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Terms of Reference

Responsibilities

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

- Relevant regional strategy and policy
- Infrastructure strategy and policy
- Unitary Plan
- Spatial plans
- Plan changes to operative plans
- Housing policy and projects
- Special Housing Areas
- City centre development
- Tamaki regeneration
- Built heritage
- Urban design
- Environmental matters relating to the committee’s responsibilities
- Acquisition of property relating to the committee’s responsibilities and within approved annual budgets
- Initiatives of the following CCOs that have a significant impact upon the implementation of the Auckland Plan and other relevant plans, policies and strategies:
  - Panuku Development Auckland
  - Auckland Transport
  - Watercare Services Limited
  - Regional Facilities Auckland (stadium)

Powers

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

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

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

Members of the public

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

Those who are not members of the public

General principles

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

Members of the meeting

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

Independent Māori Statutory Board

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

Staff

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

Local Board members

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

Council Controlled Organisations

- Representatives of a Council Controlled Organisation can remain only if required to for discussion of a matter relevant to the Council Controlled Organisation.
## Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TABLE OF CONTENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Declaration of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Petitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Public Input - Cityhop - Benefits of car share in Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Public Input - Archimedia - Archimedia's master plan for the Ports of Auckland site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Public Input - Anne Batley - Having animals accompany people on public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Public Input - SPCA - Allowing pets on public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Local Board Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Local Board Input - Franklin Local Board - Submission on Draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Extraordinary Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Notices of Motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Notice of Motion - Councillor Cathy Casey - Pets on Public Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Technical Review of Ports of Auckland Draft 30-year Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Auckland Council submission on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Summary of Planning Committee information memos and briefings - 1 May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Consideration of Extraordinary Items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 **Apologies**

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

2 **Declaration of Interest**

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

3 **Confirmation of Minutes**

That the Planning Committee:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 3 April 2018 as a true and correct record.

4 **Petitions**

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

5 **Public Input**

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

5.1 **Public Input - Cityhop - Benefits of car share in Auckland**

**Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report**

1. Victoria Carter, founder of Cityhop cars in Auckland, will speak to the committee regarding the environmental, economic and social benefits of car share schemes.

**Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s**

That the Planning Committee:

a) receive the public input from Victoria Carter, founder of Cityhop, regarding the benefits of car share in Auckland and thank her for attending.
5.2 Public Input - Archimedia - Archimedia’s master plan for the Ports of Auckland site

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Lindsay Mackie, Principal at Archimedia Limited, will speak to the committee regarding Archimedia’s master plan for the Ports of Auckland site.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:
   a) receive the public input from Lindsay Mackie regarding Archimedia’s master plan for the Ports of Auckland site and thank him for attending.

5.3 Public Input - Anne Batley - Having animals accompany people on public transport

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Anne Batley will speak to the committee about having animals accompany people on public transport.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:
   a) receive the public input from Anne Batley regarding animals accompanying people on public transport and thank them for attending.

5.4 Public Input - SPCA - Allowing pets on public transport

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. Dr Sarah Zito will speak to the committee on behalf of the SPCA about allowing pets on public transport.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:
   a) receive the public input from Dr Sarah Zito on behalf of the SPCA regarding allowing pets on public transport and thank them for attending.
6  Local Board Input

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

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

6.1  Local Board Input - Franklin Local Board - Submission on Draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1.  Andrew Baker, Franklin Local Board Deputy Chair, will speak to the Planning Committee about the council’s submission on the Draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Planning Committee:

a)  receive the local board input from Franklin Local Board Deputy Chair Andrew Baker regarding the council’s submission on the Draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018, and thank him for attending.

7  Extraordinary Business

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8 Notices of Motion

Under Standing Order 2.5.1 a Notice of Motion has been received from Cr C Casey for consideration under Item 9.
Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
1. In accordance with Standing Order 2.5.1, Councillor Cathy Casey has given notice of a motion that she wishes to propose.
2. The notice, signed by Councillor Fa’anana Efeso Collins as seconder, is appended as Attachment A.
3. Supporting information is also included in Attachment A.

