the north, northwest and south. To enable this growth, encourage use of public transport and active modes and provide a reasonable level of service, significant investment in transport infrastructure will be needed. Auckland Transport, Auckland Council, and the New Zealand Transport Agency have collaborated to develop the transport network plan needed to support these future urban areas. The funding provided in this proposal will enable the highest priority projects to be progressed over the next ten years.

ATAP included a $300 million “greenfield transport infrastructure fund”, of which $126 million will come from the Regional Fuel Tax. The intention of this fund is to unlock private funding to support growth in these major greenfield areas. Investments that are candidates for this fund are included in the table below.
### Governing Body

31 May 2018

**Proposal for a Regional Fuel Tax for Auckland**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected Household Growth</th>
<th>Indicative key investments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Warkworth | 1,000 | 4,635 | • Western Collector  
  • Warkworth Park and Ride |
| Silverdale/ Dairy Flat | 6,000 | 15,430 | • Argent-Curley Ave Extension  
  • Wilks to Penlink arterial |
| Northwest | 13,600 | 29,900 | • Northside Drive East  
  • Totara Trig Road extension  
  • Westgate to Greenhithe rapid transit network stations |
| South | 11,300 | 25,490 | • Rangi Road upgrade and grade separated rail crossings  
  • Frequent transport network upgrades between Manukau and Drury  
  • Bremner Road Extension West |

The $300 million in this programme is forecast to be spent over the whole ten-year period.

**Costs and benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Indicative RFT contribution</th>
<th>Timing of project</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Growth related transport projects – key priority areas being:  
  o Pupekohe, Drury, Paerata, and Takanini  
  Silverdale, Dairy Flat, Wainui, and Warkworth  
  o Kumeu, Redhills, and Whenuapai | $126 million +/- 10% | 2018-2026 | • Enabling PT services to growth areas  
  • Improve arterial road connections to future urban areas  
  • Ensure transport networks are in place to enable urban development  
  • Ability to partner with developers and leverage off their investment. |

**Value for money**

The cost of the full Supporting Growth preferred programme has an indicative benefit cost ratio between 3.3 and 4.8. The funding provided in this proposal allows the highest priority initiatives from the full programme to be progressed over the next ten years.
Proposed Regional Fuel Tax scheme and application of revenue

The Regional Fuel Tax is proposed to apply to sales of petrol and diesel by retailers within the boundaries of Auckland Council (excluding Aotea Great Barrier Island) starting on 1 July 2018 and expiring on 30 June 2028.

The amount of the tax is proposed at 10 cents per litre plus GST for a 10 year period.

The amount of revenue forecast to be realised from the Regional Fuel Tax is $150 - $170 million per annum.

The following information and assumptions formed the basis of the forecast revenue calculations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuel volumes</td>
<td>Volume is based on submitted returns for Local Authority Fuel Tax over recent years, plus growth of 1.2% per annum for petrol and 4.5% for diesel. The growth is based on long-term averages. This growth is then adjusted for the assumptions on electric vehicles and the impact on demand from the additional cost of the RFT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of electric vehicles</td>
<td>Modelling has been conservatively based on 15% of the vehicle fleet being electric by 2028, and a higher take-up of 30% by 2028 has also been modelled. (Ministry of Transport estimates project 15% of the vehicle fleet to be electric by 2030).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebates</td>
<td>Based on available information of national rebate levels under existing Fuel Excise Duty and Road User Charges schemes, rebates have been estimated at 2% of petrol and 30% of diesel sales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on demand of additional cost of RFT</td>
<td>A small reduction in demand (1.3%) from both private and freight vehicles has been assumed in response to the increased costs of RFT. With regard to private vehicles, generally, petrol and diesel prices tend to be higher in the rural areas (i.e. around the Auckland boundary) than urban areas. Consequently, there is limited financial benefit to travel outside the Auckland region to fill up, as most trips start and end in the Auckland region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Ministry of Transport and NZTA officials have advised that they have engaged extensively with fuel companies about their ability to implement the proposed Regional Fuel Tax for Auckland and are satisfied that the proposed scheme can be implemented from 1 July 2018. Those fuel companies that supply fuel to Great Barrier Island have confirmed that they are able to manage the exclusion of the island from regional fuel tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and associated costs</td>
<td>The NZ Transport Agency has confirmed that it is able to collect a regional fuel tax for Auckland, in the terms outlined in this proposal, by 1 July 2018. The Agency has also confirmed that, once the likely scale of private rebate entitlements is understood and the process for applying for rebates is finalised, it will be able to process rebate claims within a timeframe that meets users’ needs. The Agency advises that its objective is that its ongoing administration of RFT, including rebate processing, should cost no more than 1% of revenue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Proposal for a Regional Fuel Tax for Auckland

Item 9

Attachment A

Fuel consumption projections

Revenue projections
DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR A REGIONAL FUEL TAX – REPORT ON CONSULTATION

Submission process

The Land Transport Management (Regional Fuel Tax) Amendment Bill, requires that a regional council must carry out consultation in accordance with the principles set out in section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002. The council may also use the special consultative procedure specified in section 83 of the Local Government Act 2002.

Auckland Council consulted on its Long Term Plan 2018-28 (LTP) from 28 February 2018 to 28 March 2018. At this time, the Council proposed to implement a Regional Fuel Tax of 10 cents per litre plus GST to fund transport infrastructure. The council asked the community through the LTP consultation whether it supported a regional fuel tax as a mechanism to fund transport infrastructure. The consultation preceded the release of the Draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) and the release of the updated Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP), so the council was unable to confirm the projects that the Regional Fuel Tax would fund. The council did however indicate to the community that the projects to be funded by a regional fuel tax were likely to focus on public transport infrastructure, active transport infrastructure, safety projects, and high priority roading projects to ease congestion and support growth.

Following the release of the draft GPS and ATAP, and the introduction of the Land Transport Management (Regional Fuel Tax) Amendment Bill, the Council adopted a draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal as the basis of public with the Auckland community.

The consultation period was two weeks from 1 May 2018 to 15 May 2018. Consultation on the Regional Fuel Tax proposal took place in conjunction with Auckland Transport’s consultation on the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP).

Consultation was primarily focused as an on-line activity but hard copy information and questionnaires were available at council service centres and libraries. In addition to the draft proposal, a four page overview document was prepared and this formed the basis of the introductory on-line information. Summary information translated into 3 languages was also available.

Five “Have Your Say” events were held around the Auckland region and specific engagement with mana whenua groups also took place.

Communications activity to raise awareness utilised Auckland Council and Auckland Transport social media channels and proactive media engagement. Print, radio and digital advertising were the primary focus of the media engagement.

17,223 written responses were received to the combined Regional Fuel Tax and RLTP consultations. Of these 14,549 were replies to the question on the use of a Regional Fuel Tax to fund transport infrastructure. There were also 182 comments provided through “Have Your Say” events and 89 comments via social media on this issue.

12,811 written responses were received to the question on the relative importance of the transport projects included in the Regional Fuel Tax proposal, along with 25 comments from “Have Your Say” events and 15 comments from social media.
A more detailed analysis of the submissions received is attached to this report.

*Note for councillors – attachments will be the Draft Regional Fuel Tax report and the CEI Regional Fuel Tax report.*

**Response to submissions**

Following public feedback, Council has determined that a Regional Fuel Tax is the most appropriate funding mechanism to fund additional transport investment.

No major changes are proposed to the Regional Fuel Tax funded projects on the basis that these are complemented by a programme of government funded projects (through NZTA and Kiwirail). This total mix of projects is designed to provide an integrated regional solution focused on the key challenges, as well providing benefits across all communities. There does not seem to be any compelling reasons to change the mix of projects from the draft proposal, but public preferences and commentary can be taken into account in prioritising implementation.
A Regional Fuel Tax for Auckland – Analysis of feedback received

The draft proposal for a Regional Fuel Tax included the introduction of a regional fuel tax of 10 cents per litre (plus GST) to raise more funding for transport projects and services. It also included a list of the projects proposed to be funded from the Regional Fuel Tax.

This attachment provides an overview of the feedback received across each feedback channel and is analysed in two sections. The first section provides analysis of the responses to the question of using Regional Fuel Tax as a mechanism of funding transport infrastructure, the second section analyses feedback on the fourteen individual projects that are proposed to be funded by the Regional Fuel Tax.

Analysis of feedback received on funding transport investment from a Regional Fuel Tax

Question: Without a Regional Fuel Tax (RFT) the funding available will only cover renewing our existing transport network and the projects we have already committed to for example the City Rail Link. To enable us to deliver projects that improve congestion, public transport and road safety, we recommend an RFT of 10 cents per litre plus GST (11.5 cents). What is your opinion on this proposal? Support/ Do not support/ Other.

Key findings

Key findings across all feedback received are:

- There was strong support for improvements to public transport and infrastructure including increased reliability, frequency and improvements for those travelling across the city.
- There was a preference for the council to consider alternative funding mechanisms such as
  - reducing the council’s expenditure
  - implementation of congestion charges or toll roads
- There was concern about the impact of the fuel tax on the cost of goods and services.
- There was concern about the impact of a fuel tax on low income families.

Feedback across channels

The council received 14,820 responses to this question across all channels. Of these, 14,549 were written responses, 182 were provided through Have Your Say events and 88 were provided via social media.
Written feedback received

The council received 11,400 written feedback points in response to the introduction of a regional fuel tax, including 1,751 pro forma responses.

Themes from those who provided comments are included below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support – 42%</td>
<td>2400 feedback points with the key themes being:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 510 supported the increase in funding to be made available for improving public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 310 supported a fuel tax given that is a user pays system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 110 commented that a fuel tax would encourage the use of public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not support – 50%</td>
<td>7670 feedback points with the key themes being:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2780 stated a fuel tax would be unaffordable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 2330 requested the council to use different funding mechanisms to fund the transport programme such as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o reducing the council’s expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o implementation of congestion charges or toll roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 370 noted that a fuel tax would have an unfair impact on rural communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 360 preferred a congestion charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 230 commented that the government fuel tax was sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 180 wanted an improvement in public transport to be in place before the introduction of a fuel tax.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These responses included 1,751 pro forma submissions from the Auckland Ratepayers Alliance.

| Other – 7%          | 1140 feedback points, the key themes being:                                                                                                                                                   |
|                     | - 180 stated a fuel tax would be unaffordable                                                                                                                                                   |
|                     | - 120 commented that a different funding mechanism should be used to fund the transport programme such as                                                                                     |
Summary of written feedback on a regional fuel tax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reducing the council's expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implementation of congestion charges or toll roads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Written feedback included 1751 submissions generated through a campaign by the Auckland Ratepayers Alliance. Excluding these pro forma submissions from the submitter statistics above, the responses would be 48 per cent in support of a fuel tax, 44 per cent did not support and 8 per cent stated ‘other’.

Feedback received through Have Your Say and community events

182 people gave 97 feedback points on the tax through Have Your Say events.

![Regional fuel tax feedback chart]

Themes from the feedback included:

Summary of Have Your Say and events feedback on a regional fuel tax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support - 27%</td>
<td>13 feedback points were received. • 4 stated that it would improve public transport • 2 commented that they would benefit from the projects • 1 supported a fuel tax as it is a user pay system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not support – 56%</td>
<td>58 feedback points were received. Comments included: • 28 stated that a fuel tax would be unaffordable • 4 noted that the government fuel tax was sufficient • 5 commented that a different funding mechanism should be used to fund the transport programme • 3 preferred a congestion charge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – 16%</td>
<td>24 feedback points were received. Comments included: • 4 stated that a fuel tax would be unaffordable • 2 commented that a different funding mechanism should be used to fund the transport programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Digital feedback received
88 responses were received via social media. 44 per cent were in support, 56 per cent were opposed.

Note: Auckland Council also ran an informal poll on its Facebook page. The poll asked followers whether they agreed with a regional fuel tax to improve the transport network. There were 10,712 responses to this poll, 74% opposed the regional fuel tax. The poll was designed to stimulate awareness and direct people to the akhaveyousay site. It was mistakenly left open for seven days instead of the intended one day. The receipt of this feedback is acknowledged, but caution must be applied to interpreting feedback through social media channels as it is not possible to determine the extent to which the feedback is demographically or geographically representative of the Auckland population, or in fact whether the feedback came from outside of Auckland.

Māori feedback
There were 731 responses from submitters who identified as Maori. 48 per cent supported the introduction of the fuel tax, 41 per cent did not support and 11 per cent selected ‘Other’.

Of those who opposed the fuel tax, the most commonly expressed feedback was that a fuel tax would be unaffordable. Also noted was that a different funding mechanism should be used to fund the transport programme.

Mana whenua feedback
16 iwi authorities submitted to the consultation on the proposal for a Regional Fuel Tax and provided specific feedback. Five iwi authorities did not provide a submission to this consultation. They were Ngāti Māru Rūnanga Trust; Ngāti Paoa Iwi Trust; Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara; Te Patukirikiri Incorporated and Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mana whenua support for the introduction of a regional fuel tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Settlement Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Uri o Hau Settlement Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Other**                                                      | **Do not support**                                            |
| Ngāti Tamacho Settlement Trust                                 | Te Ahiwaru / Makaurau Marae Māori Trust                       |
| Ngāti Whanaunga Incorporated                                   | Ngāti Manuhiri Settlement Trust                               |
| Ngātiwai Trust Board                                           | Ngāti Rehua Ngātiwai ki Aotearoa Trust                        |
| Te Ākitai Waiohua Iwi Authority                                | Ngāti Tamaterā Treaty Settlement Trust                        |
| Te Ara Rangatū o te iwi o Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua                | Ngāti Whātua Ōrakei Trust                                     |
| Te Kawerau Iwi Tribal Authority & Settlement Trust             | Te Aratāura o Waikato Tainui                                  |
| Te Whakatitenga o Waikato Incorporated                        | Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated                        |

All submitters recognise transport as a major issue in Auckland. The major concern is the additional pressure the regional fuel tax would place on low income families and the elderly. Iwi commented on ways in which to reduce the impact on low income whanau with measures such as:

- a lower fuel tax with an extended implementation period for projects
• prioritising projects with the greatest impact on the low income, such as public transport projects
• a rebate for low income earners and the elderly for example, with an iwi HOP card
• reducing the region in which the tax would apply
• affordable transport options
• exemptions for those who live on Aotea (Great Barrier Island).

Other comments from iwi included:
• whanau may not be able to support the work of the marae if petrol became unaffordable
• unaffordable and unsafe travel options were obstacles to employment
• public transport is currently infrequent and inconvenient and cannot be relied on
• there is support for transport projects and initiatives that contribute to positive economic and social outcomes for mana whenua
• journeys to work may not be to the CBD and can be across the city, for example from west Auckland to the airport
• with the introduction of the government fuel tax, the council should now reconsider the regional fuel tax
• a fuel tax could increase congestion with the flow of traffic to areas where the tax is not in place
• a congestion charge would be more equitable.

The Mana Whenua Forum provided conditional support to the proposal and asked to work with the council and government to address the impacts on low income households.

Stakeholder feedback
Submissions on the introduction of a regional fuel tax were received from approximately 21 stakeholders. The stakeholders represented organisations across all areas, such as business associations across the city, Bike Auckland, Auckland Greypower and New Zealand Automobile Association.

Seven stakeholders were in support of the introduction of a regional fuel tax, two were not and 12 selected “Other”. Stakeholders also commented that:

• A fuel tax will adversely affect those on low incomes, particularly those living some distance from metropolitan centres.
• A fuel tax would also increase the cost of goods and services.
• Business associations were concerned about the impact that construction work would have on their members and asked that strategies be put in place to mitigate or minimise any disruptions.
• There was a preference for the introduction of congestion charging as a way of managing demand as well as a funding source.
• It was suggested that the use of public private partnerships supported by sustainable revenue streams should be the next step.
• Fuel tax exemptions for commercial transport operators and non-road users should be in place.
• The expected growth in more fuel efficient and electric vehicles will require some form of distance based charging for all motor vehicles.
• A requirement to estimate the costs of administering the tax including processing any rebates to enable the value and cost-effectiveness of the RFT scheme to be considered.

Feedback by local board area
The table below shows an analysis of written feedback received on a regional fuel tax by local board area. Feedback where the local board area was not stated or was from outside the region has not been included.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipatiki</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoeto</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pukepāpapa</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1,383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table: Support for Regional Fuel Tax by Local Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>267%</td>
<td>218%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>637%</td>
<td>265%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>260%</td>
<td>238%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>6,058%</td>
<td>6,628%</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>13,682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of feedback shows support for the introduction of regional fuel tax was the preferred option in 9 local board areas. Support for a regional fuel tax was higher in the central sub-region (54 per cent) than in the north (39 per cent) and South (37 per cent) sub-regions.
Analysis of feedback received for the proposed transport programme

**Question:** We are proposing the RFT funds the projects listed below. How important are these projects to you? Very important/ Moderately important/ Less important.

**Key findings**

Key findings across all feedback received are

- There was strong support for improvements to public transport.
- There was acknowledgement that congestion is an issue in Auckland and submitters wanted solutions to the problems in their areas.
- Many feedback points were in support of the provision of active transport.
- Comments regarding safety referred to improved roading as well as safety for walkers and cyclists.

**Feedback across channels**

The council received 14,649 submissions to the transport projects. Of these, 12,811 were written responses, 1,750 were through Have Your Say events and 20 were provided via social media.

From feedback received, the projects in the transport programme was ranked in the following order:

![RFT Projects Feedback Chart](chart.png)

**Written feedback received**

The council received 8,770 written feedback points in response to the transport programme, including 1,996 pro forma responses.

The table below summarises the feedback received on the projects included in the programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Less Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P4 Road Safety</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P34 Growth-related transport infrastructure</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 Bus priority improvements</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5 Park and Rides</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12 Network capacity and performance</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6 Electric trains and stations</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7 Improving airport access</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9 Active transport</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 City Centre bus infrastructure</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12 Road corridor improvements</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 MTE Eastern Baysway</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7 Downtown ferry redevelopment</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10 Penlink</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11 MIB Road Corridor</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of written feedback on transport projects**

The table above summarises the feedback received on the projects included in the programme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| P1. Bus Priority Improvements                         | There were 12,474 responses to this project.  
50% stated that this project was very important  
30% stated it was moderately important  
20% stated it was less important.  
190 feedback points with the key themes being:  
• 40 noted that a more frequent and cheaper bus service would encourage greater use of public transport  
• 20 commented that there should be additional bus lanes  
• 11 stated that public transport should be accessible in all suburbs  
• 12 noted that bus there should be more bus services across the city and not just through the CBD.                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| P2. City Centre Bus infrastructure                    | There were 12,321 responses to this project.  
28% stated that this project was very important  
35% stated it was moderately important  
36% stated it was less important.  
30 feedback points with the key themes being:  
• 3 commented on the need for a centralised transport hub in the CBD  
• 3 noted that cross town buses were as important as those to the CBD  
• 2 suggested that light rail would reduce the need for buses.                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| P3. Improving Airport access                          | There were 12,450 responses to this project.  
41% stated that this project was very important  
33% stated it was moderately important  
25% stated it was less important.  
920 feedback points with the key themes being:  
• 280 commented that connecting to the existing rail network would be a cheaper option and would better serve commuters  
• 150 stated that they did not support the proposal for light rail to the airport  
• 130 expressed support for light rail to the airport, including 60 who thought that the project should be extended to include access from across the city  
• 50 did not think that light rail from to the airport was a priority  
• 50 stated that the route to the airport should be re-designed.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| P4. AMETI Eastern Busway                              | There were 11,998 responses to this project.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
## Summary of written feedback on transport projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23% stated that this project was very important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34% stated it was moderately important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43% stated it was less important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 feedback points with the key themes being:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 7 stated that this facility needed to be redesigned to service a larger area and with growth in mind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3 suggested that a cycleway should be incorporated into the busway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5. Park and Rides</td>
<td>There were 11,998 responses to this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46% stated that this project was very important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32% stated it was moderately important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22% stated it was less important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430 feedback points with the key themes being:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 190 noted that there was insufficient parking at park and ride stations such as Albany (39), Silverdale (34), Papakura (18) Panmure (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 65 commented that multi-storied parking buildings would provide additional parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 15 stated that parking was a priority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6. Electric trains and stabling</td>
<td>There were 11,998 responses to this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44% stated that this project was very important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% stated it was moderately important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26% stated it was less important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 feedback points with the key themes being:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 30 stated that train services should be extended to their areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 20 stated that improved train services and increased frequency would encourage more use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 13 did not support provision of light rail services however, light rail was supported by 12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7. Downtown Ferry Redevelopment</td>
<td>There were 12,334 responses to this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% stated that this project was very important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36% stated it was moderately important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43% stated it was less important.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 feedback points with the key themes being:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 15 agreed that ferry services needed to be extended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8. Road Safety</td>
<td>There were 12,378 responses to this project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of written feedback on transport projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P9. Active transport</strong></td>
<td>There were 12,433 responses to this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56% stated that this project was very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% stated it was moderately important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14% stated it was less important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>195 feedback points with the key themes being:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 20 commented that walking and cycling needed to be safer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 4 stated that imposing fines would improve road safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 5 noted that driver education would improve safety for cyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40% stated that this project was very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34% stated it was moderately important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26% stated it was less important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>690 feedback points with the key themes being:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 250 expressed general support for projects to increase opportunities for active transport noting:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o that cycleways separated from roads are preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o active transport initiatives are a priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o linking cycleways to trains would encourage cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 170 did not support the provision of more cycleways as they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o are not well used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o are used for recreation purposes rather than by commuters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o reduce the space available for car use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 60 commented that walking and cycling should be made safer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 30 called for cycleways which are separated from road users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 15 commented that some existing cycleways have been poorly designed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P10. Penlink</strong></td>
<td>There were 12,017 responses to this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18% stated that this project was very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32% stated it was moderately important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% stated it was less important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>277 feedback points with the key themes being:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 60 stated that this project is a priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 25 commented that the road should have two lanes in each direction (four lanes in total) to allow for growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 20 stated that the link was not needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 10 noted that the road should not be a toll road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of written feedback on transport projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>P11. Mill Road corridor</strong></td>
<td>There were 12,002 responses to this project. 17% stated that this project was very important 33% stated it was moderately important 50% stated it was less important. 126 feedback points with the key themes being: 30 stated that this project is a priority 15 commented that the road is not required or would not ease congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P12. Road corridor improvements</strong></td>
<td>There were 12,094 responses to this project. 28% stated that this project was very important 43% stated it was moderately important 30% stated it was less important. 2,340 feedback points with the key themes being: 2,040 expressed support for prioritising the upgrade and realignment of Glenvar Road 65 commented that the Matakana Link road was a priority 50 stated that Lake Road improvements were a priority. These responses included 1,996 pro forma submissions on Glenvar Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P13. Network Capacity and Performance Improvements</strong></td>
<td>There were 12,169 responses to this project. 46% stated that this project was very important 37% stated it was moderately important 16% stated it was less important. 330 feedback points with the key themes being: 10 suggested that there should be toll roads 10 commented that motorway lanes should be increased 5 noted that traffic lights on motorway on ramps caused congestion in the surrounding areas 5 commented that developers should pay for transport infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P14. Growth related transport infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>There were 12,370 responses to this project. 53% stated that this project was very important 31% stated it was moderately important 16% stated it was less important.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of written feedback on transport projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>665 feedback points with the key themes being:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 80 commented that transport infrastructure in their area needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improvement, particularly in the north and west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 77 suggested planning to be in place to ensure that infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o can cope with growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o is in place before new developments are built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 50 stated that developers should pay for new services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 10 noted that transport infrastructure should be at the same levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>across the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 10 commented that infrastructure in growth areas should be given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>220 commented on the need for a second harbour crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 noted the transport challenges for those with mobility issues such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o uneven footpaths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o long distances from bus stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o difficulties of travelling on buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 40 requested an increase in road sealing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback received through Have Your Say and community events

1,750 people gave 25 feedback points on the projects through Have Your Say events.
Comments include:

## Summary of Have Your Say feedback on transport projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3 Improve airport access</td>
<td>Connecting to the existing rail network would be a cheaper option and would better serve commuters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6 Electric trains and stabling</td>
<td>Extending train services rather than light rail, will provide a user friendly rapid transit network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9 Active transport</td>
<td>Walking and cycling need to be safer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10 Penlink</td>
<td>Planning for growth by extending bus lanes and preparing for light rail was important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12 Road Corridor improvements</td>
<td>Roading from the South Western Motorway to east Auckland should also be prioritised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments</td>
<td>Bus services would be improved by provision of feeder services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Digital feedback received

20 feedback points were received via social media. 8 comments were in support of a train service to the airport.

### Māori feedback

Feedback from Maori respondents were similar to that of all responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Name</th>
<th>Responses from Maori</th>
<th>All responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Very important Rank</td>
<td>% Very important Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8 Road safety</td>
<td>60% 1</td>
<td>55% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14 Growth related transport infrastructure</td>
<td>54% 2</td>
<td>54% 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 Bus priority improvements</td>
<td>48% 3</td>
<td>49% 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5 Park and Rides</td>
<td>47% 4</td>
<td>47% 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13 Network Capacity and Performance</td>
<td>45% 5</td>
<td>47% 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 Improving Airport access</td>
<td>45% 6</td>
<td>42% 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6 Electric trains and stabling</td>
<td>43% 7</td>
<td>44% 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9 Active transport</td>
<td>39% 8</td>
<td>39% 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12 Road corridor improvements</td>
<td>31% 9</td>
<td>27% 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 City Centre bus infrastructure</td>
<td>29% 10</td>
<td>27% 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11 Mill Road Corridor</td>
<td>22% 11</td>
<td>17% 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7 Downtown ferry redevelopment</td>
<td>22% 12</td>
<td>20% 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 AMETI Eastern Busway</td>
<td>21% 13</td>
<td>22% 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10 Penlink</td>
<td>17% 14</td>
<td>18% 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Mana whenua feedback**

16 iwi authorities submitted to the consultation on the proposal for a regional fuel tax consultation, five provided specific feedback on the proposed projects. Five iwi authorities did not provide a submission to this consultation. They were Ngāti Māru Rūnanga Trust; Ngāti Paoa Iwi Trust; Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara; Te Patukirikiri Incorporated and Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua.