Motion
That the Planning Committee:

a) support in principle a move to allow carriage of pets on all modes of public transport, subject to the development of a consistent policy including appropriate health and safety guidelines.

b) request that Auckland Transport, at the earliest possible time, review its current policies and contracts regarding carriage of pets on public transport, with a view to allowing carriage of pets on all modes, in a consistent and safe way.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
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<td>Councillor Cathy Casey - Notice of Motion and Supporting Information - Pets on Public Transport</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Kalinda Gopal - Senior Governance Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Jim Quinn - Chief of Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memo

To: Jim Quinn, Chief Strategy Officer
Copy: Kalinda Gopal, Senior Governance Advisor
From: Councillor Cathy Casey

Subject: NOTICE OF MOTION

In terms of Auckland Council’s standing order 2.5.1, relating to Notices of Motion, I propose to move the following motion at the meeting of the Planning Committee on 1 May 2018.

Notice of Motion

That the Planning Committee:

a) supports in principle a move to allow carriage of pets on all modes of public transport, subject to the development of a consistent policy including appropriate health and safety guidelines
b) requests that Auckland Transport, at the earliest possible time, review its current policies and contracts regarding carriage of pets on public transport, with a view to allowing carriage of pets on all modes, in a consistent and safe way

Moved by

Councillor Dr Cathy Casey

Seconded by

Councillor Fa’arana Efeso Collins
1. Introduction

In light of the decision in March 2018 by the Greater Wellington Regional Council to allow contained domestic pets to travel on Wellington's buses and trains, it is time for Auckland Transport to review its current ban on pets on Auckland public transport.

2. Wellington Decision

On Wednesday 21 March 2018, the Greater Wellington Regional Council’s Sustainable Transport Committee voted to endorse “Revised Metlink Conditions of Carriage”. These revised conditions of carriage specify seven conditions regarding travelling with animals, as follows:

1. You may travel on our Vehicles with your certified disability assist dog in accordance with the Dog Control Act 1996.
2. You must comply with our staff’s reasonable instructions regarding your disability assist dog (as defined in the Dog Control Act 1996). Disability assist dogs must travel on the floor of the Vehicle and not on your lap or on a seat.
3. Domestic pets are allowed to travel on our Vehicles as long as they are enclosed in a suitable pet carrier which must be stored securely in the available space for luggage or on the passenger's lap.
4. Passengers travelling with domestic pets are responsible for their and other passenger’s safety and must keep them under control while they are on our premises, or getting on or off or travelling on our Vehicles.
5. You may be refused entry to board the Vehicle or asked to leave the Vehicle with your domestic pet if the Vehicle is crowded; or, if in our opinion, the animal is causing or likely to cause a safety risk or nuisance to other customers.
6. Passengers travelling with domestic pets must travel during off-peak periods only.
7. There is no extra fare charged for animals to travel on our Vehicles.

These new rules are due to come into effect by mid-July 2018.

3. Why Carry Domestic Animals On Public Transport?

We are currently encouraging people out of cars and on to public transport. There are almost 100,000 registered dogs in Auckland and perhaps double or triple that number of domestic cats. Most households with children have a small domestic pet. One of the main reasons to allow for access is to allow dogs, cats and domestic pets to be transported to a vet for treatment. Currently that has to be done by private motor vehicle or taxi.

Another good reason for allowing dogs on public transport is to allow owners to transport them to dog exercise areas and coastal areas which might be simply too far to walk to. Do we want our fantastic reserves to be better used? An example is the popular Meola Dog Park. Its car park is often full to capacity, while buses go right past its main entrance.
4. Auckland Transport's position on the issue to date (and associated inconsistencies)

In response to previous requests from Councillor Cathy Casey to allow dogs on public transport, Auckland Transport has stated that:

“Auckland’s policy generally has been limited to guide dogs and guide dogs only, due to limited space on some peak services and to ensure customer safety, comfort in a confined space and hygiene.”