Not all submitters elected to attribute importance to transport projects, though all provided a view regarding issues and needs. The table below shows the iwi who identified each of the transport projects as very important. Note that some projects were not ranked as very important by iwi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| P1. Bus Priority Improvements | • Ngāti Tamaoho Settlement Trust  
• Te Uri o Hau Settlement Trust  
• Ngai Tai ki Tāmaki Settlement Trust  
• Ngātiwai Trust Board  
• Te Ara Rangatū o te iwi o Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua |
| P2. City Centre Bus infrastructure | • Ngātiwai Trust Board  
• Te Ara Rangatū o te iwi o Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua |
| P4. AMETI Eastern Busway      | • Ngai Tai ki Tāmaki Settlement Trust  
• Te Ara Rangatū o te iwi o Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua |
| P5. Park and Rides             | • Ngāti Tamaoho Settlement Trust  
• Te Uri o Hau Settlement Trust  
• Te Ara Rangatū o te iwi o Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua |
| P6. Electric trains and stabilising | • Ngātiwai Trust Board |
| P7. Downtown Ferry Redevelopment | • Ngai Tai ki Tāmaki Settlement Trust  
• Ngātiwai Trust Board |
| P8. Road Safety                | • Ngāti Tamaoho Settlement Trust  
• Te Uri o Hau Settlement Trust  
• Ngai Tai ki Tāmaki Settlement Trust  
• Ngātiwai Trust Board  
• Te Ara Rangatū o te iwi o Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua |
| P9. Active transport           | • Ngātiwai Trust Board |
| P11. Mill Road corridor        | • Ngāti Tamaoho Settlement Trust  
• Ngai Tai ki Tāmaki Settlement Trust  
• Te Ara Rangatū o te iwi o Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua  
• Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated |
Mana whenua feedback on transport projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P12. Road corridor improvements</td>
<td>• Te Ara Rangatū o te īwi o Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| P14. Growth related transport infrastructure | • Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki Settlement Trust  
• Ngātiwai Trust Board  
• Te Ara Rangatū o te īwi o Ngāti Te Ata Waiohua |

Comments from īwi included:

- there should be signage to direct traffic away from SH1 towards alternative routes
- public transport between Te Hana and Warkworth to Auckland is needed
- Te Uri o Hau suggest that a park and ride facility for Te Hana may be possible by using Te Uri o Hau land
- there is support for the development of sustainable environmental infrastructure such as electric buses.

Stakeholder feedback

Submissions on the introduction of a regional fuel tax were received from approximately 21 stakeholders. The stakeholders represented organisations across all areas, such as business associations across the city, Bike Auckland, Auckland Greypower and New Zealand Automobile Association.

Stakeholder comments include:

- There should be a timeline in place for all critical projects required by 2028.
- A train service to Huapai would be a quick win.
- Parnell Business Association noted that funding will be required for the projects identified in the Parnell local area plan.
- Resolving issues which affect rural residents and heavy transport operators should be a priority due to inadequate alternative options.
- There should be transparent performance management of fuel tax expenditure.
- Generation Zero supports a complete pedestrian overhaul of the city centre, allowing for key public transport routes.
- Public transport infrastructure must be made more practical for the older age group
- Efficient movement within the North Shore and to greater Auckland is a requirement for business growth and investment in the area.

Feedback by local board area

The table below shows the number of written respondents selecting very important for each transport project by local board area. Feedback where the local board area was not stated or was from outside the region has not been included.
The following table shows the project selected as very important by local board area. The highest ranked project is highlighted in green and the lowest ranked is highlighted in amber.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Name</th>
<th>P1 Bus priority improvements</th>
<th>P2 City Centre bus infrastructure</th>
<th>P3 Improving Airport access</th>
<th>P4 AMETI Eastern Eastern</th>
<th>P5 Park and Rides</th>
<th>P6 Electric trains and stabilising</th>
<th>P7 Downtown ferry development</th>
<th>P8 Road safety</th>
<th>P9 Active transport</th>
<th>P10 Penlink</th>
<th>P11 Motorway Improvements</th>
<th>P12 Road corridor improvements</th>
<th>P13 Network Capacity and Performance</th>
<th>P14 Growth related transport infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapitāki</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere-Otahuhu</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Pepatoetoe</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketāpapa</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waheke</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiatarā</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of feedback shows that eight local board areas selected P8 Road safety as very important and five selected P1 Bus priority improvements.
WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED: 17,223

OTHER SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED:
- Feedback received in person: 93 participants across 5 events
- Social media feedback: 231 comments

HOW WE’VE RECEIVED WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSION TYPE</th>
<th>Total #</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>RFT #</th>
<th>RLTP #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online form</td>
<td>6,437</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6,419</td>
<td>6,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Panel online form</td>
<td>5,256</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>5,246</td>
<td>5,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard copy form</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>1,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non form*</td>
<td>4,406</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4,084</td>
<td>2,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17,223</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>16,867</td>
<td>15,276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Feedback received via anything other than a Council form (e.g. letter, email, pro forma)

** Submitters can feed back on both plans

WHO WE’VE HEARD FROM

The information below indicates what demographic categories submitters identified with. This information only relates to those submitters who provided demographic information on a feedback. This number is lower than the number of submissions received as it takes additional time to process this information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6,395</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6,106</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender diverse</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12,598</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Diverse</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–24</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–34</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,739</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–44</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2,392</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–54</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2,92</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–64</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,223</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–74</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12,670</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis conducted by Auckland Insights Team
Citizen Engagement and Insights Unit, Communications and Engagement Department
ETRTHCHT
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Proposal for a Regional Fuel Tax for Auckland

Attachment D

Item 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>9,760</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakeha/NZ European</td>
<td>9,044</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African/Middle Eastern/Latin</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealander/Kiwi</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,463</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not add to 100% due to some people selecting more than one ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENT LOCAL BOARD</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden Local Board</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna Local Board</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Local Board</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier Local Board</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey Local Board</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays Local Board</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick Local Board</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipatiki Local Board</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa Local Board</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakei Local Board</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura Local Board</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketapapa Local Board</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney Local Board</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour Local Board</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke Local Board</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere Ranges Local Board</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere Local Board</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau Local Board</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional (i.e. organisations whose views are not specific to a local area)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Supplied (i.e. local board not supplied and unable to be determined)</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Auckland</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>17,223</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis conducted by Auckland Insights Team
Citizen Engagement and Insights Unit, Communications and Engagement Department

Proposal for a Regional Fuel Tax for Auckland
Q1. Without a Regional Fuel Tax (RFT) the funding available will only cover renewing our existing transport network and the projects we have already committed to, e.g. the City Rail Link. To enable us to deliver projects that improve congestion, public transport and road safety, we recommend an RFT of 10 cents per litre plus GST.

What is your opinion on this proposal?

**WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS**
14,549 responses*

- Support: 42%
- Do not support: 50%
- Other: 7%

**IN-PERSON (ANONYMOUS) SUBMISSIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All formal written responses, including pro forma submissions, i.e. Auckland Ratepayers Alliance (1,751)
Q2. We are proposing the Regional Fuel Tax funds the projects listed below. How important are these projects to you?

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS
12,811 responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Less important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1 Bus priority improvements</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 City Centre bus infrastructure</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 Improving Airport access</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 AMETI Eastern Busway</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5 Park and Rides</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6 Electric trains and stabling</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7 Downtown ferry redevelopment</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8 Road safety</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9 Active transport</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10 Penlink</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11 Mill Road Corridor</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12 Road corridor improvements</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13 Network Capacity and Performance</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14 Growth related transport infrastructure</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis conducted by Auckland Insights Team
Citizen Engagement and Insights Unit, Communications and Engagement Department
SOCIAL MEDIA FEEDBACK

Social media was used to raise awareness of the consultation, but people were encouraged to give feedback using #akhaveyoursay on the Auckland Council Twitter and Facebook pages. Social media is used as an informal submission tool and we are unable to capture geographic or demographic information of submitters. As such, people were directed to the AK Have Your Say website for more information on the consultation and to give feedback via the formal channel, i.e. the official feedback form.

In addition, six polls were posted on Facebook for one week.

The following table indicates the reactions to the Facebook poll posts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Total Reactions</th>
<th>Love</th>
<th>Like</th>
<th>Angry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1. Do you agree with a regional fuel tax to improve our transport network?</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2. Congestion is costing us an estimated $2 billion a year. Do we need to invest more to fix it?</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3. Are you affected by Auckland’s congestion?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4. Would you cycle if you felt it was safer?</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5. Have you taken a bus train or ferry in the last month?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6. Do you use T2 or T3 lanes?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table indicates how people voted on the Facebook polls:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poll Question</th>
<th>Total Votes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1. Do you agree with a regional fuel tax to improve our transport network?</td>
<td>10.6k</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2. Congestion is costing us an estimated $2 billion a year. Do we need to invest more to fix it?</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3. Are you affected by Auckland’s congestion?</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4. Would you cycle if you felt it was safer?</td>
<td>1.4k</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5. Have you taken a bus train or ferry in the last month?</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6. Do you use T2 or T3 lanes?</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

184 other comments were provided via social media – 30% supported the proposed Regional Fuel Tax and 59% did not support it.
Local board resolutions on the RLTP, RFT and DC policy

Albert Eden

11 Local board decisions and input into the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, draft Auckland Plan 2050 and draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018

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

f) Provides the following feedback on the 10-year Budget 2018-2028:
   i. Supports the proposal of setting a regional fuel tax of 10 cents per litre with the expectation that additional funding raised will be used towards public transport and active transport, noting that the feedback received from the Albert-Eden community was 65 per cent were fully in support of this proposal.

CARRIED

13 Draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and draft Contributions Policy

Resolution number AE/2018/1

MOVED by Chairperson P Haynes, seconded by Member G Easte:

That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

a) Notes the unacceptable process that has required the local board to provide feedback on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and draft Contributions Policy whilst consultation is still underway and without knowing the views of the local community.

b) Provides the following feedback on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan:
   i. Supports the transformational change outlined in the draft proposal to provide people with easier, safer and wider transport choices and prevent Auckland’s severe traffic congestion worsening.
   ii. Supports the challenges identified in the draft proposal and notes the alignment of the challenges with key themes in the Albert-Eden Local Board Plan 2017 Outcome 5: Travelling around Albert-Eden is safe and easy.
   iii. Supports the aim to reduce single occupancy vehicle use by substantial improvements to public transport and incentivising and developing car-share modes.
   iv. Supports the increased focus on safety in the draft proposal.
   v. Requests the target for prevention of serious injury and death be improved to support the Vision Zero target of zero significant harm from transport-related injury in Auckland.
   vi. Supports the increased funding for local board initiatives, noting that this funding allows local boards to exercise their placemaking role and allows greater control over local transport initiatives which meet local needs.
   vii. Supports the following New Zealand Transport Agency Investment...
Programme projects, rapid transit initiatives identified in Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP) 2018:

i. Development of light rail along Dominion Road

ii. Development of light rail in the northwestern corridor, as it addresses reliance on private vehicles on state highway 16, current congestion and future growth planned for Pt Chevalier and the former Unitec site.

viii. Supports the addition of more electric trains and extensions to the electrified network.

ix. Supports the focus on reducing environmental impacts, particularly the rollout of light-emitting diodes (LED) street lighting to reduce energy use, installation of catchpit pollutant traps to protect from road stormwater discharge, street cleaning, inclusion of water sensitive design as part of infrastructure development and facilitating the uptake of electric vehicles in the public and private sectors.

x. Supports the funded project Carrington Road improvements, noting that the adjacent Crown-led development is expected to provide up to 4,000 new homes, rather than the 1,400 new homes as reported in the draft proposal.

xi. Supports the first tranche of grade separation of railway level crossing.

xii. Requests that the funding for grade separation be retained within the KiwiRail programme and that KiwiRail engage with affected local boards on the implementation of this funding so that local boards are able to undertake their placemaking role.

xiii. Requests that new projects be able to be completed under the Urban Cycleways programme, noting that only current projects within this programme are scheduled to be completed.

xiv. Requests funding be allocated under the Auckland Transport Capital programme Local Board Projects category to a new East-West cycleway from St Lukes to Greenlane, noting the Albert-Eden Local Board consulted on this project as part of the 10-year Budget 2018-2028/Local Board Agreement 2018/2019 consultation process and received 1,113 responses, of which were 65 per cent in support for the project.

xv. Requests funding be allocated under the Auckland Transport Capital programme Local Board Projects category to a new shared path to run beside the southern train line, similar to the planned New Lynn to Avondale shared path.

xvi. Requests funding be allocated under the Auckland Transport Capital programme Local Board Projects category to a new coastal boardwalk in Waterview, to improve connections between the North-Western Cycleway, central Auckland suburbs and the Avondale area, especially given the major investment in a shared path that brings people to Heron Park.

xvii. Requests funding be allocated under the Auckland Transport Capital programme Local Board Projects category to construct cycling feeder routes to the western train line train stations, so that this service can be of use to more people.

xviii. Requests funding be allocated under the Auckland Transport Capital
programme Local Board Projects category to a Balmoral Road bus to bus connection to improve passenger interchange from bus to bus adjacent to Potters Park, Balmoral, in line with the central isthmus network.

xix. Notes that all new major urban developments should have a transport assessment that clearly outlines how people and goods are to be moved in and around that site, from a sustainable, multi-modal perspective.

xx. Requests greater consideration is given to off-peak use of the public transport network operation, noting that 76% of people utilise public transport during off-peak times.

xxi. Requests the following currently unfunded projects be funded:
   I. Dominion Road bus lane improvements.
   II. St Lukes Road bus to bus connection.
   III. Infrastructure supporting development in St Lukes mall.

xxii. Requests land acquisition and construction of a shared path to complete the alternative cycling route west of Dominion Road.

c) Provides the following feedback on the draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal:
   i. Supports the transformational change outlined in the draft proposal to prevent Auckland’s severe traffic congestion worsening, and provide people with easier, safer and wider transport choices.
   ii. Notes the need for additional funding to be raised through a regional fuel tax in order to implement the suite of projects in the transport programme.
   iii. Supports bus priority improvements.
   iv. Supports improving access to Auckland Airport.
   v. Supports electric trains and stabling.
   vi. Supports the road safety programme.
   vii. Supports the active transport walking and cycling programme, noting the central isthmus and Sandringham are within the Albert-Eden Local Board area.
   viii. Supports the network capacity and performance improvements.

d) Provides the following feedback on the draft Contributions Policy:
   i. Supports the proposed increase in the average urban development contributions to $27,000 to enable the investment in community infrastructure and parks that support housing development.
   ii. Opposes the proposed amendment to the development types of ‘student accommodation’ as it does not reflect the demand students place on infrastructure.
   iii. Supports adjusting the payment timing for residential developments to support residential developers by better aligning the requirement to pay development contributions with their cashflows.
Devonport-Takapuna

11 Local board decisions and input into the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, draft Auckland Plan 2050 and draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018

Resolution number DT/2018/2

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson G Wood, seconded by Member J McKenzie:

That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

e) provides the following feedback, on the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 regional topics, based on comments and feedback received by the community during consultation:

   ii. supports the proposed regional fuel tax of 11.5 cents per litre (incl GST) be used to raise more funding for transport projects and services;

CARRIED
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Tristan Coulson, Senior Local Board Advisor was in attendance to address the board in support of this item.

A copy of the tabled Colmar Brunton survey results on the 10-year budget research has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Resolution number DT/2018/70

MOVED by Chairperson G Wood, seconded by Member M Cohen:

That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

a) provides the following feedback on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan:

   i. supports the overarching purpose and objectives of the 2018 – 2028 Regional Land Transport Plan.

   ii. supports the four strategic priorities (Safety, Access, Environment and Value for Money) and their associated objectives to guide transport investment for the next ten years.

   iii. supports Lake Road corridor improvements as a funded project in the Regional Land Transport Plan’s capital programme.

   iv. supports the Lake Road corridor improvements project being funded by the proposed regional fuel tax.

   v. recommends that that the Lake Road corridor improvements project be funded within the first three years of the capital programme, due to:

      - major planning processes (i.e. corridor management plan, indicative business case and detailed business case) have been completed, or are nearing completion

      - addressing congestion issues on Lake Road remains the number one issue for the community.

   vi. recommends that the Bayswater Ferry Terminal upgrade be included in the funded 2018 - 2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, due to:

      - the ferry terminal and associated services is linked to improving congestion issues on Lake Road

      - planning to upgrade the park-and-ride facility at the ferry terminal
is underway.

vii. supports the Devonport Ferry Terminal upgrade being a funded project in the 2018 – 2028 Regional Land Transport Plan.

viii. supports the Takapuna Bus Interchange Improvements being a funded project in the 2018 – 2028 Regional Land Transport Plan.

ix. supports as part of the NZTA Investment Programme:
   • both the Seapath and Skypath projects
   • route protection and future proofing activities for a new integrated transport system crossing of the Waitemata Harbour.

x. supports all measures to create and deliver an integrated public transport system.

xi. supports all measures to implement an integrated ticketing and affordable pricing structure.

xii. supports the redevelopment and construction of the Downtown Ferry Terminal upgrade.

xiii. supports the development of the Ferry Strategy and recommends it be included as a funded project in the 2018 – 2028 Regional Land Transport Plan.

xiv. notes that matters such as ferry design and accessibility should be incorporated into future Ferry Strategy for Auckland, and requests a workshop to discuss this further.

xv. recognizes the importance of the provision of convenient short-term and long-term parking to enhance the economic viability and accessibility of town centres.

xvi. supports the City Centre Bus Infrastructure project and requests that any infrastructure development cater to the needs of Auckland Civic Theatre, University of Auckland and Auckland University of Technology.

xvii. does not support the ‘Upper Shoal Bay bridge’ component of the infrastructure supporting development in the Takapuna centre project.

b) provides the following feedback on the draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal:

i. restates resolution number DT/2018/59 e) ii) passed at its 8 May 2018 extraordinary business meeting as follows: “supports the proposed regional fuel tax of 11.5 cents per litre (incl GST) be used to raise more funding for transport projects and services.”

ii. receives the tabled Colmar Brunton survey results on the 10-year budget research and notes that 56 per cent of survey participants in the Devonport-Takapuna local board area are supportive of the regional fuel tax.

c) provides the following feedback on the draft Contributions Policy:

i. recommends that the policy focus on ensuring the contributions have a greater relationship on where they are collected and spent.

ii. recommends that the policy has an increased focus on sub-regional catchment and brownfield areas.

CARRIED

Attachments

A Colmar Brunton 10-year budget research
Franklin
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Resolution number FR/2018/55
MOVED by Member A Cole, seconded by Chairperson A Fulljames:
That the Franklin Local Board:

10-year Budget 2018-2028
a) supports the proposals in the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, subject to the following feedback:
   i) the regional fuel tax should be an interim measure, to be replaced by a more
equitable user pays mechanism, and support part of the funding received
from the fuel tax being used to initiate the infrastructure for a congestion
charging/road tolling network;
   ii) there should be a clear commitment to deliver transport projects that will
address the needs of all those contributing to the regional fuel tax fund,
particularly resolving issues which affect rural residents and heavy
transport operators;

CARRIED

15 Draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and
draft Contributions Policy
Resolution number FR/2018/58
MOVED by Deputy Chairperson A Baker, seconded by Member A Hopkins:

a) That the Franklin Local Board supports in principle the proposals in the draft
2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal
and the draft Contributions Policy, subject to the following feedback:

Draft Regional Land Transport Plan
   i) Franklin roads should be fit for purpose and designed to accommodate
existing and planned growth;
   ii) safety is the paramount consideration and the critical areas of focus are
intersections, bridges, lighting and surface treatments;
   iii) public transport improvements should be prioritised and should be
programmed for the 2018-2023 period, not pushed out until the later part of
the decade. This includes funded stations and park and ride facilities at
Paerata and Drury;
   iv) priority be given to electrification to Tuakau;
   v) to address the impact of congestion arising from greenfield development
and improve network capacity, specific projects to be accelerated should
include Mill Road phase 2, SH20/20B extension to link Auckland airport to
the southern growth area, and Pukekohe outer freight road.
Draft Regional Fuel Tax

vi) there should be a clear commitment to deliver transport projects that will address the needs of all those contributing to the regional fuel tax fund, particularly resolving issues which affect rural residents and heavy transport operators;

Draft Contributions Policy

vii) a targeted rate should be used in greenfield development areas to contribute to the development of facilities, combined with small increase in development contributions;
   i) as council can borrow against targeted rates, this is the preferred option for ensuring that community facilities are funded through development and will ensure that those most benefitting from new facilities contribute to funding them;
   ii) as some small greenfield development areas are not currently forecast to receive additional services, the development contributions paid are unlikely to benefit the local community or new residents, so levying the same charge as for other greenfield areas would be inequitable;

b) approves the tabled attached document entitled “Franklin Local Board Position Statements on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal and the draft Contributions Policy” as its full formal feedback on these matters.

CARRIED
### Franklin Local Board Position statements on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, the draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and the draft Contributions Policy

The following summarises Franklin Local Board feedback on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal and the draft Contributions Policy. The Franklin Local Board notes that transport and development present the greatest challenges to the Franklin Local Board area and its communities and the priority for Franklin communities over and above all else. To that end, the Board have provided the below detailed feedback to be read and understood in conjunction with the formal resolution of support in principle.

#### Plan/Policy Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Regional Land Transport Plan</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport Challenges</td>
<td>The Franklin Local Board agrees that the challenges identified within the draft Regional Land Transport Plan are priorities, however provides the following feedback based on Franklin Local Board Plan outcome 2: A thriving local economy, outcome 3: An improved transport system and outcome 4: Growth is dealt with effectively. Feedback is also based on an overwhelming message from Franklin communities through the 30 Year budget public consultation for Auckland that Transport options, services and congestion are the priority (over and above all other priorities) for Franklin communities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Freight movement must be recognised as a priority with targeted funding attached and should be reflected in the prioritisation and funding of projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Recognise unique requirements of the rural urban interface through planning that anticipates an environment that must accommodate freight, pedestrians/active transport and public transport and either build roads and roading systems that can accommodate all and/or invest in options to separate e.g. the Pukekohe Outer Freeway Route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Impact of growth forecasting does not adequately reflect the current state of congestion in Franklin and therefore timing of measures to address is grossly inadequate. For example, Beachlands and Maraetai existing and anticipated developments are not referenced in the document and current congestion on Linwood Rd and SH22 approach to motorway not identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Impact of growth forecasting does not align with other growth projections (e.g. Watercare) meaning the level of investment across all issues for the area is insufficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. There is an imbalance of investment and focus between those areas with existing transport choices and those areas without options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi. Inclusion of local and feeder roads within Franklin that currently experience Greenfields generated congestion to improve safety and capacity (e.g. Linwood Road, Hingaia Rd, Whittford Road).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vii. Congestion Pricing Infrastructure (Page 68), tolling and other alternative revenue gathering initiatives should be actively pursued as a project to be funded from the Regional Fuel Tax.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Regional Land Transport Plan</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects - Funded</td>
<td>The Franklin Local Board strongly advocates for the inclusion of the following projects/initiatives (listed by suggested outcome area/budget category) in the Auckland Transport Proposed Funded Capital Programme:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome area</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-going operational programmes</td>
<td>Funded projects should include local and feeder roads within Franklin that currently experience Greenfields generated congestion to improve safety and capacity, specifically:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements complementing developments</td>
<td>i. Linwood Road, Karaka - to feature freight/bus priority lanes and dedicated/separated cycle lanes to connect Greenfields developments to PT hubs and the motorway network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT safety, security and amenity</td>
<td>ii. Whittford Road, Whittford - to cater to development in Beachlands and Maraetai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Hingaia Rd stage 2 (including signalisation of Oakland Rd). This should be brought forward to respond to the impact of greenfields developments in Pukekohe, Glenbrook, Patumahoe, Drury West, Karaka, Clarks Beach, Waiau Pa and Kingsseat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Mill Road southern (Stage 2) on the basis that this section of the road can be funded from a toll (as a new road) and that stage 1 alone will not relieve existing and anticipated Greenfields development congestion (e.g. Papakura, Clevedon, Drury West and East).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. New Pine Harbour Ferry Terminal in response to growth constraints within the current Marina location to support development in Beachlands, Maraetai and Clevedon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Transport</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Franklin Local Board support enhanced public transport provisions for Franklin area with the following additions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Ensure that new stations at Drury, Drury West and Paerata are included within the scope of the electrification project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Ensure Drury (Drury as a priority) &amp; Paerata include park and ride facilities that anticipate growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. The board supports network capacity and performance improvements and suggests priorities are connections from the south to the airport and on priority lanes connecting freight and buses to train stations and on connecting bus services to Pine Harbour ferry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Should include implementation and operations of new bus routes from Waikato, through Clarks Beach to the Papakura Train Station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. Address safety of Pukekohe Station environment (e.g. pedestrian safety on Station Road and between Station, Stadium and Manukau Roads to King Street by supporting the intersection enhancements and park and ride improvement projects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi. Extension of Sunlink Bay Road should be prioritised to enable extended bus services for the growing Beachlands Maraetai communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental projects – Street lighting improvements</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Franklin Local board supports improved street lighting noting the following funding requirements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Streetlighting improvements for Beachlands and Maraetai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Rural intersection (flag) lighting to enhance safety.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Franklin Local Board Position statements on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, the draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and the draft Contributions Policy

The following summarises Franklin Local Board feedback on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal and the draft Contributions Policy 2018.

The Franklin Local Board notes that transport and development present the greatest challenges to the Franklin Local Board area and its communities and the priority for Franklin communities over and above all else.

To that end, the Board have provided the below detailed feedback to be read and understood in conjunction with the formal resolution of support in principle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan/Policy</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety-related projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Franklin Local Board support all safety related projects with the following caveats:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i. Funding for rural road safety programmes should be commensurate with the overall number of deaths and serious crashes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Greater use of high grip chip on roads with a high crash history is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Greater capacity to review and implement speed limit reduction requests is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Whitford Road safety improvements should be prioritised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. That the following safety improvements projects should be funded either wholly or in part through this fund, noting that these may also have outcomes that align with other funded project outcomes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Intersection improvements at;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Queen St/Constable Street, Waiuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waiuku Rd/Stuart Rd, Pukekohe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harrissville/Mill Road, Pukekohe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stadium Road/Manukau Road, Pukekohe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stadium Road/East Street, Pukekohe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jack Lauchlan/Whitford-Maraetai Rd, Beachlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clifton Road/Whitford-Maraetai Road, Beachlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Road, Clevedon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greights/Tourist Road, Clevedon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SH3/Mill Road, Bombay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Bridge improvements to make fit for purpose at;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Kimpsons Bridge, (Brookby Rd), Brookby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ryburns Bridge, (West Rd), Clevedon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• McNicol Rd, Clevedon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Norrie Road Bridge, Drury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hingaia bridge, Papakura (to allow for priority lanes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Flag Lighting at rural intersections within the rural road safety programme (page 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. fit for purpose surface treatments from the rural road safety programme (page 64) as a priority over signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Capacity and Performance Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Board notes that capacity improvements should include feeder road projects (e.g. Hingaia Road stage 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Growth related transport infrastructure projects must be brought forward to respond to growth-related infrastructure demands already being experienced as a result of growth (i.e. this cannot wait for the second half of the decade).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prioritise SH20 and SH108 Southern and Eastern Airport Access over light rail from the city centre noting that this is required to address the impact of green-fields development-generated congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Unfunded</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Franklin Local Board strongly supports the addition of the following projects within the unfunded projects list:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i. Whitford-Maraetai Road has met the threshold for a Whitford-road bypass threshold (MCCL). Should be revisited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Planning and investigation of extension of SH20 from Roscomorn Road to potentially Pokeno including connection to the Southwest (Karaka) to create greater access to airport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Create a specific budget to support movement of freight from source to distribution centres and to help prioritise projects with this outcome (e.g. Pukekohe Outer Ring Freight Route (page 70), priority lanes for heavy vehicles, buses etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTA investment programme</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Franklin Local Board strongly advocates for the following changes to initiatives listed within Appendix 2– New Zealand Transport Agency Investment Programme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i. SH20 from Roscomorn Rd that extends and creates connection to the South-west SH20 and SH208 Southern and Eastern Airport Access absolute critical.Alongside Puhinui Transport Hub upgrade. Short and medium-term Airport access. Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Supports Papakura to Drury as stage one and SH1 Papakura to Bombay project as it stands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Comment on City to airport light rail not as high a priority. Not a need to have. Connect to south more important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Active transport in the South needs to be incorporated in all southern/Franklin NZTA projects (e.g. SH1 Papakura – Drury).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Franklin Local Board Position statements on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, the draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and the draft Contributions Policy

The following summarises Franklin Local Board feedback on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal and the draft Contributions Policy 2018. The Franklin Local Board notes that transport and development present the greatest challenges to the Franklin Local Board area and its communities and the priority for Franklin communities over and above all else. To that end, the Board have provided the below detailed feedback to be read and understood in conjunction with the formal resolution of support in principle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan/Policy</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiwirail Capital Programme</td>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Draft the Franklin Local Board strongly advocates for the following changes to initiatives listed within Appendix 3 – Kiwirail Capital Programme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Restore and/or reposition the historic Pukekohe rail station building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Future proof for the extension of commuter services into the Waikato prioritising electrification to Tuakau as stage 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Funding of the 3rd track Westfield and Wiri and extend to Pukekohe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Fuel Tax Draft Proposal</td>
<td>Opinion of this proposal</td>
<td>Based on alignment with Franklin Local Board Plan “outcome 3: An improved Transport system”, and in the absence of any other viable option from progressing transport improvements, the Franklin Local Board support a Fuel Tax at the level of (10c plus GST) to improve congestion, public transport and road safety with the following caveats:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Fuel Tax should also fund development of an alternative revenue stream (e.g. a congestion charge).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>The regional fuel tax is an interim measure to be replaced as soon as possible by a more equitable user pays mechanism, such as congestion charging, and the funding should be used in part to enable development of the infrastructure for a future user pays mechanism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>The regional fuel tax should in part be used for projects that demonstrate an immediate benefit to those who and contribute the most (rural areas and heavy transport operators) due to inadequate and alternative options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Projects and initiatives funded from the Regional Fuel Tax should consider the issues faced by emerging urban areas/population nodes on Auckland extremities i.e. Franklin and Rodney as a priority, addressing the imbalance between transport development in urban areas already enjoying multiple transport options and those emerging areas that have and will continue to experience significant growth and congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Fuel Tax Projects</td>
<td>The regional fuel tax should in part be used for projects that demonstrate an immediate benefit to those who and contribute the most (rural areas and heavy transport operators) due to inadequate and alternative options. The Franklin Local Board specifically supports the following types of projects for Franklin:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Bus priority improvements, specifically providing enhanced bus services from developing communities (e.g. Beachlands, Pukekohe, Clarks Beach and Drury) and communities without alternative and from transport nodes i.e. Train Stations at Papakura, Pukekohe and ferries at Pine Harbour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Improved access to the airport, particularly for freight and public transport, noting that this should be prioritised over light rail from the city centre (where alternative transport options already exist). The bus/rail interchange at Puhinui is strongly supported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Park and ride facilities are supported, noting that these must be implemented as part of the Pukekohe electrification project and anticipate significant growth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Electrification to Pukekohe is strongly supported as a priority and must be complimented by development of fit for purpose park and ride facilities, connect with public transport feeders (i.e. buses) and additional stations at Drury and P aerata. The board encourages Auckland Transport to fully placemaking obligations by enabling the treatment of stations facilities to reflect local character and heritage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Road safety projects are supported, noting that additional capacity within Auckland Transport is required to respond to requests for lower speed limits and that alternative effective safety treatments should be funded for rural roads i.e. surfacing treatments rather than just signs and that flag-lighting at rural intersections is desirable. Pedestrian safety initiatives around public transport nodes should also be considered and implemented as part of these projects (e.g. Pukekohe Station). Safety projects should also include improved intersection improvements and bridge improvements (see RLTP projects above).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Active transport options for Franklin area supported, particularly on feeder roads that connect to public transport nodes (i.e. train stations at Pukekohe and Papakura and Pine Harbour ferry terminal). Note that the active transport facilities must recognise that roads are heavily used by freight in some areas and should offer sufficient safety to underpin use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>Mill Road Corridor is a supported project however notes that both stages of the project should be advanced if this project is to cater for greenfield development (noting that greenfield-rated congestion is generated well south of Alfriston) and suggests costs of this section could be funded via toll.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii.</td>
<td>The board supports network capacity and performance improvements and suggests priorities are connections from the south to the airport and on priority lanes connecting freight and buses to train stations and on connecting bus services to Pine Harbour ferry. The Board notes that capacity improvements should include feeder road projects e.g. Hinuera Road stage 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix.</td>
<td>Growth related transport infrastructure projects must be brought forward to respond to growth-related infrastructure demands already being experienced as a result of growth (i.e. this cannot wait for the second half of the decade).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft (Development)</td>
<td>The Franklin Local Board wishes to provide the following feedback on the draft Contributions Policy:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Franklin Local Board Position statements on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, the draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and the draft Contributions Policy

The following summarises Franklin Local Board feedback on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal and the draft Contributions Policy 2018. The Franklin Local Board notes that transport and development present the greatest challenges to the Franklin Local Board area and its communities and the priority for Franklin communities over and above all else. To that end, the Board have provided the below detailed feedback to be read and understood in conjunction with the formal resolution of support in principle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan/Policy</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributions Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>i. The local board questions the statement that developers receive the greatest benefit from development of parks and community facilities – it is the community that benefits from facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. The local board believes the proposed policy undermines affordable housing (i.e. house prices will increase as costs are passed on to the buyer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Suggest that a targeted rate should be used in greenfield development areas to contribute to the development of facilities, combined with small increase in development contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Notes that Council is unable to borrow against development contributions but can borrow against targeted rates, so this may be a better option for both ensuring community facilities are funded through development and ensuring that those most benefiting from facilities fund and receive benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. Note that some small greenfield development areas are not forecast to get any additional services (e.g. Awhitu), therefore the development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Great Barrier
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Resolution number GBI/2018/43

MOVED by Chairperson I Fordham, seconded by Deputy Chairperson L Coles:

That the Great Barrier Local Board:

a) provide the following feedback on the 10-year Budget 2018-2028:
   1. Seek exemption for Aotea Great Barrier Island from the Regional Fuel Tax of 10 cents per litre (plus GST) due to the following reasons:
      a. Aotea Great Barrier is a remote island with approximately 900 residents, 90kms from Auckland, accessible only by plane and boat and has no public transport. The residents, business and visitors on the island rely solely on private transportation.
      b. Fuel prices are already highest in New Zealand at $3.11 per litre and the lowest socio-economic sector in the Auckland region.
      c. Aotea Great Barrier is off the grid and does not have reticulated power and water. Many houses use diesel and petrol generators as both the sole energy source and back up to alternate systems.
      d. Aotea Great Barrier has a number of houses that are only accessible by boat, with no other means of transport.

   CARRIED

13 Draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and draft Contributions Policy

Resolution number GBI/2018/39

MOVED by Chairperson I Fordham, seconded by Deputy Chairperson L Coles:

That the Great Barrier Local Board:

a) delegate the Chairperson in discussion with other board members to provide its formal written feedback by 14 May 2018 on:
   i. the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP)
   ii. the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal
   iii. the draft Contributions Policy

b) Thank Ben Halliwell - Elected Member Relationship Manager for his presentation and work on the board’s feedback on the RLTP.

CARRIED

Draft Regional Land Transport Plan 2018

That the Great Barrier Local Board:

- Support the Regional Land Transport Plan’s overall vision for an Auckland that is: Accessible; Well connected; Safe and Sustainable.

- Strongly support the additional funding for road seal.
• Seek assurance that the carriageway renewals investment policy will not adversely affect Great Barrier’s road corridor maintenance due to the proposed funding being based upon access and volume in traffic.

• Agree with the statement that Minimizing transport impacts on the environment is critical and strongly support ensuring maintenance and operational practices minimise impacts on the environment, including the minimisation of agri-chemical use and the remediation of culverts for fish passage.

• Strongly support the immediate facilitation for increased uptake of electric vehicles. Auckland council should be leading the way and showcasing best practice for the nation.

• Advocate for a Climate Change Mitigation fund to assist in addressing coastal erosion and extreme weather events. On Great Barrier would like to see the fund assist in the strategic planning for managed retreat for coastal roads and future-proofing for coastal infrastructure.

• Strongly support environmental sustainability research and trial for new practices and technology such as alternative vegetation control, remediation of culverts for fish passage, dust suppression on unsealed roads and electric vehicle infrastructure. This would include adequate resourcing to enable staff to investigate the new technologies and methodologies.

• Advocate for the Environment Sustainability Infrastructure programme to be embedded as a measure across the full transport work programme and not a separate fund.

• Seek assurance that all environment sustainability infrastructure will align with Seachange Tai Timu Tai Pari.

• Support the inclusion of water sensitive design as part of infrastructure development and the board would like to hear further detail about this initiative.

• Support funding for any Department of Conservation roading projects on Great Barrier Island.

• Strong support for the New Footpaths Regional Programme.

• Strongly support investment into the Ferry Strategy as the island is dependent on its wharves for passenger and freight service.

• Seek assurance that the Ferry Strategy will align with Seachange Tai Timu Tai Pari’s blue highway concept.

• Advocate for Great Barrier Island’s ferry service to be brought within the public contract.
• Seek assurance that Great Barrier’s Auckland terminals can continue to be central. The island is dependent on both the airfields and the wharves for transportation:
  o Great Barrier has Auckland Council’s only airfields. We ask that Auckland Transport assist in any advocacy required in keeping the airlines operating out of Mangere airport.
  o Sealink operates the only passenger and freight ferry service to Great Barrier. We request that Auckland Transport assist in any advocacy required in keeping the service operating from the downtown port.

• Advocate for Auckland Transport maintenance contracts to be delivered at a local level and to ensure due diligence, best practice and transparency is attained through any procurement for a fair and equitable process.

• As the island has Dark Sky Sanctuary Accreditation we are asking Auckland Transport to be mindful of street lighting design on the mainland and gulf islands to minimize impact of light pollution in the hope that new lighting designs will be introduced. We can provide further information in due course.

**Draft Regional Fuel Tax 2018**

Great Barrier Local Board supports Auckland Council’s proposal to exclude the island from the Regional Fuel Tax due to the following reasons:

• Aotea Great Barrier is a remote island with approximately 900 residents, 90kms from Auckland, accessible only by plane and boat and has no public transport. The residents, business and visitors on the island rely solely on private transportation.
• Great Barrier is off the grid and does not have reticulated power and water. Many houses use diesel and petrol generators as both the sole energy source and back up to alternate systems.
• Great Barrier has a number of houses that are only accessible by boat, with no other means of transport.
• Fuel prices are already highest in New Zealand at $3.14 per litre and the island is the lowest socio-economic sector in Auckland region.

**Development Contributions Policy**

Great Barrier Local Board provides the following feedback to the Development Contributions Policy:

• Our island relies on a robust resident population as well as tourism – the proposed Development Contributions are prohibitive, out of scale for the island, and will inhibit our growth.

• Great Barrier has no reticulated power, nor water. We have no stormwater system and no public transport. Our community lives entirely off the grid.
The island also has no council owned community halls, community centres or aquatic centres. All community meeting and sports facilities/parks are privately owned with the exception of the golf course which is council owned and leased by a local group.

We are a unique place with a unique situation and few of the fee charges within the Development Contributions Policy relate to Great Barrier.

Building on island has extra demands not associated with urban developments such as Geotech reports for waste; off the grid power systems; lizard reports; travel costs for planners (flights, parking, and time). It is a high cost for building with little infrastructure provided.

Affordable housing is difficult to find on the island and rental accommodation is near impossible. The consenting process, build and development contributions are making new builds prohibitive.

We have a number of properties in multiple ownership eg: Windy Hill; Wairahi; Arohanui; Little Goat; Waterfall Bay which seem unfairly affected with development contributions especially due to the fact most multi-dwelling properties on Great Barrier put in all their own roads, driveways and infrastructure (WWS and power).

We note Rural Islands has been introduced as a new category for the new policy and advocate for a review for the Great Barrier Development Contribution charges.
Henderson-Massey

Resolution number HM/2018/3

MOVED by Chairperson S Henderson, seconded by Member B Brady:

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

h) provides the following feedback on the regional fuel tax proposal in Auckland Council’s 10-year Budget 2018-2028.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CARRIED</th>
<th>Regional Fuel Tax (for 15 May meeting)</th>
<th>The Henderson-Massey Local Board supports implementation of a regional fuel tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

However, the local board notes that the immediate consequences could include:

- A greater cost burden on the local working population who have to commute to other Auckland areas.
- The proposed fuel tax hitting our lower socio-economic communities the hardest and being another barrier to employment and education.
- Given this, measures need to be investigated to reduce these potential impacts on our lower socio-economic communities.

The local board would like to see local prioritisation of public transport and safety projects.

Secretarial note: Member Peter Chan and Member Vanessa Neeson voted against resolution (h) and requested for their vote to be recorded.
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Resolution number HM/2018/70

MOVED by Chairperson S Henderson, seconded by Member B Brady:

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

a) Provide the following feedback on the Draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and draft Contributions Policy:

Key Priority Items

The Henderson-Massey Local Board strongly support light rail to the Northwest and request that this be funded and built immediately.

The Henderson-Massey Local Board consider Te Whau Pathway as a priority, and request that it be planned and funded through this process.

General comments

Commends the team responsible who have developed a robust and future-focused plan with a strategic approach that addresses the challenges of a swiftly growing city.
Strategic approach
Supports the strategic approach and agrees that investment in modes of travel other than roads and single occupant private vehicles is critical.
Considers that the plan is largely successful in aligning delivery to the outcomes in the draft Auckland Plan, the Government Policy Statement and the Auckland Transport Alignment recommendations.
Notes strong alignment of Henderson-Massey Local Board Local Board Plan outcome ‘It is easy to get around without a car’ and the initiatives therein to improve access through walking and cycling links and quality of transport centres.

Safety
Commends the proposal to apply the Vision Zero approach of shifting responsibility for safety from road users to designers and operators.
Supports the Auckland Transport safety related projects in the proposed funded capital programme
Supports the environmental focus projects in the proposed funded capital programme

Environment
Is heartened to see that environmental protection and measures to address climate change through decreasing green-house gas emissions is a feature of the plan.
Encourages reporting and project assessment having increased focus on CO2 emissions.
Suggests Auckland Transport audit and report all future projects against climate change impacts.

Rapid transit general
Supports investment in areas that will enhance access to public transport, active modes like walking and cycling and shifting modes from single occupant cars.
Supports integrated ticketing and would like to see all users being able to use one card to access any public transport within the Auckland region.
Considers that structuring public transport costs and ticketing to keep prices as low as possible should be a priority.
Considers that crucial to the success of rapid transit (especially light rail) and moving people away from cars in general is convenience and ease of access to transport nodes. A prioritisation program for feeder routes such as local walk/cycleways, suburban bus routes and installing park and ride in outlying areas should be investigated.

Light Rail
Strongly supports City Rail Link delivery in 2024.
Strongly supports light rail along the northwest corridor
Supports light rail between the central city and the airport.
Considers that preparations for light rail in the northwest corridor should start immediately.
Considers that the construction project needs to include an effective communication strategy to ensure that disruption is kept to a minimum, for example the successful retail strategy adopted
with the City Rail Link project.

Buses
Supports all efforts to improve capacity and speed of bus travel.
Supports bus priority improvements to improve public transport, increase productivity and lower the environmental impact of transport.

Rail
Considers that all rail crossings on the Auckland network in urban area must have pedestrian arms or gates.
Would like to see a staged progression for eventual separation of all pedestrian rail crossings.
Supports rail to Kumeu/Huapai to support urban growth in the Northwest and future extension beyond Kumeu.

Walking and cycling
Considers that separated cycleways should be the default standard and implemented wherever possible.
Requests that ways to easily accommodate bicycles on buses and light rail be explored as another method of improving integrated travel opportunities.
Supports the move to include footpaths in LTNZ subsidy and the need to invest in walking to decrease congestion from education and work commute.

Road network
Notes that apart from the Lincoln Rd corridor project all Auckland Transport roading projects in or with direct impact on the Henderson-Massey Local Board area are in the unfunded capital programs list.

Ferries
Supports the ferry strategy and considers it important to have ferries that are large enough to deal with increasing demand.
Considers it is important to integrate bus and ferry timetables to ensure bus arrivals align realistically with ferry departures.

Unfunded Auckland Transport projects
Would like more information and discussion about how the Appendix1 Table 1B unfunded Auckland Transport projects can be funded in the future RLTP programme.

Support for currently unfunded projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Feedback on the Regional Fuel Tax Proposal

The board considers these projects important, in order of priority:

1. Active transport (walking and cycling)
2. Growth related transport infrastructure (transport services and facilities for new housing developments)
3. Road safety
4. Network capacity and performance improvements
5. Bus priority improvements
6. Road corridor improvements

**CARRIED**

Secretarial note: Member Peter Chan did not support the fuel tax and requested that his feedback be recorded.
Hibiscus and Bays
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Resolution number HB/2018/4

MOVED by Chairperson J Parfitt, seconded by Member V Watson:

That the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board:

f) Provides feedback and local board views on the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 (Attachment E) as follows:

1. Transport – Regional Fuel Tax:
   i) Supports a regional fuel tax because it is more efficient and cheaper to implement than any other proposals. The local board believe that the proceeds of the fuel tax must be equitable and fund projects across the Auckland region so that our residents can see improvements at the local level.
   ii) Supports a further source of funding for transport and other infrastructure requirements as an investment or private partnership model, including Crown Infrastructure Partners. The local board supports Penlink as one of the projects identified in the Auckland Transport Alignment Project report that recognises the accelerated infrastructure to support and address growth within the Hibiscus Coast, Silverdale and Wainui areas.
   iii) Supports a regional fuel tax in that it will provide more funding to ensure local projects can be achieved and ensure the Auckland Transport Alignment Project proposal projects are delivered.
   iv) Supports the development of criteria to ensure projects will be delivered locally across the Auckland region to ensure that it does not all go to ‘approved priority’ areas.
   v) Expresses concern that there was no list of priorities/projects that were consulted on as part of the 10-year Budget consultation material for the community to review and comment on.
   vi) Notes that written submissions received from the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board area on regional proposals as part of the 10-year Budget indicated that 44% support, 49% do not support the regional fuel tax proposal and 8% indicated ‘other’.
   vii) Expresses concerns that consultation on the regional fuel tax was done prior to the government’s announcement on their fuel tax proposals and this may have changed the views of the community on the council’s regional fuel tax proposals.

CARRIED
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MOVED by Chairperson J Parfitt, seconded by Member C Bettany:
That the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board

a) provides the following feedback on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan:

i) acknowledges the inclusion of local projects within the Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028 to address current and future growth pressures and health and safety priorities

ii) supports the inclusion of Penlink and the realignment of East Coast Road at Glenvar Road and Lonely Track Road in the Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028 as these have been long-time priorities of the local board.

- Further request that Penlink, identified within the Auckland Transport Alignment Project as a key priority and regional project, is delivered in the first half of the decade, preferably as a four-lane option.

- Further request that the realignment of East Coast Road at Glenvar Road and Lonely Track Road is delivered in the first half of the decade, immediately following the completion of Glenvar Ridge Road and the upgrade of Glenvar Road.

iii) suggests that Auckland Transport use smarter procurement practices to help with delivery of projects on time and within budget. This should include looking at design and build practices so that quotes are in line with the project costs.

iv) supports funding opportunities but would like to know how Private Partnership Proposals (PPP’s) fit into the Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028 programme and how the Crown Infrastructure Programme fund is used to deliver projects within the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board area.

v) expresses concern that details of priority projects are not included in the Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028 which makes it difficult to provide comment.

vi) requests clarification on the 18 unfunded projects and how these can be funded in the future Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028 programme.

vii) acknowledges the support for the Residential Growth Funding but would like to know where the local board sits within the prioritisation for funding and for Auckland Transport to identify how this funding will be allocated.

viii) acknowledges the importance of localised bus improvements and would like to see that the park and ride is listed in the Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028 Programme for the Penlink/Wainui interchange area.

ix) supports the Walking and Cycling programme but in the past the local board area was not prioritised for this funding and requests that Auckland Transport looks favourably at the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Local Paths approved plan to help achieve some of these key linkages under the Walking and Cycling Programme.

x) supports the Marae and Papakainga (turnout Safety programme) and requests that Te Herenga Waka o Orewa, the only pan-tribal Māori organisation in existence on the Hibiscus Coast, attracts funding to provide safe and practical access for the marae at their two access points.
xi) supports the integrated ticketing system and would like to see all users being able to use one card to access any public transport within the Auckland region.

xii) supports a ferry terminal at Browns Bay (where the community have shown their support through the local board plan and the approved Browns Bay Centre Plan). However with a ferry terminal at Browns Bay parking would be required. The local board recommend that the sale of the parking area at Anzac Road be retained for future parking requirements i.e. Browns Bay Ferry terminal parking.

xiii) supports the Grand Drive Orewa bus station upgrade but expresses concern that the local board has been advised that the current site is currently up for sale. The local board requests clarification on where Auckland Transport proposes this site be placed on Grand Drive.

xiv) supports the Northern Busway enhancements and acknowledge that New Zealand Transport Agency have identified funding to support the State Highway 1 North of Albany improvements which include provision of bus shoulder lanes between Albany and Orewa.

xv) supports the ferry strategy and emphasises the importance of having ferries that are larger and capable to deal with seasonal conditions at Gulf Harbour together with the increasing demand as well as the need to ensure buses connect with the ferry services.

- The local board request that funding is set aside to complete a weekend ferry service trial to and from Gulf Harbour. Recognising that the local board area has 155km of coastline this would provide another mode of public transport whilst reducing the traffic on roads and motorways.

- the local board urges Auckland Transport seek central government funding to ensure a better working model with competing suppliers in the provision of ferry services.

- supports an upgrade the ferry terminal at Gulf Harbour

- supports Auckland Transport working with Panuku Development Auckland to realise the best outcomes for land at the Hammerhead in Gulf Harbour, Whangaparaoa

xvi) supports a second harbour crossing but would like to see that rail is also added to the project to provide another public transport option for people in the north.

b) provides the following feedback on the draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal:

i) supports a regional fuel tax because it is more efficient and cheaper to implement than any other proposals.

ii) recognises that without the Regional Fuel Tax a number of priority projects in the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board area are unlikely to be delivered within the next decade

iii) requests that the spread of projects funded by the fuel tax must be equitable and fund projects across the Auckland region so that our residents can see improvements at the local level.

iv) notes that the community was split on supporting vs not supporting the fuel tax and there was confusion on where projects would be funded as there was no prioritisation list to show benefit for their local area. The local board are pleased
to hear that Auckland Council are now going out to consult on this issue.

c) provides the following feedback on the draft Contributions Policy:
   i) supports an increase in both urban and greenfield charges to fund additional infrastructure to enable the construction of 120,000 dwellings to house an expected 300,000 additional Aucklanders and to allow for an increase in investment in parks.
   ii) supports the proposed changes to the Contributions Policy.

Resolution number HB/2018/5

MOVED by Member C Watson, seconded by Member M Williamson an amendment to clause a) Draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transfer Transport Plan and clause b) Draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal by way of addition:

Draft 2018-2020 Regional Land Transport Plan:

xvii) requests that a park n ride be included at either end of Penlink in the Regional Land Transport Plan as contemplated by Auckland Transport in previous years.

xviii) requests clarification on the location of localized bus improvements noted at the Penlink/Wainui interchange area and questions whether this should be the Penlink/Redvale interchange area.

Draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal:

v) requests that there is no increase in public transport fares as a result of the regional fuel tax.

CARRIED

Pursuant to Standing Order 1.9.7 Member Fitzgerald requested her dissenting vote be recorded

The substantive motion was put.

Resolution number HB/2018/6

MOVED by Chairperson J Parfitt, seconded by Member C Bettany:

That the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board

a) provides the following feedback on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan:

   i) acknowledges the inclusion of local projects within the Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028 to address current and future growth pressures and health and safety priorities

   ii) supports the inclusion of Penlink and the realignment of East Coast Road at Glenvar Road and Lonely Track Road in the Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028 as these have been long-time priorities of the local board.

   • Further request that Penlink, identified within the Auckland Transport Alignment Project as a key priority and regional project, is delivered in the first half of the decade, preferably as a four-lane option.