(Source: Letter to Councillor Cathy Casey from Mark Lambert, General Manager AT Metro, dated 12 April 2018)

In response to the recent Wellington decision, Auckland Transport was then quoted by Stuff as saying it “will not be following Wellington’s lead in allowing pets on public transport”:

“AT spokesman James Ireland said it had looked at the proposal in the past, but decided not to allow pets on buses and trains. However, AT would be watching what happened in Wellington closely.” 27 March 2018.

(Source: https://www.stuff.co.nz/auckland/102593715/pets-on-public-transport-still-a-no-go-auckland-transport-says)

More recently however, on 12 April 2018, Auckland Transport wrote to Councillor Casey (see attached letter) advising that it is currently reviewing the policy for bus passengers, with a view to progressing to allow pets on buses subject to a health and safety review and customer feedback. This most recent communication did not mention anything about carriage of pets on trains.

In summary, there is currently inconsistency in Auckland Transport’s carriage of pets policy, depending on which mode of transport is being used. Further, it is not absolutely clear whether Auckland Transport intends on allowing carriage of pets on buses and trains.

5. Current Rules for Pets On Public Transport in Auckland

Bus

- Disability assist dogs and disability assist dogs in training are allowed to be carried on buses under the supervision of their care-giver. Other pets are not allowed.
- Waiheke Island Buses are the exception to this “no pets” policy, dogs are allowed on board.

Train

- Disability assist dogs and disability assist dogs in training are allowed to be carried on trains. Pet dogs and other animals are not allowed.

Ferries

- Leashed dogs and small animals in cages are carried on most ferry services free of charge. Fullers have dedicated outside seats for dog owners.

Amsterdam

The GVB which runs public transport in Amsterdam states in the General Terms and Conditions Urban and Regional Public Transport 2015 that living animals can be carried free of charge (chapter 4, page 9).

Chapter 4. What can you take with you when you travel?
You may take the following items and animals with you when you travel:
Animals
4.1 Under the conditions set forth in this section, living animals may be carried free of charge in a readily portable hamper, bag or other object that can be placed on the ground or on your lap. Dogs may be transported in other ways, as long as they are kept on a short leash. Should the animal occupy a seating space, then its escort shall owe the applicable fare on the animal’s account.

Vancouver

Translink which runs the metro in Vancouver has the following information available:

Pets on Transit

Travelling with a furry friend? Welcome aboard! Pets, including dogs, cats, rabbits and small fur-bearing or feathered animals are allowed on transit as long as they are in small, hand-held cages. The approved cage or container must fit on your lap and must be fully enclosed with no part of the animal exposed. It may also be placed on the floor, but must not impede free passage of customers and must not block any doors. Please ensure cages are clean, free of odour and have no sharp edges.

If you’re travelling with your pet, it’s best to make your trips during off-peak hours. The transit operator, at his or her discretion, may not allow you to board with your pet if there is a concern for the safety or comfort of your fellow passengers. If only standing room is available, the transit operator will refuse passage to you and your pet. Please respect their decision.

Only one hand-held approved cage or container is allowed per customer and dog strollers are not permitted on transit.
12 April 2018

Councillor Cathy Casey
Cathy.Casey@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Dear Councillor Casey

Auckland Transport - CAS-732491-X2F5V3 - Allowing pets on buses

Thank you for your correspondence of 10 April 2018 sent to Auckland Transport (AT) in relation to allowing dogs on buses.

Auckland Transport (AT) has commenced a process of reviewing policies and rules regarding travel on public transport (PT) services as part of the preparation to finalise the implementation of the New Network. AT ferry service providers already allow dogs and small animals in cages to be carried on most ferry services. Rules for Bus and Train modes are different and are being reviewed to provide consistency for customers, where appropriate.

AT is in the process of transitioning to new Public Transport Operator Model (PTOM) contracts with various private bus companies who provide bus services under their Terms and Conditions (T&C). Their T&C incorporate AT’s guides to traveling on buses, trains and ferries with prams, luggage and other items, as well as other bus accessibility guidelines. AT has been consulting with all bus companies about changes to their T&C of travel, that include incorporating AT’s guidelines and consideration of allowing pets to travel on buses. AT aims to produce one set of Conditions of Carriage under the AT Metro brand and bring greater consistency between PT modes to support the inter-modal transfers within the new connected network.

The review and consultation will include a review of health and safety risks to other passengers and drivers when allowing pets on buses to ensure that the safety of the public, and the workplace safety of bus drivers are effectively managed. Following the consultation with bus operators, and taking into account feedback from customers, and subsequent internal approval, AT will publish the updated Conditions of Carriage to incorporate AT Metro bus. It is expected that this will be completed when the PTOM contracts are implemented across the bus network at the end of this year.

I trust this provides assurance that AT is actively assessing the options to enable safe travel for all passengers including those who wish to travel with their pets.

Yours Sincerely

Derek Koper
Manager AT Bus Services

20 Viaduct Harbour, Auckland 1010
Private Bag 92200, Auckland 1142, New Zealand
09 365 3653, www.AT.govt.nz
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To outline the findings of a cross-council technical review of the Ports of Auckland Draft 30-year Plan.

2. To support the general direction of the review and guidance for future collaboration with Ports of Auckland planning and implementation.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

3. A cross-council team has completed a technical review of the Ports of Auckland Limited (POAL) Draft 30-year Master Plan, as requested by the Chair of the Planning Committee. The team included staff from Auckland Council, Auckland Transport, Panuku and Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED), in collaboration with POAL.

4. In summary, the joint review team notes that the POAL proposals align with the refresh of the City Centre Masterplan, Central Wharves Strategy, and the Waterfront Plan, and in particular, enable the preferred options for cruise as proposed in the Central Wharves Strategy. The team is recommending that council can continue to work with POAL on the delivery and phasing of their development proposals. A copy of the report is provided as Attachment A.

5. POAL have prepared a narrative outlining their rationale and timing for future development, including the urgent need to grow capacity for multi-cargo berths and land facilities as identified in the Port Future Study. The proposals in the Draft 30-year Master Plan enable the on-going operation of the port in the medium term.

6. In the shorter term, working with POAL on detailed design concepts may assist with implementing Quay Street upgrades for buses and public access.

7. The joint review team also noted the need for POAL and Auckland Transport to continue to work with the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) and KiwiRail to ensure that adequate provision is made for freight on the rail network, and to explore ways to increase the rail mode share.

8. A recent Planning Committee workshop voiced support for the proposals and noted the responsiveness of POAL to public concerns about previous redevelopment proposals.

9. In general, the proposals in the master plan are permitted or restricted discretionary activities in the Unitary Plan. POAL is anticipating lodging consent for the car handling facility, the partial demolition of B1 wharf, and the North Bledisloe extension in 2018. The Port Precinct places a priority on port-related activities. A consent application would need to demonstrate that the proposed development would not compromise the operation of the port (e.g. visitor accommodation).

10. In February 2018, the Government announced a programme to develop a comprehensive Upper North Island Supply Chain Strategy, which will involve a logistics and freight review as well as planning for the long term future of ports in the sub-region. Membership of the expert working group, a terms of reference, and timing for any reports have yet to be released.
Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Planning Committee:

a) note that the general direction of the Ports of Auckland Draft 30-year Master Plan aligns with council’s City Centre Master Plan, Waterfront Plan and Central Wharves Strategy, and is consistent with the recommendations of the Ports Future Study.

b) thank Ports of Auckland Limited for its collaboration with council on the technical review, and its responsiveness to public concerns about previous redevelopment proposals, in particular the reduced Bledisloe Wharf extension.

c) support continued collaboration between council staff and Ports of Auckland Limited on the next phase of design and delivery of the initial proposals, including detailed design on Quay Street upgrades for bus, pedestrian and cycle access.

d) support ongoing collaboration between Ports of Auckland Limited, Auckland Transport, New Zealand Transport Agency and KiwiRail to ensure that adequate provision is made for freight on the rail network, and to explore ways to increase the rail mode share.

e) note that the Ports of Auckland Limited capital expenditure programme will require oversight by Auckland Council Investments Ltd, as approved by the Finance and Performance Committee.

f) note the Government’s recent announcement of a working group to prepare a comprehensive Upper North Island Supply Chain Strategy, which will involve a freight and logistics review as well as explore the feasibility of moving the location of the Ports of Auckland.