   • Further request that the realignment of East Coast Road at Glenvar Road and Lonely Track Road is delivered in the first half of the
decade, immediately following the completion of Glenvar Ridge Road and the upgrade of Glenvar Road.

iii) suggests that Auckland Transport use smarter procurement practices to help with delivery of projects on time and within budget. This should include looking at design and build practices so that quotes are in line with the project costs.

iv) supports funding opportunities but would like to know how Private Partnership Proposals (PPP’s) fit into the Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028 programme and how the Crown Infrastructure Programme fund is used to deliver projects within the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board area.

v) expresses concern that details of priority projects are not included in the Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028 which makes it difficult to provide comment.

vi) requests clarification on the 1B unfunded projects and how these can be funded in the future Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028 programme.

vii) acknowledges the support for the Residential Growth Funding but would like to know where the local board sits within the prioritisation for funding and for Auckland Transport to identify how this funding will be allocated.

viii) acknowledges the importance of localised bus improvements and would like to see that the park and ride is listed in the Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028 Programme for the Penlink/Wainui interchange area.

ix) supports the Walking and Cycling programme but in the past the local board area was not prioritised for this funding and requests that Auckland Transport looks favourably at the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Local Paths approved plan to help achieve some of these key linkages under the Walking and Cycling Programme.

x) supports the Marae and Papakainga (turnout safety programme) and requests that Te Herenga Waka o Orewa, the only pan-tribal Maori organisation in existence on the Hibiscus Coast, attracts funding to provide safe and practical access for the marae at their two access points.

xi) supports the integrated ticketing system and would like to see all users being able to use one card to access any public transport within the Auckland region.

xii) supports a ferry terminal at Browns Bay (where the community have shown their support through the local board plan and the approved Browns Bay Centre Plan). However with a ferry terminal at Browns Bay parking would be required. The local board recommend that the sale of the parking area at Anzac Road be retained for future parking requirements i.e. Browns Bay Ferry terminal parking.

xiii) supports the Grand Drive Orewa bus station upgrade but expresses concern that the local board has been advised that the current site is currently up for sale. The local board requests clarification on where Auckland Transport proposes this site be placed on Grand Drive.

xiv) supports the Northern Busway enhancements and acknowledge that New
Zealand Transport Agency have identified funding to support the State Highway 1 North of Albany improvements which include provision of bus shoulder lanes between Albany and Orewa.

xv) supports the ferry strategy and emphasises the importance of having ferries that are larger and capable to deal with seasonal conditions at Gulf Harbour together with the increasing demand as well as the need to ensure buses connect with the ferry services.

• The local board request that funding is set aside to complete a weekend ferry service trial to and from Gulf Harbour. Recognising that the local board area has 155km of coastline this would provide another mode of public transport whilst reducing the traffic on roads and motorways.

• the local board urges Auckland Transport seek central government funding to ensure a better working model with competing suppliers in the provision of ferry services.

• supports an upgrade the ferry terminal at Gulf Harbour

• supports Auckland Transport working with Panuku Development Auckland to realise the best outcomes for land at the Hammerhead in Gulf Harbour, Whangaparaoa.

xvi) supports a second harbour crossing but would like to see that rail is also added to the project to provide another public transport option for people in the north.

xvii) requests that a park n ride be included at either end of Penlink as contemplated by Auckland transport in previous years.

xviii) requests clarification on the location of localized bus improvements noted at the Penlink/Wainui interchange area and questions whether this should be the Penlink/Redvale interchange area.

b) provides the following feedback on the draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal:

i) supports a regional fuel tax because it is more efficient and cheaper to implement than any other proposals.

ii) recognises that without the Regional Fuel Tax a number of priority projects in the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board area are unlikely to be delivered within the next decade

iii) requests that the spread of projects funded by the fuel tax must be equitable and fund projects across the Auckland region so that our residents can see improvements at the local level.

iv) notes that the community was split on supporting vs not supporting the fuel tax and there was confusion on where projects would be funded as there was no prioritisation list to show benefit for their local area. The local board are pleased to hear that Auckland Council are now going out to consult on this issue.

v) requests that there is no increase in public transport fares as a result of the regional fuel tax.
c) provides the following feedback on the draft Contributions Policy:

i) supports an increase in both urban and greenfield charges to fund additional infrastructure to enable the construction of 120,000 dwellings to house an expected 300,000 additional Aucklanders and to allow for an increase in investment in parks.

ii) supports the proposed changes to the Contributions Policy.

CARRIED

Pursuant to standing order 1.9.7 Member Cooper requested his dissenting vote be recorded against b) i (draft Regional Fuel Tax)
Howick
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Amendment
Resolution number HW/2018/62

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson K Bungard, seconded by Member B Wichman:
Deputy Chairperson K Bungard moved an amendment to the original recommendation as follows:

f) i) do not support the regional fuel tax. Although the board believes that Auckland Transport projects, particularly AMETI, should be made an absolute priority, we believe that the AMETI project should be prioritised first before the light rail network, and funded through a cost savings within Council and a higher contribution from alternative funding sources

CARRIED
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A copy of “Notes on the RLTP – Howick Local Board” was tabled and has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Resolution number HW/2018/64

MOVED by Chairperson D Collings, seconded by Member M Turinsky:

That the Howick Local Board approves the tabled attached document entitled “Notes on the RLTP – Howick Local Board” as its formal feedback on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan; and delete Item 7 and replace with the following:

Do not support the regional fuel tax. Although the board believes that Auckland Transport projects, particularly AMETI, should be made an absolute priority, we believe that the AMETI project should be prioritised first before the light rail network, and funded through a cost savings within Council and a higher contribution from alternative funding sources.

CARRIED

Secretarial Note: Member J Donald requested that his dissenting vote be recorded.

Attachments
D 20180510 Howick Local Board meeting Item 14: Draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and draft Contributions Policy - Notes on the RLTP - Howick Local Board
Attachments
D Notes on the RLTP
Notes on the RLTP - Howick Local Board

HLB appreciates the opportunity to comment on the RLTP.

1) We acknowledge $730M for supporting growth, but we raise our concerns that Flat Bush/Ormiston is not on the map in supporting growth areas. Flat Bush being the largest SHA within the Auckland Region. (We note this is a map from the Auckland Plan)

Despite this there are many projects featured within the RLTP that will support the expected growth in Flat Bush and the development of Ormiston Town Centre.

We note that Mill Road improvements are approved, but would also like to see approved improvements to feeders into Mill Road corridor such as Murphys Road down to Ormiston Road and Chapel Road towards Redoubt Road.

We also note that Chapel Road realignment is not featured and understand that there is geotechnical work being carried out by AT and support AT to include within the RLTP realignment and a new bridge as an issue of safety and also to due to the Flat Bush growth.

2) We support the Mangere Otahuhu Local Board position asking for heavy rail to the airport as overseas visitors don’t wish to traverse the urban areas of Auckland on their way to catching an international flight any more than Aucklanders do.

However if Light Rail is going to be provided down a corridor from the CBD to the Airport this should be extended across Manukau and through the existing corridor (Flat Bush - Botany - Pakuranga) which has been set aside for many years originally by the former Manukau City Council on Te Irirangi Drive and through to the Panmure Station.

Coming back to the discussion about heavy rail, and myself being very much a part of the AMETI project, (In fact chairing the political steering group) when we approved the upgrades to the Panmure Station. My recollection was that we approved heavy rail for the AMETI corridor in later years in the same way that the North Shore Busway is proposed to change to heavy rail in the future.

3) HLB also supports the continuation of the East West Link, identifying the large numbers of people and vehicles (including many freight journeys) from our area into the Onehunga/Mt Smart/Penrose business area. This was identified as part of the original AMETI study, but it is blatantly apparent that most of the Auckland Regions’ major road corridors run from North to South with very little or poor East West connections right throughout the Auckland isthmus.
4) On a completely different note, we support the idea of an additional third or even fourth line to the main trunk rail line between Auckland CBD and the end of the commuter service in the south. This has been a personal idea of mine for many years with an extra line being able to act as an express line into the city in the morning peak, out in the afternoon peaks and used for freight at other times would make Auckland’s rail system much more efficient. I am pleased that my board supports this idea as even though rail does not come to Howick, maybe subject to the above one day, our board see the benefit of such an addition to provide faster express services perhaps only stopping twice along the route as a huge uplift to rail journeys from further afield and perhaps also getting a large number of vehicles off of the motorway.

5) In the same light I have suggested, and it is supported by HLB, that a similar system is introduced to our local bus network with express buses running along Pakuranga Road from Howick and Ti Rakau Drive from Botany. This would improve the journey time for public transport users and get more people out of their cars many of which are reluctant to as the buses are currently caught up in the congestion due to having to stop to pick up passengers along the way.

6) One other corridor important to Howick is the Ferry corridor on our waterway the Tamaki Estuary. I think we would all say what a wonderful collaborative project the development of the Ferry Pier at Half Moon Bay was; in fact I remember the accolades from NZTA with the chairman stating they would like to collaborate in such a way right across the country. It is good to also see timetable alignments between the new Eastern Bus Network and Ferry sailings, where bus routes now begin and end at this point. HLB notes $200M allocated for the Ferry Strategy and would be very keen to work together to see any more such improvements at Half Moon Bay. HLB feels our next challenge is to encourage other ways for commuters to make their way to the terminal; the new bus network, walking and cycling, carpooling and Uber and such like systems.

7) The Howick Local Board do not support the regional fuel tax. Although the board believes that Auckland Transport projects, particularly AMETI, should be made an absolute priority, we believe that the AMETI project should be prioritised first, before the light rail network, and funded through a cost savings within Council and a higher contribution from alternative funding sources.

8) The Howick Local Board supports the draft Contributions Policy
Kaipatiki

Kaipātiki Local Board’s Position on Regional Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issue / Plan</th>
<th>10-year Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transport - Regional Fuel Tax</td>
<td>The Kaipātiki Local Board supports the introduction of a regional fuel tax to be used to raise more funding for transport projects and services, in line with feedback received from the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MOVED by Chairperson J Gillon, seconded by Member L Waugh:

That the Kaipātiki Local Board:

a) provide feedback on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan as per the tabled document subject to the following amendments:

i. under the section entitled ‘Projects unlisted in the RLTP’ (page 7 of tabled feedback document) – amend current wording for ‘Ferry service improvements’ project to read:

“Additional services on the Beach Haven route on weekends to provide a desirable public transport alternative. The importance of ferry services to our residents is further reinforced by the seamless connection to the airport bus service leaving from the downtown ferry terminal every 20 minutes. Reliable and regular ferry services would benefit our residents and is in line with Outcome 4 of our Local Board Plan 2017”; and

ii. remove reference to “Alignment of timings between ferry services and the bus to the airport to reduce the approximately 20 minute wait time” and associated commentary under ‘Projects unlisted in RLTP’ section of the tabled feedback document (page 8).

iii. Include the following wording under “Integrated ticketing improvements, replacement and national system”, as part of local boards feedback:

“The kaipatiki local board also advocates for the full integration of ferry fares into a single ticket system”.

A division was called for, voting on which was as follows:

For  Against  Abstained
Chairperson J Gillon
Member P Gillon
Deputy Chairperson D Grant
Member A Hartley
Member K McIntyre
Member A Smithson
Member A Tyler
Member L Waugh
The motion was declared CARRIED by 8 votes to 0.

b) provide the following feedback on the draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal, as resolved as part of the boards Long-term Plan 2018 – 2028 feedback at its 9 May 2018 extraordinary meeting:

supports the introduction of a regional fuel tax to be used to raise more funding for transport projects and services, in line with feedback received from the community.

A division was called for, voting on which was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Abstained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson J Gillon</td>
<td>Deputy Chairperson D Grant</td>
<td>Member A Smithson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member P Gillon</td>
<td>Member A Hartley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member A Hartley</td>
<td>Member K McIntyre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member K McIntyre</td>
<td>Member A Tyler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member L Waugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motion was declared CARRIED by 6 votes to 2.

c) provide feedback on the draft Contributions Policy:

i. recognises that new development requires appropriate council infrastructure and facilities, and that it is appropriate that the ‘developer’ generating this demand contributes to meeting the capital costs that council must incur to support this increased demand.

ii. recommends that the policy focus on ensuring the contributions have a greater relationship on where they are collected and spent.

iii. Recommends that the policy has an increased focus on sub-regional catchment and brownfield areas.

iv. Recommends that the status quo remains for “Aged Care Rooms” and “Students Accommodation” development types as they do appear to create a significant demand on our open space, community infrastructure and transport infrastructure.

A division was called for, voting on which was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Abstained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson J Gillon</td>
<td>Deputy Chairperson D Grant</td>
<td>Member A Smithson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member P Gillon</td>
<td>Member A Hartley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chairperson D Grant</td>
<td>Member K McIntyre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member A Hartley</td>
<td>Member A Smithson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member K McIntyre</td>
<td>Member A Tyler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member L Waugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The motion was declared CARRIED by 8 votes to 0.
CARRIED
### Regional Land Transport Plan

The Kaipātiki Local Board is broadly supportive of the long-term direction set forth by the draft Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP).

The RLTP is in line with key outcomes of the Kaipātiki Local Board Plan, namely Outcome 2: Our natural environment is protected for future generations to enjoy, Outcome 3: Our people are active and healthy, Outcome 4: Getting to and around Kaipātiki is easy, and Outcome 5: Our urban centres are vibrant. The projects included as part of the Auckland Transport Proposed Funded Capital Programme are welcomed as they allow the local board to respond to localised priorities not ranked as high on a regional program.

The table below outlines the alignment between specific projects and outcomes 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the Kaipātiki Local Board Plan 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RLTP Project</th>
<th>Project description</th>
<th>Kaipātiki Local Board feedback</th>
<th>LBP 2017 Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Transport Proposed Funded Capital Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Board Initiatives Fund</td>
<td>To allow Local Boards to fund transport projects in their communities. Projects to be funded will be worked through with Local Boards to meet their specific priorities.</td>
<td>The local board supports the increased funding to local boards to undertake projects of local importance, recognising the role local boards play in the shaping of neighbourhoods and communities.</td>
<td>Outcome 4: Getting to and around Kaipātiki is easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Priority: Localised improvements</td>
<td>Delivery of localised bus priority improvements across Auckland to support the roll out of the new bus networks.</td>
<td>Connecting services to the Northern busway from Kaipātiki that are better and more frequent Bus lanes from Upper Harbour to Chartwell Avenue Inadequate bus capacity often means full buses are unable to pick up passengers at Smale’s Farm and Akoranga Stations. More double decker buses from the bus stations at the southern end of the bus way to increase passenger capacity would alleviate this issue.</td>
<td>Outcome 4: Getting to and around Kaipātiki is easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Decker Network Mitigation Works</td>
<td>Mitigation works to safely allow the passage of double decker buses, addressing risks such as street signage, street furniture, low hanging power or phone lines, overhanging trees and low bridge structures.</td>
<td>The introduction of double decker buses in Kaipātiki has been very well received for increasing capacity on the bus network. The board supports continuing mitigation measures to continue the efficiency of double deckers on the current routes and for their introduction on new routes.</td>
<td>Outcome 3: Our people are active and healthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown bus Improvements</td>
<td>Delivery of new bus interchanges on Quay St East and Lower Albert St, in conjunction with CRL and Council Downtown projects</td>
<td>Having suitable bus infrastructure for downtown buses heading for and coming from Kaipātiki would be of significant benefit for our residents.</td>
<td>Outcome 4: Getting to and around Kaipātiki is easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Ferry Basin Redevelopment</td>
<td>Construction of a new Downtown Ferry Terminal to accommodate future growth and expansion of services.</td>
<td>Having suitable infrastructure for ferry’s heading for and coming from Kaipātiki would be of significant benefit for our residents.</td>
<td>Outcome 3: Our people are active and healthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Buses and Infrastructure</td>
<td>Infrastructure to support electric buses on the public transport network</td>
<td>Electric buses reduce fossil fuel dependence and are more sustainable, leading to better environmental outcomes. The local board supports extending the trial to the Kaipātiki Local Board if appropriate.</td>
<td>Outcome 4: Getting to and around Kaipātiki is easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Ticketing – Improvements, Replacement and National System</td>
<td>To extend, enhance and replace AT HOP equipment and systems - including the back-end system, retail and top-up devices and the tag-on/off devices for rail, ferry and bus.</td>
<td>Ferry passengers are currently doubly disadvantaged in paying higher fares for ferry services, and being excluded from single journey fare calculations both bus and train services enjoy. Without rail on the North Shore, our only feasible public transport options are the bus and our ‘blue highway’.</td>
<td>Outcome 4: Getting to and around Kaipātiki is easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting Improvements</td>
<td>Programme to deliver improved street lighting throughout the Auckland Region where it has been identified as deficient, such as where there are safety concerns. This programme also includes rollout of LED street lighting.</td>
<td>Lighting around the shops at Chartwell Avenue, and in the Birkenhead town centre should be included in this project. In order to retain the Village design and feel of the Birkenhead town centre however,</td>
<td>Outcome 2: Our natural environment is protected for future generations to enjoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>Proposal for a Regional Fuel Tax for Auckland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governing Body</strong></td>
<td><strong>31 May 2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachment E</strong></td>
<td><strong>Item 9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lighting on the local road network</strong></td>
<td>ambient “Art Deco” decorative street lights that comply with the relevant regulations but similar in style to the current existing globe lights, should be used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Footpaths Regional Programme</strong></td>
<td>Programme to construct new and widened footpaths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Glenfield Road frontage to Eskdale Reserve should be included in this project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Footpaths around schools in particular should be widened as a matter of course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walking &amp; Cycling Programme</strong></td>
<td>Walking and cycling programme focuses on achieving maximum impact for short trips to the city centre, public transit interchanges, schools and local and metropolitan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further investigation into more cycling links into town centres and the Northcote safe cycle route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Cycleways Programme</strong></td>
<td>Completion of the current Urban Cycleways Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental sustainability infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Programme which seeks to address environmental sustainability issues from Transport. This includes installation of catch pit pollutant traps in CBD, Industrial areas, and marine sensitive areas within central area to protect sensitive receiving environment from road storm water discharge (including gross pollutants). The programme also includes infrastructure requirements to support uptake in Electric vehicles such as charging points.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In line with the environmental aspirations of the board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AT Metro Business Technology</strong></td>
<td>Technology improvements supporting PT customer experience and operations. Includes items such as improvements to the real-time passenger information system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This project would benefit our residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Zealand Transport Agency Investment Programme</strong></td>
<td>A new walking and cycling connection between North Shore and the Auckland city centre across the Auckland Harbour Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This project will have the greatest impact on our residents as it provides an alternative, active transport option, to cross the Waitematā Harbour to access the central business district. The local board is very supportive of this project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 3: Our people are active and healthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 4: Getting to and around Ōrākei is easy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 5: Our urban centres are vibrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposal for a Regional Fuel Tax for Auckland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board advocacy projects:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SeaPath</strong></td>
<td>Provision of a 3.4km shared path between Esmonde Road and Auckland Harbour Bridge/Northcote Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SH1 Waitemata Harbour Crossing</strong></td>
<td>Route protection and future proofing activities for a new integrated transport system crossing of the Waitemata Harbour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Corridor Improvements (NCI)</strong></td>
<td>A package of capacity and safety improvement projects on the Northern Motorway between Upper Harbour Highway and Greville Road:  - Widening of SH1 between Constellation Drive and Greville Road  - Widening of SH18 between SH1 and Unsworth Drive  - New motorway-to-motorway connection between SH18 and SH1  - Upgrade of Greville Road interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kiwirail Capital Programme</strong></td>
<td>Programme of works to close roads where ever practical and in areas with the best immediate prospects for construction, building an initial tranche of grade separated road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Auckland Transport Capital Programme – additional items currently unfunded

*We want the Northcote Point wharf upgraded to provide all-weather capability to increase service reliability, increased ferry services for Beach Haven, ferry fares integrated into the wider public transport fare structure and further consideration of a ferry service to Island Bay.* (Kaipātiki Local Board Plan 2017, pg 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RLTP Project</th>
<th>Project description</th>
<th>Kaipātiki Local Board feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key advocacy project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northcote Point Ferry Terminal Upgrade</td>
<td>Provision for a new ferry terminal to mitigate existing adverse weather and marine condition impacts.</td>
<td>This was identified as an advocacy point in the Local Board Plan (LBP) 2017, specifically all-weather berthing to increase service reliability. Through supporting new infrastructure such as SeaPath, SkyPath and the Northcote Safe Cycle Route, the Northcote Point Ferry Terminal Upgrade potentially eases congestion on Onewa Road as travellers opt for a reliable public transport alternative. Linking with SkyPath, Seapath and the Northcote Safe Cycle Route would also boost tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akoranga Busway bus station improvements</td>
<td>Provides for northbound access to Akoranga Station from Esmonde Road</td>
<td>Better and clearer public access from the Kaipātiki local board area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taharoto/Wairau Corridor: Bus Priority Improvements</td>
<td>Widening Wairau Road between Forrest Hill and Shakespeare Road to provide better bus access to Smales Farm Bus Station and improve pedestrian/ cyclist facilities</td>
<td>This project would benefit our residents and is line with Outcomes 3 and 4 of our Local Board Plan 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Highway (Sunset to SH18) corridor improvements</td>
<td>Extension of Albany Highway between Sunset Road and State Highway 18, to widen the road to two lanes in each direction, and provide on-road cycle lanes, etc.</td>
<td>This project would benefit our residents and is line with Outcome 4 of our Local Board Plan 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed project</td>
<td>Kaipātiki Local Board feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect SealPath to the new walking and cycling facilities in Constellation Drive on the western side of the motorway</td>
<td>This would benefit our residents as it improves access to bus stations and is in line with Outcomes 3 and 4 of our Local Board Plan 2017, as well as the Kaipātiki Connections Network Plan (Greenway plan).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate pedestrian walking and cycling bridge across the motorway to Sunnynook Station</td>
<td>This would create better and safer access to Sunnynook Station for our residents and is line with Outcome 4 of our Local Board Plan 2017.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry service improvements</td>
<td>Additional services on the Beach Haven route on weekends to provide a desirable public transport alternative. The importance of ferry services to our residents is further reinforced by the seamless connection to the airport bus service leaving from the downtown ferry terminal every 20 minutes. Reliable and regular ferry services would benefit our residents and is in line with Outcome 4 of our Local Board Plan 2017.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry pontoon at the bottom of Island Bay Road</td>
<td>This is proposed to link into the Beach Haven and Hobsonville route and through improving ferry services, is in line with Outcome 4 of our Local Board Plan 2017.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawene Road Carpark reinstatement</td>
<td>The Kaipātiki Local Board supports the current funding and process underway to reinstate the carpark.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation into a park and ride facility in Birkenhead</td>
<td>This would greatly benefit our residents and is in line with Outcome 4 of our Local Board Plan 2017.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northcote Road cycle / pedestrian bridges over SH1</td>
<td>This local board would like to have confirmation that the cycle / pedestrian bridges adjacent to the Northcote Road SH1 overbridge will be funded and constructed as per the plans for the Northcote Safe Cycle project currently under construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mangere-Otahuhu

4 Local board decisions and input into the 10-year Budget 2018-2028m draft Auckland Plan 2050 and draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018

The feedback under f) tabled at the meeting is attached to the back of the agenda.

Resolution number MO/2018/60

MOVED by Chairperson L Sosene, seconded by Member C Elliott:

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board:

f) endorses the feedback on the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, the draft Auckland Plan 2050 and the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018, tabled at the meeting and attached to the minutes.

CARRIED

Item 4 Feedback

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Feedback on the 10 Year Budget 2018 – 2028

| Transport Regional Fuel Tax (RFT) | • Generally, support RFT in accordance with community feedback
| | • Public transport to be accessible and affordable through an equitable sharing of the costs between public transport users, ratepayers and road users, as current levels are impacting lower income families
| | • Deliver Route 32 and integrate with local projects
| | o One Local Initiative – Mangere East precinct
| | o Otahuhu Portage project
| | o Light rail Mangere town centre rapid transit rail to airport, and
| | o Complete local projects to a high quality
| | • Deliver more safety programmes, streetscape upgrades, and safer active modes of transport
| | • Fix local congestion. |

Item 17

Draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and draft Contributions Policy

The feedback was tabled at the meeting and is attached to the back of the minutes.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board give formal written feedback on:

a) the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan (attached to these minutes)

b) the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal (attached to these minutes)

c) the draft Contributions Policy.
2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and draft Contributions Policy

Affordable
Being able to afford a relatively comfortable standard of living is the challenge for people in our community.

Mangere-Otahuhu is an area of high deprivation. This is fact. You only have to look at the statistics.

We have the highest number of unemployed youth in Auckland. Compared to the rest of the region our people are earning considerably less with the local average income medium for adults, at $19,700 per annum compared to $29,600 - the Auckland medium and the medium household income is $59,900 per annum, compared to $76,500 for Auckland.

Most of our families live tough, and we are literally bracing ourselves for the implications of the looming regional fuel tax to hit our pockets! It is important therefore that public transport is cheaper and easier to access.

This must be a joint approach between Auckland Transport and central government. The main way of changing this is through amending the ‘fare box recovery’ rate. This is the amount of operational cost that is expected to be recovered from public transport ticket sales. The remainder being made up of subsidies from local and central government.

In Auckland the current rate is 47%. Some NZ cities have higher rates like Wellington 53%.

But other areas have lower rates for example Canterbury 41%, Waikato 31% both of which have large urban areas. If we look across the Tasman - Sydney has a rate of 20%. Canberra 21% and Melbourne 30%.

MOLB is advocating for a decrease in the rate of ‘Fare Box Recovery’ to a level that is consistent with these Australian cities and that is not inconsistent with some other areas in NZ.
This will mean an increase in the subsides on public transport (PT) and would allow the ticket prices to be lowered.

The MOLB understands that there are significant financial considerations but is keen to advocate for lower priced PT.

And we know the feedback to the long-term plan supports a regional fuel tax, but the fact that only 0.4% of our population made submissions means this result is
inconclusive.

In our local area, we have the Otahuhu station - a modern and beautiful facility and the revamped bus interchange in the Mangere town centre, but if people can’t afford to use the services provided – they are not relevant.

(LTP fuel tax results: support 49%/do not support 44%; MOLB population 79,990)

**Integrated approach:** Mangere-Otahuhu Roading Network

As we know Auckland Airport is an important employment area, as well as the international gateway to New Zealand. Rapid growth in employment and tourism is placing substantial pressure on the transport network that serves the airport and its surrounds.

Without a major increase in the proportion of people accessing the airport by public transport, the road network will not be able to function effectively, and the success of this critical employment area will be placed at risk.