Horopaki / Context

11. This report outlines a cross-council review of the Ports of Auckland Limited (POAL) Draft 30-year Master Plan. The purpose of the review was to ensure integration of the POAL proposals with cross-council planning and delivery, including the recently-approved refresh of City Centre Master Plan and Waterfront Plan.

12. POAL presented their Draft 30-year Master Plan to a Planning Committee workshop on 1 November 2017, before it was released for public consultation. The Chair of the Planning Committee requested that there be a whole-of-council approach to reviewing those proposed plans against council’s own plans and strategies.

13. The brief was to prepare consolidated council technical advice to elected members on the impacts and effects of the Ports 30-year Plan on approved city centre and waterfront strategic plans (City Centre Master Plan, Waterfront Plan, Central Wharves Strategy) and ongoing project delivery. Staff did not consult with any elected members or mana whenua in putting together the feedback – a workshop was held on 5 April 2018 for elected members to input into the final form of the feedback which is presented in this report.

14. The review has been undertaken by a team from Auckland Council, Auckland Transport, Panuku and ATEED, in collaboration with POAL. The POAL representative was able to further explain the underlying assumptions and phasing of the proposed development, which enabled the team to interrogate the POAL preferred options and to reach a shared view on the way forward. A summary of the feedback received and consultation undertaken by POAL through their public consultation period is provided at Attachment B.

15. This review used the 2016 Port Future Study consultant report as the basis of future freight projections.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

16. The joint review team notes that there was a high level of collaboration and consensus between the council and POAL contributors. The POAL representative further explained the rationale for their proposed development programme, as well as more information about the proposed delivery timeline.

17. In summary, the joint review team is recommending:

a. The proposals align with the refresh of the City Centre Masterplan and the Waterfront Plan, and council can continue to work with POAL on the delivery and phasing of the development proposals. The proposals enable the Central Wharves Strategy preferred options for cruise, may assist with implementing Quay Street upgrades for buses and public access, and enable medium term operation of the Port.

b. Support the early construction of the car handling facility to remove cars from Captain Cook wharf and to enable the eventual release of Captain Cook wharf for cruise, as is the preferred scenario in the Central Wharves Strategy. While there is support for a green roof of some sort, due to the difficult access, council’s parks planning and operations do not endorse the rooftop as public open space. However POAL may choose to operate that space themselves and make it open to the public. The team note that the design of the building and vehicle access will be critical, and can be managed through the resource consent process.

c. Further work with POAL and the cross-council design team developing the Quay Street bus terminal and streetscape proposals, to explore options to enable public access north of the red fence and to enable better an improved public realm without compromising port operational requirements.

d. Continued work with Auckland Transport and POAL on evolving internal circulation requirements, access to Quay Street and impacts on the wider networks from increased port activity.

e. Continued work with Auckland Transport (and other transport agencies, NZTA and KiwiRail) to ensure that adequate provision is made for freight on the rail network, and to explore ways to increase the rail mode share.

f. In general, the proposals in the master plan are permitted or restricted discretionary activities in the Unitary Plan, for the Ports Precinct of the city centre zone and the general coastal marine zone.

g. The Port Precinct places a priority on port-related activities. A consent application would need to demonstrate that the proposed development would not compromise the operation of the port (e.g. visitor accommodation).

h. New buildings subject to design review if within 50m of Quay Street. POAL notes that even though the car handling building is not within that “Area A”, they intend to submit the proposed concept for urban design review.

i. POAL notes that the Bledisloe North extension follows the recommendations of the Port Future Study, to cater for the increasing freight demand, address existing capacity constraints, and ultimately move cargo off Captain Cook Wharf. The berth is a piled structure, not reclamation, and along with the car handling facility, provides replacement berth to enable POAL to remove freight from Captain Cook.

j. POAL is anticipating lodging consent for the car handling facility, the partial demolition of B1 wharf, and the North Bledisloe extension in 2018.