**We are advocating for Auckland Transport, New Zealand Transport Association, and the Council family to work together, and deliver the following projects in a timely manner:**

1. East West Route 32
   This project could potentially encompass several of the board’s major aspirational projects such as:
   - One Local Initiative – Mangere East precinct
   - Portage project initiative

2. Light rail - Mangere town centre as a key station as part of rapid transit rail to airport.
   - We want a stop close to the Mangere town centre to integrate with the transport developments already invested in this area.

3. Safety is an important focus in the area. Future Streets and to some extent Otahuhu streetscape upgrade, has alleviated some of our road safety problems.
   - The recently released **Government Statement Policy for Transport 2018**, where our board agreed to a joint submission with the other local boards in response to this policy. We did this as
‘safety’ was one of the main priority areas. By doing this we want to gain more programmes and more capital investment like our Future Streets initiative for our area.

By working together our local board believes we will deliver our projects and keep our streets safer. By working together you will help deliver our local board plan’s transport outcome 4: “a well-connected area”.

We want to deliver this outcome, but we need everyone working together.

We have consistently said as part of our regional advocacy that we want to see heavy rail connected and including Auckland Airport. Please investigate options between heavy and light rail, from the CBD to Onehunga, and then Mangere to the airport.

c) draft Contribution Policy:

supports in principle increased contributions due to the rapid growth of our city as proposed in the draft Contributions Policy, but asks officers to ensure local boards are given more time to develop local board feedback on regional polices in future.
### Manurewa

**14 Local board decisions and input into the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, draft Auckland Plan 2050 and draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 - Manurewa**

Resolution number MR/2018/62

MOVED by Chairperson A Dalton, seconded by Member S Cattle:

**That the Manurewa Local Board:**

**d) provide the following feedback on the 10-year Budget 2018-2028:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Transport - Regional Fuel Tax</th>
<th>- Fifty two percent of Manurewa residents do not support the introduction of the proposed RFT. Of the 41 per cent that do support it, this is conditional on the extra revenue contributing to transport priorities in the Manurewa area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The board is supportive of this community position. Of those who did not support the RFT the most common concern raised was lack of affordability, and equity impacts on lower income residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Research shows commentary from the Ministry of Transport and Treasury which notes that the RFT “could result in lower income households contributing a higher proportion of their income to the tax compared to higher income households”. It also notes that these households are less likely to own newer more fuel efficient or electric vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In Manurewa, public transport, active modes and working at home are all significantly below regional averages, as is the level of self-containment (the proportion of residents who work in their local board area). Indeed, Manurewa has the second-lowest level of self-containment in the region and the highest private vehicle usage in the region at 85 per cent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | - Based on 2013 census data there is a significantly high share of worker trips to the airport from the south and its abutting suburbs (approximately an 18 kilometre radius). Private vehicles account for almost 93 per cent (12,264) of these trips. The public transport share is low at about 2 per cent (215 bus trips). This reflects:
1. Transport - Regional Fuel Tax (cont.)

- The board therefore has concerns about the value for money of the light rail proposal, noting it won’t materially improve southern commuters’ access to the airport precinct, and questions whether there are more cost-effective alternatives.

- Instead of an RFT, the board would like to see the Lean Model of continuous improvement applied to Auckland Transport operations to create efficiencies and identify savings within existing budgets.

- The board supports any RFT revenue generated to be equitably allocated across Manurewa, including improvements to public transport provision.

CARRIED

15 Draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and draft Contributions Policy

The Manurewa Local Board written feedback on the draft 2018-2028 Regional land Transport Plan, the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal, and the draft Development Contributions Policy was tabled.

A copy of this document is publicly available on the Auckland Council website as an attachment to the minutes.

Resolution number MR/2018/63

MOVED by Chairperson A Dalton, seconded by Deputy Chairperson R McLean:

That the Manurewa Local Board:

a) endorse the feedback tabled at the meeting regarding (see attachment A to the minutes):

i) The draft 2018-2028 Regional land Transport Plan

ii) The draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal

iii) The draft Development Contributions Policy

CARRIED

Attachments

A Manurewa Local Board feedback on the draft 2018-2028 Regional land Transport Plan, the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal, and the draft Development Contributions Policy
10 May 2018

Manurewa Local Board Formal Feedback on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal and the draft Contributions Policy.

The Manurewa Local Board has considered the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal and the draft Contributions policy, and provides the following feedback:

1. **2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan**

   The Manurewa Local Board believes the Regional Land Transport Plan offers an exciting step change in transport projects for Auckland. The board supports the plan’s goal to provide Auckland with an integrated transport system that offers genuine travel choice, while maximising safety and environmental protection. It is important to the board how this is applied equally across the region to ensure all Aucklanders’ benefit.

2. **Regional Fuel Tax**

   The board accepts the current model of funding is not going to achieve the step change needed to keep deliver on key transport projects, however;

   - Fifty two percent of Manurewa residents do not support the introduction of the proposed RFT. Of the 41 per cent that do support it, this is conditional on the extra revenue contributing to transport priorities in the Manurewa area.

   - Of those who did not support the RFT the most common concern raised was lack of affordability, and equity impacts on lower income residents.

   - Research shows commentary from the Ministry of Transport and Treasury notes that the RFT “could result in lower income households contributing a higher proportion of their income to the tax compared to higher income households”. It also notes that these households are less likely to own newer more fuel efficient or electric vehicles.

   - Instead of an RFT, the board would like to see the Lean Model of continuous improvement applied to Auckland Transport operations to create efficiencies and identify savings within existing budgets.

   - The Board would like to have seen a targeted rate that captures the value uplift applied to the City Rail Link project as an alternative method of investment into that project.

   - The Board supports tolling for roads of significance e.g. Penlink

3. **Regional Fuel Tax Priorities**

   - 43
a) Project 1 – Bus priority improvements

- In Manurewa, public transport, active modes and working at home are all significantly below regional averages, as is the level of self-containment (the proportion of residents who work in their local board area). Manurewa has the second-lowest level of self-containment in the region and the highest private vehicle usage in the region at 85 per cent.

- The Board has invested its capital fund into public transport improvements as a priority; we hope to see localised bus priority improvements spending in the south to target severe congestion areas as part of the RLTP.

b) Project 3 – Improving airport access

- Based on 2013 census data there is a significantly high share of worker trips to the airport from the south and its abutting suburbs (approximately an 18 kilometre radius). Private vehicles account for almost 93 per cent (12,264) of these trips. The public transport share is low at about 2 per cent (215 bus trips). This reflects:
  o the limited availability of easy public transport services
  o the nature and geographical distribution of employment in the area with a high proportion of shift working
  o and the dispersed nature of work sites located away from public transport routes on offer.

- The board therefore has concerns about the value for money of the light rail proposal, noting it won’t materially improve southern commuters’ access to the airport precinct, and questions whether there are more cost-effective alternatives.

- The board supports any improvements to access to airport via private transport to provide options for employment and lessen congestion, especially the proposed bus/rail interchange at Puhinui that will improve access from all areas to the south, including Manurewa. The board supports the proposed completion of the Puhinui bus/rail interchange by 2021.

- The board also supports the NZTA committed SH20 and 20B Southern and Eastern airport access project but is concerned that short and medium term airport access supporting projects are not confirmed.

c) Project 5 – Park and rides

- The board asks consideration of a multi-storey expansion at the main P&R at the Manurewa station be considered as part of the Park and Ride Programme. This would support the Local Board’s continuing investment of its capital fund into the train station.

- The current overflow Park and Ride from the Manurewa station is currently under-utilised due to the distance from the station and security issues. This area is the traditional home of prostitution and gangs. Our residents will continue to drive north to Homai to catch the train if they do not feel safe catching the train at Manurewa Train Station.

d) Project 6 – Electric trains and stabling

- We support investment into EMU’s and electrification to Pukekohe.
e) **Project 8 – Road safety**
   - the board supports increase in current safety budget from current $13M per annum to proposed $500M over 10 years.
   - the board asks Auckland Transport to work with local boards when identifying and prioritising safety improvements in local areas to maximise leverage opportunities with our transport capital fund.
   - Pedestrian safety is particularly important around town centres, schools, neighbourhoods, and aged care facilities where there are vulnerable users. Also in less affluent communities with lower access to vehicles.

f) **Project 9 – Active transport (walking and cycling)**
   - the board supports improvements to the cycle network, provided that any cycle facilities provided on busy arterial roads are to be fully separated from motor vehicle traffic and therefore safe to use.
   - Great South Road through the Manurewa Local Board area is extremely busy and it is unsafe to expect some paint on the road surface to attract regular cycle use – paint on arterials is proving to be a poor investment of money.
   - The board would welcome working with Auckland Transport on identifying investment in safer cycle facilities using greenways, wherever possible and appropriate.
   - the board would like to work with Auckland Transport to encourage cycling to train stations by providing cycle shelters with CCTV coverage at all train stations on the network.

g) **Project 10 – Penlink**
   - the board supports the use to tolls on new roads to bring projects forward and reduce construction costs on general ratepayers.

h) **Project 11 – Mill Road**
   - the board fully supports the inclusion of Mill Road in the list of projects and advocates for inclusion of the southern section in the funding.
   - the entire Redoubt-Mill Road corridor has a poor safety record, and improvements are critical from a safety perspective.
   - congestion and safety issues on Mill Road, and congestion/access issues at the Takanini interchange, have diverted traffic away from those routes and onto Stratford and Hill Roads in Manurewa, to access the motorway at the Hill Road northbound on ramp.
   - roads are being destroyed and houses damaged by the constant vibration from heavy vehicle traffic from the industrial area at Takanini and the quarries at Brookby and Clevedon as they rat run up to the Manurewa motorway on-ramp.
   - new housing areas in Flatbush, rural communities and traffic from east of Flatbush and Alfriston, and new housing areas in north Takanini, will continue to impact on local roads until Mill Road is upgraded.
route protection at least is critical as new housing in the south continues to be built on areas needed for the southern end of the route, from south of Alfriston and stretching to Drury.

without urgent route protection, the cost of the southern section of Mill Road will exponentially increase if left until the second decade. Without this important southern section, Mill Road will never be able to fully provide resilience for Auckland’s transport network as intended.

**i) Project 13 – Network capacity and performance improvements**

- to improve the reliability of the network, the board would particularly support intersection traffic flow improvements at congestion hot spots, real-time active network management on congested routes during morning and evening peaks, and bus priority measures to improve public transport reliability and encourage better uptake of public transport.

**j) Project 14 – Growth related transport infrastructure**

- the board has some concern that the priority for this project may be directed at greenfield growth areas, when the proposal acknowledges that most of Auckland’s growth will take place within existing urban areas.

- There are also new developments recently or currently occurring within or adjacent to the Manurewa area (e.g. Weymouth, Wattle Downs, Waiata Shores, Pacific Gardens, Eugenia Rise), and the board is concerned that the wider network impacts of these pockets of new development should have some redress through this growth-related fund.

4. **Unfunded Projects**

   a) Grade separation

   The Manurewa Local Board is concerned that the following two items are currently unfunded in the proposed programme and does not support the low priority given to these two projects and requests that they be brought forward into the funded programme.

   - Rangi Road Upgrade and Grade Separated Crossing ($171M)
   - Level Crossing Safety Improvements and Grade Separation ($424M)

   - These projects are critical to the proposed closure and/or grade separation of a number of level crossings in Takanini. Given that the KiwiRail capital programme includes Tranche 1 of Level Crossing Grade Separations ($185M), the board is concerned that there may be some disconnect between the AT and KiwiRail projects, though it is acknowledged the KiwiRail project does not specify areas.

   b) **Public Transport Safety, Security and Amenity and other capital improvements ($121M)**

   - security improvements at all train and bus stations, and improvements at suburban bus stops such as provision of shelters is fully supported by the board to encourage uptake of Public Transport use.

   c) **Porchester Road upgrade**
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5. Transport Challenges

The Manurewa Local Board agrees the identified transport challenges should include improving:
- Safety
- Congestion
- Increase accessibility
- Impacts on the environment
- Growth across the region

6. Draft Contributions Policy

The Manurewa Local Board supports in principle the draft contributions policy subject to the following feedback:
I. A targeted rate should be used in greenfield development areas to contribute to the development of facilities, combined with a small increase in development contributions.

II. As some small greenfield development areas are not currently forecast to receive additional services, the development contributions paid are unlikely to benefit the local community or new residents, so levying the same charge as for other greenfield areas would be inequitable.

III. The board has some concern that the priority for development contributions may be directed at greenfield growth areas, when there is a high probability that most of Auckland’s growth will take place within existing urban areas.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Angela Dalton - Chair
Manurewa Local Board
Email: Angela.Dalton@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Ph: 0212833311
Maungakiekie-Tamaki
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Resolution number MT/2018/7

MOVED by Chairperson C Makoare, seconded by Member A Verrall:

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

d) provides the following feedback on the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 and associated policies:

   Regional Fuel Tax
   i. Supports a regional fuel tax but seeks commitment from Auckland Transport to increase subsidies on public transport to allow fares to be affordable and accessible especially for members in our community that will be severely impacted by the increase in the cost of fuel;

   ii. Requests Auckland Transport to investigate the possibility of providing some direct support to those who need it most including possibly linking subsidies to Community Services Card;

   CARRIED

13 Draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, Regional Fuel Tax proposal and draft Development Contributions Policy

Resolution number MT/2018/8

MOVED by Member N Henry, seconded by Member A Verrall:

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board receives:

a) the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan and delegates feedback to the Chair and Deputy Chair before the 15th May 2018;

b) the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal and delegates feedback to the Chair and Deputy Chair before the 15th May 2018;

c) the draft Contributions Policy and delegates feedback to the Chair and Deputy Chair by the 15th May 2018.

   CARRIED

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board feedback on the draft proposal for an Auckland Regional Fuel Tax submitted by Chairperson Chris Makoare

The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board (The Board) appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposal for a regional fuel tax for Auckland.

The Board supports the proposed Regional Fuel Tax (RFT) of 10 cents per litre (plus GST) applied to the sale of petrol and diesel within the boundaries of Auckland Council, for a period of ten years. We recognise that without an RFT there will be a transport funding shortfall of $1.5 billion over the next ten years and many of the planned transport projects that will benefit our local board residents would be unable to proceed.

Furthermore, 56% of submitters to the Auckland’s Long-Term Plan who live in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki area support the proposed RFT.
However, the Board is concerned with the impact of the RFT on its lower-income residents. As a result, the Board resolved in its business meeting on 8 May 2018 (Resolution number MT/2018/9):

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board supports a regional fuel tax but seeks commitment from Auckland Transport to increase subsidies on public transport to allow fares to be affordable and accessible especially for members in our community that will be severely impacted by the increase in the cost of fuel, and requests Auckland Transport to investigate the possibility of providing some direct support to those who need it most including possibly linking subsidies to Community Services Card.

The Board has provided its views on the 14 projects that the RFT proposal will fund in its submission on the Auckland Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028. Please refer to that submission for details.

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board feedback on the draft Auckland Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028, submitted by Chairperson Chris Makoare

The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board (The Board) appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback to the Regional Transport Committee on the draft Auckland Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028 (RLTP).

The Board supports the general direction of the draft RLTP, particularly the fact that, in prioritising activities for inclusion in the proposed funded programme, highest priority has been given to improvements that deliver of the key strategic priorities of the draft GPS 2018 – access and safety.

However, the Board wishes to make the following comments on the details:

- The Board advocates strongly for a transport hub at Onehunga to co-locate the bus and train stations, and that allows for the inclusion of future public transport connections such as light rail. This project is the Local Board’s number one transport priority and the Board’s “One Local Initiative” in terms of advocating to Governing Body. We would like to see Panuku lead this project, working alongside Auckland Transport to ensure the timely delivery of a transport orientated development with a strong place-making focus. We encourage the Governing Body to prioritise this project to ensure Panuku’s mandate to Transform Onehunga can be achieved, whilst at the same time maximising development opportunities of the existing bus station and surrounding assets.

- The Board notes the KiwiRail Capital Programme in the RPLT (p. 73) and strongly supports the inclusion in the “Funded Programme” of the $69 million upgrade of the Onehunga Rail Line to accommodate higher frequency service. The Onehunga Rail Line is currently not operating at capacity due to the infrequent rail service and inefficient park-and-ride. Many potential rail users are choosing to begin their train journey from neighbouring stations, such as Penrose, as a result.

If for any reason the upgrades to the heavy rail line between Onehunga and Penrose were unable to be completed to allow for greater frequency of service, the Board advocates that a light rail route between Onehunga and Penrose is established to provide the frequency of service required to meet our growing community needs.

- The Board supports the $1.8 billion in funding for light rail (p. 71) and ask that the city to airport route taken through Onehunga responds to the needs of the local community. Due to previous infrastructure development that has “been done TO Onehunga”, namely SH16 and overhead powerlines, Onehunga is both physically and visually disconnected from the foreshore and Manukau Harbour. We strongly oppose the light rail further severing Onehunga from its natural surroundings and ask that full consideration is made to minimise the negative impact of the light rail route. It is for this reason that we ask that the route from Dominion Road shoulders SH16 and does not come through Onehunga Bay Reserve. We also strongly support connecting Onehunga with Māngere Bridge via light rail.

One option could be that it goes from along SH16 to the new Onehunga Wharf development where two routes could be provided for – one to connect the wharf to the transport hub on or near Onehunga Mall, the other to cross the Māngere ‘new’ Bridge (currently the old pedestrian bridge).
The other option could be coming off SH16 at Princes Street where it goes to the planned transport hub before continuing to Onehunga Wharf and then over the Māngere Bridge. Keeping the tracks along the motorway side of Onehunga Bay Reserve avoids severing the community from Onehunga Reserve and continues to allow full public access. It is a priority for the Board that the light rail services the new wharf development to allow for a mixed-use sympathetic development that incorporates residential, hospitality and retail. The existing road infrastructure would not support development of any kind in this area and with uncertainty of the ‘revised’ East West Link this area needs public transport to allow for future growth and full use of the local amenities.

As noted above, if for any reason the upgrades to the heavy rail line between Onehunga and Penrose were unable to be completed to allow for greater frequency of service, the Board advocates for the establishment of a light rail route between Onehunga and Penrose.

- The Board advocates for a mitigation package to address the adverse impacts on the local community of the $800 million revised East West Link (p. 71). It is crucial that this mitigation package includes funding for the $119 million of local road improvements in Onehunga which are intended to support NZTA’s East West Link project, but which are currently in Auckland Transport’s Capital Programme in the “unfunded category” (p. 70). Funding could come from the $381 million Local Residential Growth Fund intended for areas with residential growth, including special housing areas (pgs. 44, 63). While Onehunga is not a special housing area, it is an area of high residential growth, with an expected population increase of 25% over 10 years.

- The Board expresses concern that the Ellerslie Panmure Highway bus priority improvements are currently unfunded in the RLTP (p. 67). These improvements would help address current safety issues and would provide much needed improvements in journey time and reliability to and from East Auckland. Furthermore, these improvements would support Panmure as a transport hub.

- The Board strongly urges Auckland Transport to use $9 million of the $121 million “Public transport Safety, Security and Amenity and other capital improvements” fund to upgrade the Glen Innes rail station – a project which is currently listed in the “unfunded category” of AT’s Capital Programme (p. 68). We have been told repeatedly by constituents that the current underpass access to the train station is a safety concern. This upgrade, which would involve building an overbridge, is an opportunity to address their concerns and increase patronage. Furthermore, the upgrade provides an opportunity to link the bus station and train station with cycleway/walkways. The overbridge provides an opportunity to connect the shared path from the central city to Glen Innes with the planned Pt England to Panmure greenway, via a greenway that goes from Glen Innes to Pt England. This would enable off-road cycling and walking from Panmure all the way into the central city.

- The Board supports the proposed $197 million funding for the Urban Road Safety Programme (p. 64) and urges AT to use a portion of this to address the Royal Oak roundabout (as we have discussed with AT previously). The Royal Oak roundabout is currently ranked 9th on Auckland’s Top 100 list of high-risk intersections. We also urge AT to address safety issues at the Great South Road/Portage Road intersection and the Jelliscoe Road/Pleasant View Road intersections, as the two intersections also feature on the Top 100 list of high-risk intersections.

- Our community supports investment in infrastructure that supports and incentivises the use of public transport, particularly park-and-ride facilities and bike parking stands. Therefore, the Board notes the $51 million for the Park and Ride Programme (p. 65) and asked that a portion of these funds be used to extend the facilities that our communities are using as park-and-rides at Glen Innes, Onehunga and Panmure, prioritised in that order. All our park-and-ride facilities are oversubscribed and commuters who miss out at the park-and-ride facilities are parking all day in nearby areas causing issues for those who need parking for shorter durations. The Board also notes that $180 million has been set aside for Network Performance (p. 65), which includes first-and-final leg trials and implementation and ask that Onehunga is chosen as one of the trial areas. If funding were provided for such a trial, then we would rescind our request for park-and-ride funding for Onehunga.
The Board support the proposed $15 million in funding for the Sylvia Park Bus Improvements Project (p. 65) which will deliver a new bus station and route at Sylvia Park which will allow buses to avoid the more congested Mt Wellington Highway intersections.

Our community has told us in our Local Board Plan engagement that they value safe and secure walking and cycling connections. Further, LTP feedback shows Maungakiekie-Tamaki residents still value walking and cycling as it complements public transport and works to reduce congestion. As such, we support the $153 million Urban Cycleways Programme (p. 65) and the $338 million Walking and Cycling Programme (p. 65), and request that greenways be built and connected-up to ensure that people can cycle or walk from Panmure into the central city on paths which are separated from vehicles.

Furthermore, the Board support the $5 million in funding from Auckland Transport to complete the Orakei shared path (p64) and the $3 million in NZTA’s investment programme for the investigation of potential southern cycle link connecting Newmarket to Ellerslie/Penrose (p. 72).

We recognise that walking and cycling contribute indirectly to non-transport related outcomes desired by our community, particularly health and wellbeing as well as reducing carbon emissions and traffic congestion.

Our community have told us that a cleaner environment is essential to their quality of life so we urge AT to prioritise installation of catch pit pollutant traps at roadsides in the Maungakiekie-Tamaki area. Pollutant traps in our area could improve the poor water quality of both the Tāmaki Estuary and Manukau Harbours, as well as Omaru Creek and Miami Streams which are among the most polluted waterways in Auckland.

The Board supports the proposed the $41 million earmarked to fund local road upgrades, improvements to Glen Innes town centre, and enhanced linkages to public transport delivered in conjunction with the Tamaki Regeneration Project (p 63).

The Board requests that a portion of the $195 million Safer Communities and Speed Management funding (p 64) be used to address the unsafe self-explaining roads in Glen Innes. Unfortunately, the design of the roads introduced new safety hazards which now must be addressed as a matter of priority.

Finally, the Board requests that in due course, public feedback from Maungakiekie-Tamaki residents on the RLTP be shared with us.

The Maungakiekie-Tamaki Local Board supports the draft Developments Contributions Policy subject to the following comments:

a. Support the proposed increase in development contributions so that general ratepayers are not burdened by funding the needs generated by growth and much needed development is not deferred or halted.

b. Support the creation of the Greater Tāmaki funding area and looks forward to working closely with staff to ensure that growth projects that are being considered for funding include infrastructure projects that have been raised by our community in and around Tāmaki.

c. Note that there significant growth anticipated in the Maungakiekie-Tamaki local board area with large housing redevelopments taking place and/or planned in Tāmaki, Panmure, Onehunga, Oranga and Riverside. As such, the board and the community expect to see substantial investment in upgrading community infrastructure in and around these areas.

d. Request support from officers to plan, scope and identify community outcomes and aspirations which are eligible for development contributions/growth funding.
e. Requests officers and CCOs to incorporate community outcomes in large infrastructure developments that are planned and funded from development contributions.

f. Notes that there are community-owned infrastructure (eg halls, marae) which offer significant community outcomes and there may be cases where it is more cost-effective for Auckland Council to support upgrades to those facilities instead of building new ones.

g. The local board advocates for financial support from growth funding towards the upgrade of the Ruapotaka Marae in Tamaki which is a community-owned facility that is a valued part of our local network of community facilities.

h. Requests more transparency in the Council processes for allocation of development contributions that are received.
Oturerei
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Resolution number OR/2018/10

That the Otaherei Local Board:

f) provides the following feedback based on the feedback the Board has received as part of the consultation process on the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 as follows:

i) that if the Governing Body resolves to set a regional fuel tax at 10 cents per litre (plus GST), the Otaherei Local Board requests that the regional fuel tax be used to raise more funding for transport projects and services.

CARRIED

13 Draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and draft Contributions Policy

The Board’s feedback on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal and draft Contributions Policy were tabled. A copy of the tabled documents immediately follow at the end of these minutes.

Resolution number OR/2018/11

MOVED by Chairman C Davis, seconded by Member T Millar:

That the Otaherei Local Board formally endorses its tabled feedback on:

a) the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, noting that the Board presented this feedback at the Regional Transport Plan Committee, Local Boards Hearing on Monday 7 May 2018

b) the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal

c) the draft Contributions Policy.

CARRIED

Item 13:

Otaherei Local Board feedback on the Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028

Otaherei Local Board believes environment and an efficient and safe transport system are key ingredients to a healthy and resilient Auckland. We also recognise that in addressing the five challenges there will be conflicts which need to be resolved.

Broadly speaking the RLTP supports what is in the Otaherei Local Board Plan 2017-2020, particularly our outcome - People can move around our area easily and safely, an extract from our plan is attached. We hope that the RLTP remains flexible to cope with the changes that will occur in the next decade whilst delivering value for money for Aucklanders.

We recognise that the RLTP is based on the premise that the Regional Fuel Tax for Auckland will be approved. Even if the RFT is not approved, there are projects in Appendix 1a which must go ahead regardless, for example the Otaherei shared path. Otaherei shared
path must be provided for to achieve the full potential of the Glen Innes to Tāmaki Drive Shared Path and to ensure economies of scale make it affordable.

**Board specific projects in the RLTP -**

**Ōrākei shared path** (P64) - We are pleased to see the inclusion of the ‘Ōrākei shared path’, also known as the Gowing Drive linkage. This project has been widely supported through our Local Board Plan consultation last year, and has been very well received from our communities as our One Local Initiative advocacy consultation through the Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

We request the use of the term ‘Gowing Drive linkage’ instead of ‘Ōrākei shared path’ as we have concern that the public will be confused due to the change of name. ‘Ōrākei shared path’ can also be easily confused with the GI to Tāmaki Drive shared path.

The project is key to providing a viable linkage for students accessing local schools, and commuters to the Glen Innes to Tāmaki Drive shared path. It connects several neighbouring suburbs that are cut off from each other by the rail line. The project easily sits under all of your five pillars and assists in opening up the GI to Tāmaki Drive shared path to another large catchment. It is particularly important to ensure our local students use safe routes to get to school. However, we do question the $5 million figure, and believe additional funding should be set aside for the linkage. To ensure value for money is met through procurement and construction, the project should be aligned for delivery at the same time as the construction of the GI to Tāmaki shared path.

We have also shown our commitment to this project by committing up to $2 million of funding to its development.

**Tāmaki Drive** (P64) - We are also pleased to see the inclusion of a Tāmaki Drive resilience investigation but would like to see more than just plans, action is needed. The flooding mitigation issues for this important road must be a priority.

We support projects that protect Tāmaki Drive and assist in reducing congestion. Focus on bus reliability should be extended along Tāmaki Drive and into Ōrākei Local Board area to ease congestion.

We would hope that the Seismic Strengthening Programme will include seawalls in the Ōrākei Local Board area, and that any work done will be aligned with other construction works to ease disruption.

**Patteison Avenue** (P70) – There is insufficient details, however, we support improvements to the bus network onto Tāmaki Drive as long pedestrian safety, recent improvements and businesses are not affected negatively.

**Morrin to Merton Road connection** (P70) – We support safety improvements and improving network capacity in this area but request full engagement with the local board and community before works occur.

**Wider projects –**

**Funding of projects** – There should be clear mention that the proposed Regional Fuel Tax is key to delivering the content, in particular local projects, of the RLTP. We support the
Local Board Projects listed in Appendix 1a being funded even if the RFT is not progressed. These projects should be based on the merits of community need, endorsement and satisfying region-wide initiatives of enhancing transport alternatives and safe routes accessibility for our constituents.

**Accessibility through improved network** – We support the extension of the public transport network to all our suburbs. Parts of our area have historically had a limited availability of frequent public transport and would benefit greatly from an improved public transport network.

**Improved technologies** – We support the use of new technologies to reduce congestion and would like the use of dynamic lanes to be investigated on appropriate arterial roads for peak times. Improved traffic light sequencing should be identified at all controlled intersections, and consideration given to shorter sequences at off-peak times such as 1-5am at identified intersections.

**Congestion pricing** (P41) – we support an investigation into the feasibility of introducing congestion pricing and strongly support it being prioritised.

**Whole of Bus Route Priority Phase 1** (P34) – We support the proposed programme and request that Auckland Transport work with local businesses and residents to ensure as little disruption as possible to the business areas.

**Vision Zero** (P31) – We support the Vision Zero approach and would value working with Auckland Transport and the community on making this a reality.

**Ferries** (P35) – We support the completion of the Future Ferry Strategy for Auckland, and would encourage investigation of the viability of water-based transport for the eastern bay suburbs such as water-taxis. This includes using existing infrastructure such as the Ōrākei wharf to get to the premium tourist attraction – Kelly Tarlton’s.

**Walking and Cycling** – We would like Auckland Transport to take into account the local path and greenway plans that local boards have and are developing. They are an important contributor to providing safe recreational and commuter connections for Aucklanders.

**LED street lighting** (P43) – We support the rollout of LED street lighting to reduce energy use, but would like the priority to be towards lights needing an upgrade to ensure we are being prudent with rate-payer money. Auckland Transport should be working with Vector to under-ground lines where possible.

**Environmental maintenance** – We strongly support improved environmental outcomes, particularly proactive projects such as the reduction of carbon emissions. Although this is a reactive measure, we would like to see the use of tetratrap used on all roads that neighbour a waterway or are heavily used. We have concern that Auckland Transport’s maintenance within the natural environment is not up to standard. The removal of noxious and other weeds is falling behind on Auckland Transport land and property and must be rectified.

**Appendix table 1a.** – We support the projects listed and they should remain unchanged.

**Freight** (P18) –
With freight in Auckland expected to grow substantially in the next 30 years, we have concern on the detrimental effect heavy vehicles have on the residential roads in the Ōrākei Local Board area. We request that appropriate funding for renewals to local roads and environmental alleviations are budgeted for the Ōrākei Local Board area, in particular Kepa Road, Kupe Street, Ngapipi Road, Ōrākei Road and St Johns Road, as well as our local waterways of Hobson Bay, Ōrākei Basin and the Hauraki Gulf. These roads and areas have a large number of schools, the safety of students must always be taken into account.

We note that upgrading the rail network to provide greater capacity for freight is a focus; however, we see this as a priority for Auckland. It will ease congestion, improve the environment and make roads safer. This includes prioritising a third rail line. Rail networks need to be developed in the emerging greenfield sites.

We also note that there is a full restriction on freight trucks turning left out of Mechanic Bay, Ports of Auckland, onto Tāmaki Drive. This should be re-stated as it is not appropriate for heavy vehicles to be using residential routes to access the motorway network.

The Ōrākei Local Board would like to investigate a bylaw to stop heavy vehicles using residential streets, and would value Auckland Transport working with us to achieve safe roads for our residents. Should this not be able to be achieved, we would like an investigation on heavy vehicles not using roads, including motorways, at peak time to ease commuter congestion. This could be achieved by providing areas for stopovers for the drivers.

**Placemaking (P39)** –

We are pleased to see the acknowledgement of local boards as the lead in placemaking. We welcome Auckland Transport in working closely with local boards and using their knowledge of the local area when engaging on local projects.

We support the proposed increase to the Transport Capital Fund for Local Boards. However, we have reservations that the necessary operational expenditure, resource and strategic advice will not be forthcoming, or available to make use of the additional funds.

We see early engagement with communities and businesses as being key to the successful delivery of transport projects. Working with local boards will also assist in this. Improvements must be made by Auckland Transport on their communications of projects and plans, including the consultation on the RLTP.

We would value Auckland Transport working with local boards and business associations in the infancy of a project so that its economic viability if in commercial areas can be fully met.

Along with the increase in freight, we see the residential up-zoning along our arterial routes having an adverse effect on congestion. The increase of growth in urban areas must be considered when improving access and making the most of our existing network.

**What is the plan missing, and how will they be addressed?** –

Clarity on how projects will be funded.

There is no mention of Local Board Plans and how Auckland Transport has aligned to these outcomes. We would expect to see this under ‘Strategic Content’. 56
Wilson’s Beach to Shore Road cycle-path and that network be continued to Tāmaki Drive as mentioned in the Ōrākei Local Board’s Hobson Bay Plan.

Investigate a railway station at Pōruewa Valley to provide better access to public transport and ease congestion.

A shared path through Colin Maiden Park to provide better access to local communities and users of the park.

Ōrākei Local Board feedback on the Regional Fuel Tax for Auckland –

The Ōrākei Local Board supports the Regional Fuel Tax for Auckland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Less important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project 1: Bus Priority Improvements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 2: City Centre Bus infrastructure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 3: Improving Airport access</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 4: AMETI Eastern Busway</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 5: Park and Rides</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 6: Electric trains and stabling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 7: Downtown Ferry Redevelopment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 8: Road Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 9: Active Transport</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 10: Penlink</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 11: Mill Road corridor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 12: Road Corridor improvements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 13: Network Capacity and Performance Improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 14: Growth related transport infrastructure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ōrākei Local Board supports the six key objectives of the programme.

The Board has concerns on the long-term negative effects from the RFT and believes further consideration and necessary addressing should be investigated on –

1. Increased fuel prices leading to more costly travel for private and commercial vehicles.
The Ōrākei Local Board supports the use of congestion pricing over a fuel tax as believes it is more equitable to Aucklanders and would like the investigation of congestions pricing prioritised.

The Board prioritises safety for all transport decisions, but sees education as also being a key initiative in improving the safety record on our roads.

The Ōrākei Local Board supports Project 9, and believes that if the RFT is not approved, the Ōrākei shared path should be supported and funded by Governing Body.

We request the use of the term ‘Gowing Drive linkage’ instead of ‘Ōrākei shared path’ as we have concern that the public will be confused due to the change of name. ‘Ōrākei shared path’ can also be easily confused with the GI to Tāmaki Drive shared path.

The Board requests the inclusion of Tāmaki Drive improvements to be prioritised in Project 12. Tāmaki Drive is a key arterial road to the Eastern Bay’s and must be protected for the long-term.

**Ōrākei Local Board feedback on the Draft Contributions Policy 2018**

The Ōrākei Local Board support the proposed increase in the average urban development contributions to $27,000 to enable the investment in community infrastructure and parks that support housing development.

The Ōrākei Local Board supports the four additional funding areas for transport, which allocates the cost of transport infrastructure to the priority areas in Kumeu/Whenuapai/Redhills, Dairy Flat/Wainui/Silverdale, Greater Tāmaki and Albany.

The Ōrākei Local Board supports the additional funding area for reserves and community in Greater Tāmaki, noting that it will be required so that neighbouring areas are not adversely affected.

The Ōrākei Local Board supports amending the development types of ‘student accommodation’ and ‘aged care rooms’ to better reflect the demand they place on infrastructure.

The Ōrākei Local Board supports the changes to the definitions of the following development types:

- Small ancillary dwelling units
- Retirement villages
- Accommodation units for short term rental

The Ōrākei Local Board supports the status quo for payment timing for residential developments.
Otara-Papatoetoe
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Resolution number OP/2018/59

MOVED by Chairperson L Fuli, seconded by Deputy Chairperson R Robertson:

That the Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

f) provide feedback on the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 (Attachment E).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board Feedback on 10 Year Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport- Regional Fuel Tax (RFT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General Support for the RFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Congestion needs to be fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Congestion Charges need to be considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need more T2 and T4 lanes to encourage carpooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disproportionately affects people in our local board area, this board would like to see more transformation projects in the Otara Papatoetoe area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A copy of the boards revised feedback (Attachment A) was tabled at the meeting and has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Resolution number OP/2018/77

MOVED by Chairperson L Fuli, seconded by Member R Autagavaia:

That the Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

a) approve the board’s feedback to Auckland Transport on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan and the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal, in the tabled document (Attached to the minutes).

b) support in principle the increased urban and greenfield development contributions proposed in the draft Contributions Policy, recognising the costs that growth imposes, but request more time to develop local board feedback on regional policies in future.

CARRIED

Attachments

A Auckland Transport on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan and the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal feedback
Attachment A

Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028 & Regional Fuel Tax Submission
Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board

**SUBMISSION**
To the Auckland Transport Board of Directors regarding the Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028 and Regional Fuel Tax

**Summary**

1. The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board understands that transport is a complex issue. Congestion is getting worse and safety is becoming more of an issue, especially in our local board area. It is essential that the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) addresses these issues at a practical level.

2. We support the ‘Vision Zero’ concept and have identified the Ormiston Rd to East Tamaki road connection (Ormiston/Preston/East Tamaki Road Reconfiguration) and the Portage Road and Station Road Intersection upgrade and roundabout installation as practical steps forward in making this vision a reality.

3. We also support the investigation, design and route protection for a new rapid transit route from Auckland International Airport to Botany via Manukau City Centre, including Puhinui. However we strongly advocate for a light rail option over any bus options. We note Auckland Airport has also advocated for light rail.

4. The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board recognise that the Regional Fuel tax (RFT) can disproportionately impact low income people in Ōtara-Papatoetoe, but recognise the need to fund significant transport infrastructure in Auckland, and accordingly support the RFT.

**Submission**

Regional Land and Transport Plan

5. The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board supports the inclusion of the these project in the Auckland Transport Capital Project:
- Protection and CAPEX, but advocate for light rail from the start, in preference to bus rapid transit (Table 1B)
- Middlemore rail station upgrade (Table 1B)
- Infrastructure supporting development in Manukau Centre (Clist Cres and Barrowcliffe Pl) (Table 1B)
- Infrastructure supporting development in Puhinui corridor - McLaughlans Rd - Prices Rd link and bus priority improvements on Puhinui Rd (Table 1B)
- Ormiston Rd to East Tamaki Rd connection, (Table 1B)

6. Request that these projects be added to the Auckland Transport Capital Programme:

- Portage Road and Station Road intersection – install roundabout
- Development of the Southern Spur rail line
- Intersection upgrade and realignment at St. George/Kolmar Rd/Wallace Rd.

7. The Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board have advocated for several years and would request that the Portage Road and Station Road intersection upgrade - roundabout installation be included in the Auckland Transport Capital programme.

8. There have been fatalities in the recent past and as congestion worsens this intersection is becoming more and more unsafe for local community, especially our primary, intermediate and college students.

Ormiston Rd to East Tamaki road connection- Ormiston/Preston/East Tamaki Road Reconfiguration

9. For years the Ōtara Papatoetoe Local Board has been advocating for the reconfiguration of the Ormiston Road/Preston Road/ East Tamaki Road intersection. From 2012-16 there have been two fatalities, three serious accidents and over 60 minor incidents with the potential for more if nothing is done. This does not include the two fatalities between 2010-11

10. The project itself is at an advanced stage where delivery can happen sooner rather than later. Business cases, concept plans and the land for realignment have already been purchased and are owned by the council.
11. We support the ‘Zero Vision’ concept, the Government Strategic Plan on Land Transport and the Auckland Transport Alignment Project both put heavy emphasis on safety. This project would be a practical step forward in achieving what has been set out in these plans.

Light Rail from Airport to Botany via Manukau

12. For years this board has been advocating for rail from Auckland Airport through SH20B to Puhinui Station to Manukau and through to Botany. We note the former Auckland Regional Council concluded Heavy Rail would be the best option for both SH20A and SH20B. We understand Heavy Rail is no longer an option and therefore advocate for Light Rail along SH20B.

13. The Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP) shows significantly higher growth figures in the South over the next ten to thirty years over any other sub-region. To accommodate the growth immediate prioritisation of this corridor improvement and mass rapid transit-light rail is the way forward.

14. With the expansion of the Airport and majority of workers in the area coming from the South, congestion is going to get worse. Light rail will allow more people to access Auckland and alleviate congestion while still allowing tourist to experience the rich cultural vibrancy of the south, rather than going straight past it.

15. We note Auckland Airport has also publicly advocated for Light Rail. We understand a study was undertaken by Auckland Transport to assess whether Light Rail or Rapid Bus option would be suitable.

16. We are therefore dismayed that the RLTP currently only proposes additional lanes along SH20B for high occupancy lanes, supporting bus, freight and carpooling.

17. If Light Rail will not be implemented in the near future, then proper dedicated bus lanes should be installed along SH20B for the short term. Sharing lanes with other vehicles will diminish the effectiveness of any rapid mass transport option along SH20B.

Regional Fuel Tax
18. This board would want to see congestion charges be investigated in our most congested areas (Auckland CBD) as another source of funds. International examples like London and Singapore would be good examples as a starting point.

19. This board would like to see more T2, T3 and T4 lanes to encourage carpooling as a result lessens congestion on roads at peak times.

20. This board would expect that the RFT would avoid disproportionate effects on people in the Ōtara-Papatoetoe area.

Signed

[Signature]

Lotu Fuli - Chair of the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board

Date 11 May 2018
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Resolution number PPK/2018/12

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson F Auva’a, seconded by Member K Winn:

That the Papakura Local Board:

d) provide the following feedback on the 10-year Budget 2018-2028:

| 1. Transport - Regional Fuel Tax | The Papakura Local Board agrees that an increase in revenue is required to speed up progress on roading and public transport initiatives.

However, the board fears there will be no direct benefit from revenue raised through a regional fuel tax for employees in South Auckland or Papakura residents because:

- There is a lack of public transport options available for people living in the South, yet a lot of growth is occurring in the South;
- The funding is most likely to be spent on projects benefitting central Auckland (Dominion Road connection through to the Auckland Airport).

The board does not feel that there have been sufficient reasons given as to why a change to the current funding structure (e.g. the transport levy) is required.

The board questions whether or not alternative funding mechanisms have been explored thoroughly enough like for instance:

- congestion charge;
- road tolling;
- congestion charge for the city centre;
- public private partnerships funding mechanisms.

The proposed regional fuel tax is usually regressive in nature and will most affect those who can least afford it.

The board strongly feels that Council should take measures to mitigate the inequities associated with this form of tax. Council should therefore prioritise investing in improved transport options for South Auckland and Papakura and invest in projects like:
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Resolution number PPK/2018/13

MOVED by Member W McEntee, seconded by Member K Winn:

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) provide the following feedback on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan:

i) The Papakura Train Station park and ride is a project that will support the transition of the Papakura town centre into a metropolitan centre while creating an opportunity to increase passenger boardings.

ii) The board is supportive of the funding allocated to the Redoubt Road - Mill Road corridor project and funding for phase 2 must be committed to ensure the infrastructure is in place to support the rapid growth in and around Papakura.

iii) The board believes there is a potential risk that Phase 1 of Mill Road will increase the pressure on the traffic flows into Papakura.

iv) The board has concerns about the safety of cyclists on the on-road cycle lane on Great South Road. The board is supportive of the plans to upgrade Great South Road and include a bus lane, however, the board and the Papakura community has signalled that the Great South Road cycleway must be relocated to a shared cycle pedestrian carriageway parallel to the road, to ensure the safety of cyclists.

v) Grade separation to improve east-west links – the board is supportive of plans to progressively improve and remove road/rail level crossings to manage safety risks.

vi) Grade separation in Papakura at Walters Road, Rangi Road and Taka Street needs to be prioritised to support the growth in the immediate and surrounding areas.

vii) Takanini train station and parking facilities upgrade – the board is appreciative of the works currently being scoped to upgrade the platforms and parking facilities at Takanini train station. The project will have a positive impact on the local community and increase passenger boardings.

viii) Rail network and facilities – the board is supportive of the proposed
expansion of the rail network, including:
- the third and fourth railway lines
- electrification of the line to Pukekohe
ix) The development of a train station at Drury should be aligned with the implementation of the structure plan.
x) The board would like to see a rail connection towards the airport.
xii) Speed limits around rural schools - a priority for the board is lowering the speed limits around schools on roads currently zoned rural but with significant development in the immediate surrounds.
xii) The board would like to see a flexible approach from Auckland Transport regarding the application of speed policies. This approach is in line with the ‘Safe System/Vision Zero’ approach described in the RLTP.
xiii) Implementation of the Greenways plan – the board would like to work with Auckland Transport to phase the implementation of the Papakura Local Board Greenways projects.

b) provide the following feedback on the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal:

i) The Papakura Local Board agree that an increase in revenue is required to speed up progress on roading and public transport initiatives.

iii) The board fears there will be no direct benefit from revenue raised through a regional fuel tax for employees in South Auckland or Papakura residents because:
- there is a lack of public transport options available for people living in the South, yet a lot of growth is occurring in the South;
- the funding is most likely to be spent on projects benefitting central Auckland (Dominion Road connection through to the Auckland Airport).

iv) The board does not feel that there have been sufficient reasons given as to why a change to the current funding structure (e.g. the transport levy) is required.

v) The board questions whether or not alternative funding mechanisms have been explored thoroughly enough like for instance:
- congestion charge
- road tolling
- congestion charge for the city centre
- public private partnerships funding mechanisms.

vi) The proposed regional fuel tax is usually regressive in nature and will most affect those who can least afford it.

vii) The board strongly feels that Council should take measures to mitigate the inequities associated with this form of tax.
viii) Council should therefore prioritise investing in improved transport options for South Auckland and Papakura and invest in projects like:

- the Mill Road corridor project
- a third rail line
- a bridge from Karaka to Weymouth
- a rail link to the airport or light rail from Manukau to the airport the airport
- a rail link loop from Puhinui and/or Onehunga to the airport.

CARRIED

Resolution number PPK/2018/14

MOVED by Member K Winn, seconded by Member MV Turner:

That the Papakura Local Board:

c) delegate authority to the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson to draft the Papakura Local Board feedback on the draft Development Contributions Policy.

CARRIED
Papakura Local Board Feedback on the Development Contributions Policy

The Papakura Local Board provides the following feedback on the Development Contributions (DCs) Policy being consulted on along with the Regional Land Transport Plan and the Regional Fuel Tax from 1 May to 14 May 2018:

1. The board supports the proposed amendment to the Development Contributions Policy to increase the average urban development contribution from $20,000 to $27,000.

2. The board believes development contributions should be spent in or nearby the area where they are collected from.

3. The board wishes to highlight the fact that there is significant growth happening in the south, that will require additional transport infrastructure. The board believes that the Drury Structure Plan area, the Manurewa/Takanini/Papakura Integrated Area Plan area and the growth occurring in Hingaia should be acknowledged through the inclusion of an additional funding area in the Development Contributions Policy.

4. The board agrees with the proposed amendments to the development types to better reflect the demand they place on infrastructure, i.e. “student accommodation units” and “aged care rooms”.

5. The board agrees with the proposed adjustments to the payment timings for residential developments, i.e:
   * developments that create five or more dwelling units will be classified as non-residential developments. This will allow the DCs assessment to be invoiced at time the Code Compliance Certificate (CCC) is applied for. This will extend the time until council receives payment by an average of 9-15 months.
   * all other residential developments will be charged six months after building consent is issued.

Brent Catchpole
Chairperson
Papakura Local Board

Felicity Auva’a
Deputy Chairperson
Papakura Local Board
Puketapapa
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Mary Hay, Senior Local Board Advisor - Puketapapa, and David Rose, Lead Financial Advisor, spoke to this item.

Resolution number PKTPP/2018/15

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson J Fairey, seconded by Member D Holm:

f) provide feedback on the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, as follows:
   i) supports the proposed Regional Fuel Tax, noting majority support from submitters from the Puketapapa Local Board area, and people who attended the local Have Your Say, who cited the need to improve public transport.

CARRIED

Note: Member E Kumar requested that her dissenting vote be recorded against Items c) i) and f) i).
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Mary Hay, Senior Local Board Advisor - Puketapapa, and Ben Moimo, Local Board Advisor - Puketapapa, spoke to this item.

Resolution number PKTPP/2018/63

MOVED by Member D Holm, seconded by Member A-M Coury:

That the Puketapapa Local Board give formal written feedback on:

a) the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan
b) the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal
c) the draft Contributions Policy.
d) thank officer Mary Hay and Ben Moimo for their attendance.

CARRIED

Note: Member E Kumar requested that her dissenting vote be recorded against Item f) i).

Attachments
A 20180510 Puketapapa Local Board Item 14: Draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and draft Contributions Policy - Feedback

Attachment A

Feedback on:
Draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and draft Contributions Policy
10 May 2018

For clarifications and questions, please contact:
Mary Hay, Senior Local Board Advisor (Puketāpapa Local Board)

a) Draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP)

The Puketāpapa Local Board provides feedback on the RLTP in the table below. However, it would like to highlight the importance of the four issues below:

1. **Light rail**
   - Compared with other local board areas, Puketapapa has received limited capital investment in public transport. Improvements are limited to double decker buses and bus priority routes. This highlights the importance of a light rail transport option
   - Construction of light rail will need to include an effective communication strategy for business to ensure that disruption is kept to a minimum. The board cites the successful retail strategy adopted with the City Rail Link project

1. **Coordination with HNZ/HLC**
   - Housing NZ/HLC are undertaking significant redevelopment of its housing stock in Puketapapa, particularly in the Mt Roskill area. There will need to be appropriate transport infrastructure to support this.
   - Collaborating with HNZ/HLC will assist with leveraging resources from a variety of sources and therefore contribute to positive outcomes.

2. **Increased funding for footpaths**
   - There has been limited investment in footpaths in Puketapapa. Auckland Transport has advised that they do not prioritise these because they do not attract a subsidy.
   - There will be increasing competition for space on footpaths with the growing number of seniors, increasing cyclists/walkers and increasing number of waste collection bins. This is raising safety concerns regarding potential conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists.

3. **Park and Ride**
   - The board is seeking an assessment of the land on the corner of Denbeigh Avenue and Dominion Road for a Park and Ride facility. If this is not suitable then other park and ride options need to be found. The local board is willing to contemplate park and ride users being charged for this service, as long as it’s affordable and encourages people to use the service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>The board supports the following proposals in the draft 2018-2028 RLTP:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focusing on increasing safety and lowering deaths and serious injuries on the transport network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Improving cycle and walking networks to encourage active transport
- Bus priority improvements in order to improve public transport, increase productivity and lower the environmental impact of transport
- NZTA Investment Programme: Light Rail from the city to the airport and the Manukau Harbour Crossing (Walking and Cycling)
- KiwiRail Capital Programme: The upgrade of Onehunga Rail Line to accommodate higher frequency service.

Note: the board is strongly in support of a Regional Fuel Tax and an increase in the Local Board Transport Capital Fund and provision of a fund for transport feasibility studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seeks plan amendments</th>
<th>The board also advocates for the following improvements to the draft RLTP:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Funding the Housing NZ Projects – Transport infrastructure improvements to support Housing New Zealand / HLC development at Mount Roskill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased promotion of the benefits of light rail to both the community along the corridor, including present users of buses, as well as to the wider region. Answers to the Frequently Asked Questions about the project should be highlighted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The local board seeks access to relevant (area specific) data from outcomes measured. (See draft RLTP, 07 - Measuring outcomes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Subsidies from the New Zealand Transport Agency to include footpath work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Park and ride facilities within Puketapapa and the consideration of user payment for this offering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Funding village upgrades if not included in NZTA Rapid Transit/Light Rail projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Investigating bikes on buses (and light rail) in order to encourage active transport and the integration of networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Investigating the relocation of pylons along the Waikowhai coast as well as the consideration of tolling in any East West Link developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A emphasis on the Manukau Harbour within the Environmental sustainability infrastructure project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A thorough investigation of ferries in the Manukau Harbour as part of the Future Ferry Strategy for Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Funding for the SH20 / Queenstown Road / Hendry Avenue project within the NZTA Investment Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal
   - The board supports the Regional Fuel tax proposal

c) Draft Contributions Policy 2018
   - The board supports the draft Contributions Policy 2018
Rodney
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Resolution number RD/2018/16

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson P Pirrie, seconded by Member L Johnston:

That the Rodney Local Board:

f) provide the following feedback on the 10-year Budget 2018-2028:

i. support the Regional Fuel Tax provided that it will enable the delivery of the package of projects outlined in the Regional Land Transport Plan that includes key transport projects in Rodney such as $121 million for additional road sealing

CARRIED
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Resolution number RD/2018/17

MOVED by Chairperson B Houlbrooke, seconded by Member B Bailey:

That the Rodney Local Board:

a) provide the following feedback on the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan:

i. support the increased funding for road sealing, totalling $121 million over 10 years, and request that the funding is delivered at the rate of $12 million per year for each of the 10 years of the Plan

Road Resilience

ii. request an increase in the planned budget for road maintenance, particularly in rural areas, noting that a lack of maintenance is a leading cause of complaints from residents in Rodney

iii. request a change to the methodology for road maintenance to enable a full rebuild of road base and potential cap seal or maintenance seal to be applied

Public Transport

iv. support the focus on public transport in the Plan, in particular the opportunities it brings to connect Rodney’s rural towns and villages to the wider transport network

v. suggest that the Plan include consideration of innovative approaches to the challenges, that we have in rural areas to embracing public transport

vi. acknowledge that light rail to the North West is a good long-term goal, but request that the Plan consider an interim solution to the congestion issues that are facing this area now, such as trains to Huapai, which is strongly supported by the community

Road Safety

vii. note that Rodney has the highest/worst Death and Serious Injury (DSI) statistics of all local boards

viii. support the allocation of $140 million over 10 years for road safety
improvements and request that Rodney be prioritised to receive this expenditure given the current DSI statistics

ix. consider that addressing road safety will require a multi-faceted approach, including:
   a. addressing unsealed metal roads and improving the maintenance or sealing of them
   b. constructing footpaths and greenways for pedestrian safety
   c. improving dangerous intersections where people get frustrated and take risks

Key Projects

x. support the inclusion of these funded projects in the Plan in addition to those funded by New Zealand Transport Agency:
   a. Road Sealing $36 million and $85 million
   b. Dairy Flat Highway safety improvements $17 million
   c. Station Rd/Tapu Rd/SH16 intersection upgrade $37 million
   d. Rural Road Safety Program $121 million
   e. Matakana Link Road $89 million

xi. support the inclusion of these key New Zealand Transport Agency projects in the Plan:
   a. SH1 – Dome Valley safety improvements project
   b. SH1 – Puhoi to Warkworth, support the completion of this RON project
   c. SH1 – Warkworth to Wellsford, investigation of delivery for this RON project
   d. SH1 – north of Albany improvements, in particular the extension of the dedicated northern busway
   e. SH1 – Hill Street intersection improvements
   f. SH16 – Brighams Creek to Waimauku safety improvements
   g. SH16 – Helensville to Wellsford safety improvements
   h. SH16/Kahikatea Flat Road intersection improvements
   i. SH16 Stoney Creek Road to Helensville safer corridor
   j. Supporting Growth Alliance to look at route protection for the preferred network in the North West, and North growth areas.

xii. support the inclusion of these projects in the Plan and welcome any future funding being allocated to them:
   a. Wainui Growth Projects $25 million
   b. Postman Rd, Dairy Flat upgrade (for Penlink) $67 million
   c. Redhills to Coatesville Riverhead Highway arterial $314 million
   d. Matakana Road to Sandspit Road realignment (Hill Street intersection) $51 million
   e. Western Collector, Warkworth $68 million
   f. Warkworth Park and Ride $15 million
   g. Infrastructure to support development in Matakana $2 million

Other Issues

xiii. request that the funds from the Araparera Joint Forestry Venture be shown in the Regional Land Transport plan to more accurately reflect the funding to be applied for road sealing in the legacy Northern Riding area of the Rodney ward

xiv. note that a decision on the proposed Rodney Local Board Transport Targeted Rate will be made on 24 May 2018

xv. request that when the decision is made on the Regional Land Transport Plan that communications confirming the projects in the Rodney Local Board area are publicised.

b) provide the following feedback on the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal:
i. support the regional fuel tax on the basis that it is needed in order to provide the package of projects outlined in the Regional Land Transport Plan, including key projects in Rodney such as $121 million for additional road sealing

ii. support the inclusion of the following Regional Fuel Tax projects:
   a. park and rides, and in particular requests that park and rides in Kumeu and Warkworth be made a priority, and request the expansion of the park and ride facilities in Albany and Silverdale
   b. road sealing
   c. road safety, particularly in rural areas
   d. active transport, and request that Rodney’s town centres receive an equitable share of this expenditure
   e. road corridor improvements, in particular the Matakanui Link Road
   f. growth related transport infrastructure.

CARRIED

c) provide the following feedback on the draft Contributions Policy:

i. notes that the level of growth in Rodney vastly exceeds the amount of funding available to build much needed infrastructure to keep up with growth

ii. support the increase to the development contributions in greenfield areas to reflect the additional investment required by growth

iii. requests that the draft Funding Areas be reduced in size to more accurately reflect the needs of growing communities, for example, the current Transport Funding Area is so large it allows contributions collected from a development in Warkworth to fund transport improvements in Takapuna, even though residents in Warkworth will not receive any benefit

iv. support the review of the policy if/when the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill is passed which would allow council to use development contributions to fund public swimming pools, libraries and other community facilities.
Upper Harbour
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Resolution number UHCF/2018/15

MOVED by Member N Mayne, seconded by Member U Balouch:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board Community Forum:

d) provide the following feedback on the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 after considering the feedback received on the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 from the Upper Harbour community:

i. Question 1 (Transport): the board notes that at the time this issue was consulted on, Government’s own proposed fuel tax was not public knowledge. The board has no confidence that the feedback received to council’s proposal would remain the same had consultation occurred after Government’s proposal was released

CARRIED

19 Draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and draft Contributions Policy

The Local Board Advisor was in attendance to support the item.

A copy of the board’s final submission was provided at the meeting. A copy has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

Resolution number UH/2018/44

MOVED by Member N Mayne, seconded by Chairperson L Whyte:

That the Upper Harbour Local Board:

a) adopt the submission tabled as Attachment A as its feedback to the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan.

b) note that in its view, the public feedback on the draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal undertaken as part of the long-term plan process may not be reliable, as government’s own fuel tax proposal was not public knowledge at the time of the council public consultation. Notwithstanding that caveat, the Upper Harbour Local Board supports the outcomes that the draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal will enable.

c) support the draft Contributions Policy as it recognises that new development requires appropriate council infrastructure and facilities, and that it is appropriate that the ‘developer’ generating this demand contributes to meeting the capital costs that council must incur to support this increased demand.

CARRIED

Attachments

A Upper Harbour Local Board submission to the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan

Attachment A

Upper Harbour Local Board feedback on the Draft Regional Land Transport Plan Introduction
Thank you for the opportunity for the Upper Harbour Local Board (the board) to provide comment on the draft Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). The board regrets that the consultation period for the RLTP has been so short as it reduces the opportunity for our community to provide its views. Notwithstanding that concern, the board acknowledges the challenges that Auckland Transport has faced preparing the RLTP, due to the timing and changes to Government’s Draft Government Policy Statement for transport and the revision of the Auckland Transport Alignment Project.

**Executive Summary**

The board congratulates Auckland Transport on the RLTP proposal. The RLTP correctly identifies the challenges facing Auckland and the board believes that, in the main, the document is well thought through. The board welcomes the funded projects identified for the Upper Harbour area.

In the board’s view there are a number of areas where further thought and consideration is needed, before the final RLTP is adopted. The board believes that its suggestions provide a local lens through which Auckland Transport can consider the issues important to our community.

**Recommendations**

The board recommends that:

- Auckland Transport notes the board’s preferred projects, identified from Appendix 1 Table 1B – Auckland Transport Capital Programme – additional items currently unfunded, for further consideration should additional funding become available:
  - Northern busway enhancements
  - West Harbour ferry terminal
  - Enhanced park and ride programme
  - Westgate to Greenhithe RTN stations
  - Albany Heights intersection improvements
  - Albany Highway(Sunset to SH18) corridor improvements
  - Investigation and route protection for future priorities (Henderson to Albany / Constellation …) NZTA SH16/SH18 connection and Squadron Drive improvements

- early engagement with local boards takes place as regional programme budgets start to be disaggregated to the project level

- Auckland Transport provide assurance that local roads will not be allowed to deteriorate beyond acceptable service standards as a result of re-prioritisation of renewals budgets

- greater emphasis and funding is provided to encourage mode, switching to active and public transport for shorter journeys

- increased investment in park and ride facilities at the Northern Busway Stations is made, and that the new northern network feeder bus system is reviewed 6 to 12 months after implementation to allow for it to be fine-tuned

- increased ferry services are commissioned (together with integrated local bus services) for Hobsonville Point and Hobsonville Marina

- planning for a rapid transit route alongside State Highway 18 be progressed, so that it can be actively considered for construction during the next RLTP

- further consideration of the proposed outcome measures for; cycling, public transport, commuting active and sustainable mode share, and school active and sustainable mode share be undertaken
- local road and public transport prioritisation improvements are undertaken to support the success of the Rosedale Busway Station
- demand responsive transport be considered for growth areas such as Whenuapai, to ensure that new residents have the opportunity to develop the public transport habit
- local road network improvements around Whenuapai be undertaken to increase safety and functionality to support the planned population growth.

Upper Harbour Context
The Upper Harbour Local Board area is currently on the periphery of the substantive Auckland metropolitan area. It includes the suburbs of Whenuapai, Herald Island and Hobsonville in the west, Paremoremo, Greenhithe, Albany, Rosedale, Northcross, Unsworth and Pinehill in the east.

The Draft Auckland Plan projects growth from the current estimated 83,610 to 148,420 by 2051. This equates to some 233 percent above current levels. The distribution of this population is projected to change, with increasing density overall and a substantial greenfields growth in the Whenuapai area.

Figure 1 Upper Harbour population density and growth projection

As this projected development occurs, Upper Harbour will no longer be at the edge, but enveloped into the metropolitan area as Auckland expands North and North West. Over time it will far more resemble current board areas, such as Kapātiki and Whāau. These areas are metropolitan in nature, and residents expect better service provision by Auckland Transport, given their higher population numbers and population density. Due to the long lead in times for infrastructure provision, the board believes it is essential that planning for future infrastructure and service provision is underway now.

While Upper Harbour is often thought of as being an affluent area with high access to private vehicles, there are many in the community who are transport disadvantaged due to disability, age (young and old), recent immigration status or income, and whom are reliant on other transport modes.

---

1 Draft Auckland Plan, belonging and participation population growth
2 Graphic taken from Strategic Play Provision Assessment, UHLB commissioned research 2018.
The Albany area is an important sub-regional employment hub, with some 28,000 jobs in the North Harbour Business Association Area, it is also home to Massey University’s Albany campus. The northern busway provides a further traffic generator for the area, with the current park and ride areas overflowing into neighbouring streets and reserves, part way through the morning traffic peak.

The Albany employment area attracts workers from across the wider northern part of the region.\(^3\)

![Figure 2 Journey to work patterns to the Albany area.](image)

Many residents also work in the Takapuna and central business district areas.

![Figure 3 Journey patterns to Takapuna and the Central Business District](image)

The board acknowledges that as part of the northern bus network review, additional feeder bus services will be provided to the two current busway stations (Albany and Constellation), and that an additional busway station (Rosedale) is planned as part of the Northern Corridor Improvement project.

The position of these stations near the edge of the current metropolitan area means that for many busway patrons, private vehicle use will remain the only practicable means of

\(^3\) North Harbour Business Association submission to Auckland Transport, Albany Parking Consultation 2017.

\(^4\) N.B. the North Harbour Business Association business improvement district only covers part of the wider Albany area.

accessing the rapid transit busway services. This may be one of the reasons that access to employment by public transport is projected to remain relatively low.\(^6\)

**Figure 4 Access to employment by public transport over time.**

This situation will lead to an increased reliance on private vehicles as the Upper Harbour population burgeons, and access to public transport remains low.

**RLTP Consultation Questions**

The draft RLTP requests comment on three questions:

- Have we correctly identified the challenges facing Auckland?
- Have we allocated available funding to the highest priorities?
- Have we excluded any projects or activities from the proposed transport programme that should be included?

**Have we correctly identified the challenges facing Auckland?**

In the board’s view the range of challenges have been correctly identified. Depending on where in Auckland a commentator lives the weighting to each aspect may be different, but overall Auckland Transport is to be congratulated on its assessment of the transport challenges facing our communities.

**Have we allocated available funding to the highest priorities?**

---

The proposed direction aligns well with the local priorities and preferences of the Upper Harbour community, as identified in the Upper Harbour Local Board Plan as set out below:

- Efficient and effective transport links
  - Improve roads and connections in and around Upper Harbour
  - An affordable frequent and reliable public transport network that encourages higher user uptake
  - A quality walking and cycling network within our neighbourhoods

Identified projects
The board welcomes the many projects relevant to the Upper Harbour, area identified in Appendix 1 Table 1A – Auckland Transport Proposed Funded Capital Programme, Appendix 1 Table 1B – Auckland Transport Capital Programme – additional items currently unfunded, and Appendix 2 New Zealand Transport Agency Investment Programme. Should additional funding become available, in terms of the projects listed in Appendix 1 Table 1B, the board views the following as priorities for its community:

- Northern busway enhancements
- West Harbour ferry terminal
- Enhanced park and ride programme
- Westgate to Greenhithe RTN stations
- Albany Heights intersection improvements
- Albany Highway (Sunset to SH18) corridor improvements
- Investigation and route protection for future priorities (Henderson to Albany / Constellation …)
- NZTA SH16/SH18 connection and Squadron Drive improvements

Disaggregation of regional budgets

The board notes that many of the budgets identified in the RLTP are regional budgets from which local projects will be identified and funded. The board would like clarification as to when the regional budgets will be disaggregated to the local level, and what involvement local boards will have in the identification and prioritisation of local projects. The board would like early engagement from Auckland Transport in this identification and prioritisation process.

Renewals re-prioritisation
The board appreciates the rationale for prioritising renewals funding to regional and arterial roads. The board is however, concerned that service levels on local roads will deteriorate, and that this will lead to community complaints. The board would like assurance from Auckland Transport that reductions in service levels will not lead to a substantial deterioration in local road condition rating.

Shorter journeys
The board notes the statement in the RLTP that “Nearly half of peak time trips are less than six kilometres…” The February draft of the RLTP contained the statement “Across the region the majority of journeys between 8am and 9am are education related, with an average journey length of less than 2km. Encouraging people to walk or cycle for these journeys frees up capacity in the transport network for journeys that need to be made by vehicle.” These shorter trips are capable of being undertaken by active transport (walking and cycling) as well as public transport, and the board believes that greater investment and

---

priority should be given to encouraging mode switching, to reduce single occupancy vehicle use.

The focus should be on access to schools, metropolitan and urban centres, and public transport FTN and RTN routes and interchanges. In the board’s view this will deliver a substantial return on investment in reducing congestion to help public transport to maintain its schedules, create space for freight and for those who need to use private vehicles. It will also deliver health and environmental benefits through increased physical activity for those using active transport and reduced emissions from vehicles.

Public transport improvements
The board supports the prioritisation of public transport. There are a number of areas where the board has specific comments:

- **Passengers accessing the Northern busway park and ride stations.** - The Northern busway has been a great success, and has shown that if public transport is good enough many Aucklanders will use it in preference to using private vehicles to access the central business district. The current park and ride stations are not big enough, and this has created a situation where there is substantial overflow parking on adjacent streets and reserves. The new northern network will deliver better feeder services to the busway. This should reduce pressure on the park and rides. Due to the Upper Harbour area’s location on/near the periphery of the metropolitan area, there will always be a proportion of Northern busway users who live in areas not serviced by public transport, and the feeder bus network will help free up space for these individuals. To encourage the use of the new feeder buses, the board requests Auckland Transport to review the new northern bus network after six to 12 months, so that the network can be fine-tuned and feeder bus services improved.

- **Hobsonville Point and Hobsonville Marina ferry Services.** – The board welcomes Auckland Transport’s view that “Ferries have the potential to play a significantly increased role during the next decade, to assist with addressing Auckland’s growth and improving the resilience of the transport system.” The board shares that view, and believes that much greater utilisation of the ferry facilities at Hobsonville Point and Hobsonville Marina is desirable. In the board’s view this means more frequent services (including all day, weekend and evening). These services should be ‘clock faced’ timetabled, and vessels used on these services should be big enough to cater for demand. These services, in turn need to be supported by integrated bus services that serve the ferry catchments, and which align with the ferry timetable to allow passengers to seamlessly transfer from bus to ferry and vice versa.

- **State Highway 18 rapid transit services.** – The board welcomes the proposed investment in RTN stations at Greenhithe and Hobsonville (even though these projects are currently unfunded). Missing from the RLTP, however, is a clear commitment to progress a rapid transit route along the State Highway 18 corridor. Given the projected growth in Whenapai, Hobsonville, and the Albany basin’s role as a sub-regional employment centre, the board suggests that plans for a rapid transit route be progressed with a view to starting construction during the next decade’s RLTP.

**Outcome measures**
It is a truism that what’s measured becomes important. It is also true that the incorrect selection of performance measures can lead to less than optimum outcomes, due to the
failure to provide the best information to decision-makers. In the board’s view the following outcome measures should be re-considered:

- **Cycling.** – The network of cycling counter sites should be comprehensive enough to provide an accurate picture of the uptake of cycling across the region. Focusing on the strategic routes developed out of the urban cycleways programme, will not deliver investment to support cycling for the shorter journeys around schools, urban centres and RTN and FTN routes across the region.

- **Public transport.** – Total public transport boardings and regional public transport mode share are important metrics for the public transport system. As important is the percentage of residents living within a short walk of a RTN or FTN stop. Unless this percentage steadily moves higher there will always be a fundamental reason (access) why many individuals chose not to use public transport.

- **Commuting active and sustainable mode share.** – The RLTP contains no definition of what a commute programme is. The board suggests that the number / geographical range of commute programmes across the region is also important, and should be measured if system wide increases in the active and sustainable mode share is to be achieved.

- **School active and sustainable mode share.** – The take up of active and sustainable modes at Travelwise schools is an important metric. Equally important is the proportion of schools qualifying as Travelwise schools. Unless this proportion continually increases, the number of pupils travelling in their care giver’s vehicles to and from school will remain too high.

**Have we excluded any projects or activities from the proposed transport programme that should be included?**

In the board’s view there are three Upper Harbour projects missing from the proposed RLTP. These are:

- **Rosedale busway station.** - The board welcomes the provision of the new Rosedale busway station as part of the Northern Corridor Improvement project. This busway station will not have its own dedicated park and ride. The board hopes that most passengers will access the Rosedale station by local feeder buses or walking and cycling. In the board’s view the new busway station needs to be supported by bus priority measures on the local roads e.g. Rosedale Road that provide access to the busway. Some widening of the carriage way may also be needed. The board is disappointed that this issue isn’t an identified project in the RLTP.

- **Whenuapai greenfields public transport.** – As noted previously, there is substantial population growth projected in the Whenuapai area. In the board’s view it is important that residents moving into the area develop the public transport habit. They will not do this, if there are no (or limited) services available. The board understands that Auckland Transport is trialling demand responsive transport (DRT) in the Devonport peninsula. The board suggests that DRT be provided in greenfields growth areas, until population densities are sufficient to justify regular bus schedules. This approach would give new residents the chance to develop the public transport habit.
Item 9

- **Whenuapai area road network.** – Historically most of the road network in the Whenuapai area was of a standard appropriate for its largely rural character. There have been a number of localised improvements made over the years, however most of the network remains at the original design and engineering standard. As noted previously Whenuapai is facing substantial greenfields growth. The area also provides a popular recreational cycle network. The

safety of the roads is of increasing concern to the local community and the board shares this concern. The board believes that implementing more systematic upgrades to the roading system in Whenuapai should be part of the RLTP.

**Conclusion**

The board believes that the draft RLTP correctly identifies the challenges facing Auckland. The board welcomes the funded projects identified for the Upper Harbour area. In the board’s view there are a number of areas where further thought and consideration is needed, before the final RLTP is adopted. The board believes that its suggestions provide a local lens through which Auckland Transport can consider the issues important to our community.
Waiheke

14.1 Extraordinary Business - Draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and draft Contributions Policy

Resolution number WHK/2018/18

MOVED by Chairperson C Handley, seconded by Member J Meeuwsen:

That the Waiheke Local Board:

a) delegate authority to Chairperson C Handley to provide the written formal feedback on the following on behalf of the board:

i. the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan

ii. the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal

iii. the draft Contributions Policy.

CARRIED

Draft Regional Land Transport Plan 2018 - 2028
Waiheke Local Board feedback to Auckland Transport on the Draft Regional Land Transport Plan 2018 - 2028

The Waiheke Local Board welcomes the opportunity to give feedback on the Draft Regional Land Transport Plan 2018 – 2028. The board’s response will be categorised by the key challenges facing transport in the Auckland region over the next 10 years used in the document.

VISION

The Waiheke Local Board support the vision that:

“Auckland can be a city where there is growth without increased congestion, where it is easy to access employment and services, where it is safe to drive walk and cycle, where there are genuine travel choices and where the negative impacts of the transport system on people and the environment are minimised”.

Waiheke Island’s own vision is expressed in the community-developed and board-endorsed document “Essentially Waiheke”. “Essentially Waiheke” advocates strongly for the protection of the semi-rural character of the island and for greater community decision-making over transport planning and works on Waiheke.

The Essentially Waiheke 2016 Refresh can be viewed using the following link: https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/about-auckland-council/how-auckland-council-works/local-boards/all-local-boards/waiheke-local-board/Pages/waiheke-plans-agreements-reports.aspx

The Waiheke Local Board’s response to the RLTP is therefore informed and underpinned by:

1. ‘Essentially Waiheke’,
2. the Local Board’s concerns to meet both residential and ratepayer needs in terms of transport infrastructure and those of the overwhelming visitor/tourist numbers (current est. 1.4 million per annum), and
3. the governance pilot, which aims to build the board’s decision-making role, with respect to local matters, in close collaboration with Auckland Transport.
GROWTH

There has been significant growth in the resident population resulting in added pressure on the transport network. There has been a 12 per cent increase since the 2013 census to a current population of 9500. Visitor numbers have increased at a greater rate with 50 per cent growth over the last three years. There were an estimated at 1.4 million visitors in the 2016/17 summer season and a resident summer population of over 30,000. There is strong growth projected over the next ten years. Given the huge impact of high visitor numbers on the fragile semi-rural island infrastructure, population-based funding formulae are not directly relevant. Increased traffic volumes and larger tour vehicles on roads designed for low volumes have significantly increased people safety issues island-wide. Most roads have no footpaths or cycle ways.

The Waiheke Local Board:

- recommend that transport planning on Waiheke takes account current population and visitor numbers as well as growth predictions over the next ten years of both resident and visitor numbers.

CONGESTION

Because of growth in commuter and visitor numbers (and other factors) Matiatia wharf and transport hub is now so severely congested it is no longer fit for purpose. The majority of the wharf tax collected in the Hauraki Gulf originates from the Waiheke ferry services, yet is not spent transparently on Waiheke infrastructure.

The Waiheke Local Board:

- support and commend the investment now earmarked for redevelopment of the park and ride facilities in the draft Regional Land Transport Plan Funded Capital Programme

- propose that the Wharf Tax of $1.02 each return ferry trip be used to transparently fund Auckland Transport’s wharf/transport-related infrastructure on Waiheke.

ACCESSIBILITY

At present there is greater emphasis on infrastructure provision for visitors to Waiheke than for residents commuting to Auckland. The board wishes to see this imbalance corrected.

The Waiheke Local Board:

- support a fully integrated transport hub at Britomart with integrated connections between ferries, public buses and trains

- welcome the planned new investment in the public bus service for Waiheke and support the introduction of electric buses on Waiheke

- support improved direct transport links from Downtown Ferry terminal and Britomart to the airport for the very high volumes of domestic and international travellers and locals (Draft Regional Land Transport Plan p. 34, 39)
• support the planned new investment in the Future Ferry Strategy and the redevelopment of the downtown ferry terminal with the emphasis on the Waiheke Local Board’s involvement in ensuring its residents’ needs are understood and met (Draft Regional Land Transport Plan p. 35)

• support the $35 million indicated in the Auckland Transport Capital Programme (unfunded) for the redevelopment of Matiatia and Kennedy Point ferry terminals for additional berths and passenger amenities. The board recommends that funds be allocated over the next five years

• strongly recommend that the Britomart/Downtown redevelopment needs to urgently address access issues from the downtown ferry terminal direct to Auckland Hospital and Greenlane Outpatients Unit for Waiheke’s most infirm and frail residents

• assert that there needs to be greater emphasis in the Regional Land Transport Plan on providing equality of access for people with disabilities

• assert that there needs to be lower ferry fares for Waiheke residents to prevent population attrition and therefore more competition on the Waiheke ferry routes.

• The board support coverage of Waiheke ferry services by the Public Transport Operating Model.

SAFETY

Due to the increasing congestion and traffic speeds on Waiheke, there needs to greater investment on Waiheke on continuous cycle ways and footpaths to improve safety and to encourage opportunities for active transport.

The Waiheke Local Board:

• support the walking and cycling initiatives including for Waiheke (Draft Regional Land Transport Plan p. 36, 37)

• seek inclusion in the new footpaths regional programme (Draft Regional Land Transport Plan p. 38) and recommend that funding for board-specified projects be allocated over the next two years

• seek inclusion of cycling and walking modes in road redesigns for Waiheke and recommend that funding for board-specified projects be allocated over the next two years

• seek inclusion of Waiheke in the Urban Cycleways Programme (Draft Regional Land Transport Plan p. 37) and recommend that funding for board-specified projects be allocated over the next two years

• advocate for Waiheke as a safe speed environment with reduced speed limits on local roads shared with mobility, walkers, cyclists and prams and support Waiheke’s inclusion in Safer Communities and Speed Management Programmes’ funding (Draft Regional Land Transport Plan p. 64)
• state that long-term planning is required to deal with unstable land features in or near the road corridor (risk management that mitigates repeating the very high unplanned costs for Auckland Transport in the 2017/2018 year)

• require a commitment from Auckland Transport for higher quality roads in Waiheke’s character without the frequency of potholes, surface repairs and road failures (consistent with the Regional Land Transport Plan asset management objectives p. 48).

ENVIRONMENT

With Waiheke as one of the treasured island of the Gulf and protected by the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act it is critical to the health of the Gulf that roading infrastructure enhances and protects the receiving environment and does not contribute to further degradation. The maintenance of the road corridor itself provides an enormous opportunity to retain the rural character of the island, protect native flora and fauna and to encourage safe speeds.

The Waiheke Local Board:

• applaud water sensitive design initiatives (Draft Regional Land Transport Plan p. 43, 64) to slow water velocity, filter impurities, protect wetlands, waterways and the marine environment and recommend that they be utilised on all Waiheke roading projects when specified by the Auckland Council Healthy Waters Department

• support the introduction of electric buses and infrastructure for e-cycles and electric vehicles to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and wish to be included in these initiatives (Draft Regional Land Transport Plan p. 10, 27, 64)

• highlight the need for protection of coastal roads by provision of sea-walls and long-term road strengthening in preparation for predicted coastal inundation

• highlight the need to deal with the issue of beaches as legal roads and the safety issues for beach users as well as negative environmental degradation

FREIGHT

Increasing freight volumes are moving through Kennedy Point wharf and congestion at both terminals is exacerbated by freight movements.

The Waiheke Local Board:

• support the need for improved infrastructure at Kennedy Point including parking provision

• recommend that future-proofing at Matiatia and Kennedy Point requires freight movement planning and rationalisation across the two sites

LOCAL DECISION-MAKING

Through the feedback received from Essentially Waiheke and from local feedback on the Long Term Plan, Waiheke residents have repeatedly expressed the desire for greater control
over the island transport infrastructure and the need for protection of the semi-rural character of the island.
In March last year Auckland Transport presented its proposed Roads and Streets Framework to local boards which aims to:

“Integrate the road and street network with the existing natural and built environment and promote community ownership of the Place”
(Roads and Streets Framework p.13).

The Waiheke Local Board:

- strongly support Auckland Transport’s new Roads and Streets Framework, recommend that the model be rolled out immediately on Waiheke and that a Waiheke Design Guide be included in the Transport Design Manual in a similar manner to the inclusion of the Waitakere Design Guide
- strongly recommend that Auckland Transport gives effect to the Waiheke Local Board Pilot Project that promotes increased planning and place-making input and empowered decision-making by the local board
- recommend that Auckland Transport commits to a ten-year plan of improvements to roads, footpaths and cycle ways to improve the safety of all road corridor users and to cater for the projected growth in resident and visitor numbers.

FEEDBACK ON THE REGIONAL FUEL TAX

Responding to the Long Term Plan, the proposed Regional Fuel Tax has been endorsed by respondents, including by the majority of Waiheke Islanders who completed the consultation survey. Some who completed the consultation also sought to have Waiheke Island exempt.

The Waiheke Local Board:

- express its concern about the impact on island residents of the increased cost of fuel and on its low-wage high cost economy
- recognise that that funds from the proposed Regional Fuel Tax are initially designated for projects including the redevelopment of Matiatia’s Park and Ride facility.

Thank you.

Waiheke Local Board
Feedback on the Contributions Policy

That the Waiheke Local Board

a) note the Rural Islands has been introduced as a new category for the new policy and advocate for a review for the Waiheke Development Contribution charges.
Waitakere Ranges

12 Local board decisions and input into the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, draft Auckland Plan 2050 and draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018

MOVED by Chairperson G Presland, seconded by Member S Tollestrup:

That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

e) provide feedback on the 10-year Budget 2018-2028 as outlined in Attachment A

Attachments

A 20180510 Waitakere Ranges Local Board Item 12: Local board decisions and input into the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, draft Auckland Plan 2050 and draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 - Advocacy and Feedback on 10-year Budget and Regional Plans

Attachment A

Waitākere Ranges Local Board Feedback on 10-year Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issue / Plan</th>
<th>Summary of Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport - Regional Fuel Tax</td>
<td>• Support regional fuel tax proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is concern that it may be regressive for poorer households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It will have environmental benefits as will support increased investment in public transport and cycleways. Persons may give greater consideration to coordinating travel and reducig single trips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Note that many residents in the local board area are not well served by current public transport options and possible options need to be continued to be investigated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 Draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and draft Contributions Policy

The Waitakere Ranges Local Board Feedback was tabled and a copy has been placed on the official minutes and is available on the Auckland Council website as a minutes attachment.

MOVED by Member S Tollestrup, seconded by Member N Henderson:

That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

a) delegate the provision of feedback to the Chair, Greg Presland, in consultation with the local board.
Auckland Regional Land Transport Plan submission

14 May 2018

Greg Presland
Waitakere Ranges Local Board Chairperson
greg.presland@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Phone +6421998411

Growth

First comment to make is the draft RLTP is right to focus on the effects of growth.

The growth in Auckland’s population in the past three years has been significant.

And the effects, including increased congestion is clear.

Environmental effects

The other focus is on environmental effects, particularly climate change. If Auckland wishes to be carbon neutral then a fundamental change in its transport systems is required.

And given that the effects of climate change are becoming more and more pronounced the sooner the better.

Government Policy Statement

Clearly the most recent significant event is the change in Government and the release of a new Government Policy Statement.

The Government’s new focus on safety and environmental outcomes and the likely associated change in funding priorities means that Auckland should also reassess its priorities.

Pleased that ARLTP provides for support for an increase in public transport and cycling mode share, with flow on benefits for health, safety, the environment and congestion as well as improved environmental outcomes through the provision of lower carbon alternatives for travel and by encouraging less single-occupant travel.

In relation to specific projects:

North West light rail - the Board fully supports further investigation. Pleased the proposal is so brave, that we are not mucking around with a bus route but heading straight to light rail.

There is another existing rail line that is ready to go now. The Swanson to Huapai rail line is in place. With issues surrounding the Waitakere Tunnel and the length of the Swanson station worked out hybrid electric trains could be running very soon.

The light rail proposal could take years. We believe that a rail service to Kumeu deserves a further look.

Most members support light rail to the airport although there are also views that the alternative heavy rail proposal should be reviewed and progressed.
Either would be potentially transformative projects for the region and especially for the areas involved.

With regards to light rail it should be remembered that the potential benefits are not only for airport users but anyone travelling to or from the airport or to or from town.

City Rail Link

The local board has strong support for CRL delivery in 2024.

The use of Glen Eden Train Station has increased by 40 percent over the past three years, with around 650,000 trips annually. The station is right within the town centre so we would like to work with AT to improve the amenity around the train station.

There is a need to improve the pedestrian and cycling links in the town centre and to the surrounding residential catchment so that is easier for people to get to the station. Park and ride capacity on western line is also key.

Two park and rides have been built in the Local Board area are already at capacity.

There should be thought given to managing their use so that only train users are parking there.

Walking and cycling

At the recent hearing the draft Waitakere Ranges Greenways Plan was presented to AT. The Board is keen for delivery of walking and cycling projects, such as:

* Western rail corridor cycleway from Swanson to New Lynn
* Cycling links to train stations: Patts Park to Sunnyvale Station and Harold Moody Reserve to Glen Eden Station

The draft walking and cycling programme (2018 – 2028) released by AT prior to the draft RTP does not have any projects within the Waitakere Ranges area. We are very keen that local projects are advanced.

Roadside weeds throughout the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area

One aspect corridor management with particularly local application is the state of the road corridor. There are many areas that are inundated with weeds.

And the road corridor allows them to spread.

Extensive efforts to eradicate weeds on private land and parkland are being thwarted because there is reinestation occurring from the road corridor.

But little budget to address this.

The Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act imposes obligations on the Council family to have regard to the purposes and objectives of the Act.

We urge AT to properly fund this important work noting proposals for Community Facilities to take over responsibility for this in the future.

Other WRLB advocacy topics
AT Streets Framework / delivering the Glen Eden Town Centre Implementation Plan. Transport projects in the town centre need to come as an integrated package with funding
for place-making, eg the West Coast Road safety improvement project. There is still a question of who pays for delivering the Streets Framework which was developed by AT and endorsed by AC.

Increasing up take of electric cars. The RTP refers to a strategy including working to increase distribution of charging stations across the Auckland region, however the local board is yet to see this and would welcome the opportunity to work with AT on what this might look like for west Auckland.

Rural footpaths

The AT footpath programme provides for urban areas only. A specific programme is needed to address rural pedestrian safety so improvements can happen over time.

Rural bus services

The local board fully supports the proposed pilot service for Piha/Te Henga/ Huia.

Regional Fuel Tax Proposal submission

14 May 2018

Greg Presland
Waitakere Ranges Local Board Chairperson
greg.presland@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Phone +6421998411

The Waitakere Ranges Local Board supports the aims of the regional fuel tax proposal to:
• increase capacity and use of the existing public transport network
• continue to encourage active transport options through the extension of the walking and cycling network
• increase the capacity of the existing road network to improve overall performance
• increase investment in road safety initiatives
• support key growth areas with appropriate transport infrastructure

Recommends the following priority projects from the draft Waitakere Ranges Greenways Plan (currently under consultation) be included in Project 9: Active Transport for investigation as they deliver on the strategic outcome of increasing active transport and access to public transport:

• Western Train Line cycleway from Swanson to New Lynn
• Parrs Park to Sunnyvale Train Station
• Harold Moody Reserve to Glen Eden Train Station

Recommends park and ride capacity on the Western Train Line be included in Project 5: Park and Rides for investigation to make the most of the expected CRL completion in 2024.
Waitemata

Resolution number WTM/2018/40

MOVED by Chairperson P Coom, seconded by Deputy Chairperson S Chambers:

That the Waitematā Local Board:

d) provide the following feedback on the proposed 10-year Budget 2018-2028
   i) support the proposed regional fuel tax of 10c (plus GST) per litre to fund transport projects and services with the expectation that additional funding raised will be prioritised towards improving public transport and active transport.

CARRIED
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Resolution number WTM/2018/47

MOVED by Chairperson P Coom, seconded by Deputy Chairperson S Chambers:

The Waitematā Local Board give formal written feedback on:

a) endorse the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan with particular support for:
   i) safety, with a Vision Zero approach
   ii) the walking and cycling network
   iii) city centre focus
   iv) rapid transit and public transport
   v) placemaking
   vi) environment - water sensitive design, working towards zero emission and agrichemical reduction
   vii) innovative approaches to transport corridors

b) the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal support the proposed regional fuel tax of 10c (plus GST) per litre to fund transport projects and services

c) support the 14 projects which are proposed to be funded by the Regional Fuel Tax but gives lower priority to Mill Road and Penlink

d) serious consideration of moving to a mode neutral approach in central government subsidies for provision and maintenance of roads, footpaths and cycleways

e) supports the inclusion of the following projects in the transport programme:
   i) upgrade of Quay Street streetscape
   ii) Victoria Street Linear Park
   iii) Newmarket Train Station access from Broadway
   iv) Parnell Train Station second underpass and greenway link to Newmarket via old Parnell rail tunnel
   v) St Georges Bay Road streetscape upgrade
   vi) port access along The Strand
   vii) Dominion Road flyover removal
viii) the cycling programme identified in the 10 year cycling plan

f) delegate to the chair to provide further detailed feedback on the draft Regional Land Transport Plan

g) support the draft Contributions Policy

h) note that the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill proposes to restore territorial authorities’ power to collect development contributions for any public amenities needed because of development

i) support the proposed provisions in the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill as noted in resolution h) above

**CARRIED**

17 May 2018

*Waitematā Local Board submission on the draft Auckland Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028*

**Introduction**

The Waitematā Local Board (the “Local Board”) welcomes the opportunity to submit on the draft Auckland Regional Land Transport Plan 2018 - 2028 (RLTP). The vision of the Local Board is to foster ever-more vibrant, connected, healthy and thriving communities. We aspire to be a city where our transport network is integrated and gives options for moving about, with accessible, sustainable and reliable public transport and safe, pleasant walking and cycling routes. Our pedestrian-friendly streets are great public spaces. The Local Board is committed to working with Auckland Transport, New Zealand Transport Agency and Kiwirail to achieve an integrated and multi-modal transport system that connects communities, offers transport choice and allows people to travel safely whichever mode they are using.

On the 15 May 2018 the Waitematā Local Board resolved to delegate the drafting of the Local Board’s submission on the draft RLTP to the Chair of the Local Board (Attachment 1). This submission is based on the presentation on behalf of the Local Board to the Regional Transport Committee hearings panel on 7 May (Attachment 2).

The sections referred to below relate to the relevant sections of the draft RLTP.

**Summary**

The Local Board supports the overall direction of the RLTP. It shows strong alignment between central government and Auckland Council and a real commitment to deliver a transport programme that responds to Auckland’s challenges. It is reassuring that much of the draft RLTP reflects the transport objectives and initiatives set out in the Waitematā Local Board Plan.

We support the strategic approach towards creating an accessible, connected, safe and sustainable transport network. The RLTP aligns with the Local Board outcome: *An accessible, connected and safe transport network with well-designed streets* (Waitematā Local Board Plan 2017).

The Local Board supports the Regional Fuel Tax (RFT). Seventy-two percent of Waitematā submitters to the 10-year Budget support the RFT and want investment to be focused on public transport and active transport.

We particularly support the focus in the RLTP on:

- Safety, with a Vision Zero approach
- Environment
- Rapid transit
- Accessibility
- Placemaking
• City centre
• Active modes and pedestrian prioritisation

In addition to the projects identified below for inclusion in the transport programme, we request as a priority additional funding be identified to deliver the 10-year Programme Business case for cycling recently adopted by Auckland Transport.
The Local Board has provided feedback on the draft Auckland Plan 2050 and has requested that it include measurable transport targets. We therefore request that the RLTP is aligned to include these targets and provides the funding to deliver on them.

Section 2 Purpose and Scope of the RLTP
The Local Board has provided feedback on the Auckland Plan 2050 requesting inclusion of clear targets to measure the success of the plan. These are as follows:

- Zero net carbon emissions
- Transport targets covering:
  - Access to jobs
  - Traffic congestion
  - Mode share (use of public transport, walking and cycling)
  - Household transport costs and
  - Deaths and serious injuries

We would like to see the inclusion of relevant transport targets in the RLTP and provision of appropriate funding to ensure they can be achieved.
The Local Board requests that the strategic context acknowledges Local Board Plans and the City Centre Master Plan.

Section 3 Auckland’s challenges

Overview
The Local Board broadly agrees that the draft RLTP identifies the main challenges facing Auckland.
Growth and the dynamics of that growth is significant for Waitmata particularly in the City Centre. Overall the population of Waitmata is currently estimated to be 108,500 and will reach 130,200 by 2033 (up from 77,316 residents in 2013). Our city centre population is growing six times faster than the rest of Auckland. There are now over 52,000 residents living in the city centre compared with 20,000 in 2010.

We know our residents and the 100,000 people that come into the city centre daily to study, work, play and visit are particularly concerned with safety, environment (pollution, reducing carbon emissions), footpaths and accessibility. In the context of this substantial growth the transport network in the city centre is no longer fit for purpose.
The Waitmata Local Board area has a unique transport profile. From the 2013 Census we know that 25 percent of households in the Waitmata Local Board area do not have a car compared to the Auckland average of 8 percent (in the city centre this rises to 51 percent).

In the Waitmata area 51 percent travelled to work by means other than a car/truck/van compared with the Auckland average of 17 percent (2013 Census data). The 2018 census is likely to show an even stronger move to households without cars and changes to travel patterns in favour of public transport and active modes.
The board requests the inclusion of graphs that more effectively demonstrate the changing growth patterns and influences eg number of people coming into the city centre on public transport such as that set out below. We question the value of the graph showing car registrations.
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Safety
Auckland’s road safety crisis needs to be more clearly acknowledged. The graph, Auckland Road Deaths & Serious Injuries (DSI) 2007 – 2017 explicitly illustrates that there is a major safety crisis with our roading/transport network. The language used in this section should be strengthened and more to the point. It would be useful to provide an international context as a comparator for Auckland as well as a sub-regional context. This would provide a greater depth of understanding of safety trends and enable identification of the specific locations in Auckland where safety is a greater issue.

Accessibility
The accessibility challenge is far wider than currently outlined. Access to jobs, education, health etc is vital, but “accessibility” is also about how we ensure everyone can, for example, access public transport regardless of physical ability. We request the meaning of “accessibility” is better defined and broadened to ensure everyone, regardless of physical ability, has access to the transport network.

Placemaking
The Local Board would like the effects of movement on placemaking recognised as a challenge in this section. Auckland Transport and NZTA have consistently prioritised time savings, road capacity and vehicle speed over the design of great streets. As a result the Local Board’s ability to undertake placemaking to create vibrant public places that serve the community has been compromised. This has led to poor outcomes for residents, workers and visitors especially in the city centre.

Section 4: Addressing Auckland’s Challenges
The Local Board supports the strategic approach to create accessible well-connected safe and sustainable transport network. This closely aligns with our Local Board Plan. We support the greater focus on customer needs and improving customer experience. We welcome this new focus and expect that it encompasses meaningful consultation with the public, other relevant stakeholders and the Local Board. This focus also needs to take into account local boards’ governance role and responsibilities such as placemaking. We would welcome AT taking a more holistic approach to design solutions and moving away from purely engineering based design solutions. It is important to acknowledge the impacts that many transport projects have in a wider context (social, environmental, economic, cultural) and the opportunities they provide such as greening of road corridors.

We agree that funding has been allocated to the highest priorities and we are particularly supportive of funding for:
- safety with a Vision Zero approach
• Walking and cycling network – connecting the network, pedestrian priority, separated safe infrastructure, footpath investment and maintenance
• Rapid transit – including to Auckland Airport
• Placemaking
• Water sensitive design, working towards zero emissions, agrichemical reduction
• Innovative approaches to transport corridors – freeing up the road corridor for all road users
• A world class city centre

We consider that Mill Road and Penlink are lower priority projects to be funded from the RFT.
We support the move to a mode neutral approach in central government subsidies for provision and maintenance of roads, footpaths and cycleways.
The Local Board is pleased to see recognition of local board’s placemaking role in this section and the proposed budget allocation to enable this to occur.
We believe that supporting growth should also include creating capacity in brownfield areas. Projects such as removing the Dominion Road flyover and providing for Port access along the Strand can release tracts of land for development that are currently locked by inefficient or poorly designed transport infrastructure.

Section 5: Maintaining and Renewing Existing Assets
We believe that Section 5 should be incorporated into Section 4 of the RLTP as maintenance and renewals are a key way of addressing Auckland’s challenges. There is no rationale to separate the two matters.
The Local Board has the following advocacy position that we would like to see implemented by Auckland Transport:

• **Maximise Renewal and Maintenance Opportunities** – [Auckland Transport to ]
  Consider how every renewal and maintenance project can be leveraged to improve the road design for all users including layouts that include bus lanes, greenways, and cycle lanes, remove cycle pinch points and add better pedestrian crossings and street trees.

We have many examples of renewals going ahead without any input from the Local Board (or even notification) to add value and improve the outcomes for all road users. Auckland Transport has also not been taking advantage of our local board capex fund which could be utilised to enhance renewal opportunities. This is particularly material given the Local Board’s role in placemaking.

Appendices – Details of Funded and Unfunded Investments

Unfunded Projects

Waitemata Local Board would like the following unfunded projects included in the transport programme:
• Upgrade of Quay Street streetscape
• Victoria Street Linear Park
• Newmarket Train Station access from Broadway
• Parnell Train Station second underpass and greenway to Newmarket via old Parnell rail tunnel
• St Georges Bay Road streetscape upgrade
• Port access along the Strand
• Dominion Road flyover removal
• Additional investment in the “walking and cycling programme” to deliver the recently adopted 10-year Programme Business case for cycling
Other funding areas
Waitematā Local Board would like the following areas to be provided with adequate funding in the transport programme:

- Implementation of residential parking zones and parking enforcement
- Travel management planning
Attachment One
Resolution WTM/2018/50
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Resolution number WTM/2018/1

MOVED by Chairperson P Coom, seconded by Deputy Chairperson S Chambers:

The Wai tamatā Local Board give formal written feedback on:

a) endorse the draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan with particular support for:
   i) safety, with a Vision Zero approach ii) the walking and cycling network iii) city centre focus iv) rapid transit and public transport v) placemaking vi) environment - water sensitive design, working towards zero emission and agrichemical reduction
   vii) innovative approaches to transport corridors

b) the draft Regional Fuel Tax Proposal support the proposed regional fuel tax of 10c (plus GST) per litre to fund transport projects and services

c) support the 14 projects which are proposed to be funded by the Regional Fuel Tax but gives lower priority to Mill Road and Penlink

d) serious consideration of moving to a mode neutral approach in central government subsidies for provision and maintenance of roads, footpaths and cycleways e) supports the inclusion of the following projects in the transport programme:
   i) upgrade of Quay Street streetscape ii) Victoria Street Linear Park iii) Newmarket Train Station access from Broadway iv) Parnell Train Station second underpass and greenway link to Newmarket via old Parnell rail tunnel
   v) St Georges Bay Road streetscape upgrade vi) port access along The Strand vii) Dominion Road flyover removal
   viii) the cycling programme identified in the 10 year cycling plan

e) delegate to the chair to provide further detailed feedback on the draft Regional Land Transport Plan

f) support the draft Contributions Policy

g) note that the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill proposes to restore territorial authorities' power to collect development contributions for any public amenities needed because of development
i) support the proposed provisions in the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill as noted in resolution h) above

CARRIED
Attachment Two
Waitematā Local Board submission to the Regional Transport Committee

Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028
Waitematā Local Board presentation
7 May 2018
Pippa Coom, Chair

Scene setting – growth in Waitematā

- 77,316 residents in 2013
- 130,200 residents by 2033
- 52,370 call the city centre home
- City centre population growing 6 times faster than the rest of Auckland

108,500
186,000
Local Board Plan Transport Outcome
An accessible, connected and safe transport network with well-designed streets

Our Vision:

Our transport network is integrated and gives people options for moving about, with accessible, sustainable and reliable public transport and safe, pleasant walking and cycling routes. Our pedestrian-friendly streets are great public spaces.

Strong alignment between the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport, the draft Auckland Plan, the RLTP and the Waitakere Local Board Plan

Strategic View

• Strong support for the overall direction of the RLTP
• Agree need a new innovative approach
• 10-year budget feedback
  • 72% support for Regional Fuel Tax want funding to be invested in improving PT and active modes
• Local Board priorities – strong public support
• Particular support focus on:
  • Safety – Vision Zero
  • City centre
  • Placemaking
  • Environment
  • Rapid transit
  • Accessibility
  • Active modes
Question One:
Challenges facing Auckland

- Agree: Challenges set out in the RLTP are the challenges facing Auckland and the Waitematā Local Board area
- Residential growth in the city centre - network not fit for purpose
- Particular concern:
  - Safety
  - Environment
  - Growth
  - Accessibility

Question Two:
Funding highest priorities

- Support the strategic approach to create accessible well connected safe and sustainable transport network
- Support focus on world class city centre
- Aligns with the Board’s vision
- Funding priorities:
  - Safety, with a Vision Zero Approach
  - Walking and cycling network – connecting network, pedestrian priority, separated safe infrastructure, footpath investments/ maintenance
  - Rapid transit – including to Auckland Airport
  - Placemaking, including provision of public toilets
  - Water sensitive design, working towards zero emission, agrichemical reduction
  - Innovative approaches to transport corridors – freeing up land
Question Three:
Other projects for inclusion

Waitēmatā Local Board would like included in the transport programme:

- Upgrade of Quay Street streetscape
- Victoria Street Linear Park
- Newmarket Train Station access from Broadway
- Parnell Train Station second underpass and greenway link to Newmarket via old Parnell rail tunnel
- St Georges Bay Road streetscape upgrade
- Port access along the Strand
- Dominion Road flyover removal

Congratulations and thank you
Whau
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Resolution number WH/2018/43

MOVED by Chairperson T Mulholland, seconded by Member D Macdonald:

That the Whau Local Board:

a. provides the following feedback on the 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport plan
b. supports the realignment towards the Government Policy Statement
c. notes the RLRP’s alignment to the Whau Local Board’s outcome of “20 mins to all we need by PT/walking and cycling” and key initiatives of improving access through walking and cycling links and quality of transport centres
d. notes the short timeframe for consideration and review of projects and therefore the need for a dynamic approach and full re-assessment of all project’s and their alignment to delivering on the priority areas
e. recognises the growing commute times for residents in the Whau and the west generally and raises concern that this plan does not prioritise projects that will address this
f. supports investment in areas that will support increased access to public transport and active modes like walking and cycling and shifting modes from single occupant cars.
g. requests Auckland Transport develop a plan for encouraging walking and to identify work areas with local boards to improve access to public transport through local walkways
h. note with displeasure that Te Whau Pathway (P67) , Rosebank Road and Memorial Drive Extension (P69) are unfunded and requests that these projects be urgently reassessed for their strategic contribution
i. supports increased investment in rail/road crossing safety work as Whau noting Kiwirail’s investment but that Council’s contribution is unfunded (P67)
j. supports NW motorway Busway/light rail direction noting the need for as stop at Rosebank to support business commute and ease congestion for freight.
k. supports the move to include footpaths in LTNZ subsidy and the need to invest in walking to decrease congestion from education and work commute (education examples in the Whau include Te Whau Pathway providing walking alternatives for five Kelston schools and the Rosebank Peninsula coastal walkway providing options for Avondale College students relieving congestion on Rosebank Road)
l. supports the increased focus on environment outcomes which is in line with the Local Board Plan focus on
   i. Whau river clean up through swales and rain gardens decreasing heavy metals
   ii. Climate change through decreasing green-house gas emissions
m. encourages AT to measure, regularly report and to reassess projects to prioritise those that deliver strongly on reducing CO2 emissions
n. would like to see stronger local board engagement in the prioritisation of public transport access, cycling and walking and safety projects.
o. provides the following feedback on the Regional Fuel Tax

The Whau Local Board:

i. generally supports implementation of a regional fuel tax
ii. notes that a greater cost burden will likely be placed on many in the local working population who have to drive to other Auckland areas
iii. notes that Whau has the one of the lowest levels of local employment in Auckland
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iv. notes current projections are that commute times will increase for many west and Whau residents resulting in increased costs for travel and further loss of time spent with family and community

v. requests that further joint planning be conducted to address west and particularly the Whau’s work commute costs and durations and that this work be conducted jointly by Auckland Transport and ATEED so as to include transport and local job growth initiatives

i) has concerns that only a few of the proposed projects will address the increasing commute times for western residents

With regard to the Development Contributions Policy the Board

a) notes the proposed legislative change to re-introduce the four wellbeings and the reinstatement of the opportunity to use development contributions to fund pools and libraries

b) notes the significant growth in our urban area

c) supports policy that will enable infrastructure to be available as we need it

CARRIED