18. At a Planning Committee workshop on 5 April 2018, points raised by elected members included:

- Commendation to POAL for its recent public engagement, which largely supported the proposals, and for how the current proposals responded to public concerns to previous proposals, in particular the substantial reduction in size of the Bledisloe North extension.
• Support for the car handling facility, and while there was some support for a roof-top open space, acknowledged that it was not part of council’s overall open space priorities for the city centre and suggested that the space could either be privately-managed or just a green roof with no public access.

• Some support for the proposed hotel, although some questioned the appropriateness of the use on industrial land, given the space constraints for other ports activities. It was acknowledged that this will be a business decision for POAL, and any impacts will be managed through the resource consent process.

• Note that while the proposals released multi-cargo from Captain Cook wharf, there was no further discussion of the future use of Captain Cook for cruise berths, as preferred in the Central Wharves Strategy.

19. In its Letter of Expectation to Auckland Council Investments Ltd (ACIL), council has noted that it expects ACIL to have visibility over POAL’s capital programme, and keep the council fully informed about this. It is assumed that each proposal will be informed by a Business Case, which ACIL will be privy to.

20. Central Government has recently announced a programme to develop an Upper North Island Supply Chain Strategy. Strategy development will involve a logistics and freight review, as well as planning for the long-term future of ports in the upper North Island. As well as identifying priorities for investment in rail, roads and supporting infrastructure, it will explore the feasibility of moving the location of the Ports of Auckland.

21. An independent working group of experts will be appointed, reporting to the Ministers of Finance, Transport and Regional Economic Development.

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

22. Ports of Auckland Ltd have been conducting their own consultation on the Draft 30-year Master Plan and a summary of the feedback and consultation that they have undertaken is provided at Attachment B. The Waitematā Local Board was invited to the Planning Committee workshop on 5 April 2018 but was unable to send a representative.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

23. It is recognised that any development in or adjacent to the harbour will impact on and be important to mana whenua.

24. As above, a summary of feedback and consultation undertaken by POAL is provided at Attachment B. It is noted that mana whenua were very involved in the Port Future Study, and POAL intends that a Māori Impact Statement will be prepared for all specific projects and resource consent applications.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

25. In its Letter of Expectation to ACIL, council has noted that it expects ACIL to have visibility over POAL’s capital programme, and keep the council fully informed about this. Given that POAL forms part of the group balance sheet, any planned capital investment that might affect the council’s ability to stay within its debt limits will need to be carefully managed.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

26. There is a possible reputational risk if the POAL Draft 30-year Master Plan, the Port Future Study and the council’s strategies for the waterfront and city centre are in conflict. The joint review group was a way to avoid such conflict.

27. In relation to proposed developments, under the Unitary Plan, the proposals in the Draft 30-year Master Plan are generally permitted or restricted discretionary activities on ports land. Council will manage any resource management risks through the regulatory process as POAL moves into implementation for each project.
Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

28. Council and Auckland Transport’s team are working with POAL on detailed design concepts for the Quay Street upgrades, exploring options for buses, cyclists and pedestrian access around the eastern bus terminal.

29. The joint review team also noted the need for POAL and Auckland Transport to continue to work with NZTA and KiwiRail to ensure that adequate provision is made for freight on the rail network, and to explore ways to increase the rail mode share.

30. POAL is anticipating that consents for the car handling facility and North Bledisloe extension will be lodged during 2018. POAL capital expenditure programme will require oversight by ACIL, as approved by the Finance and Performance Committee.
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1. Summary

This report outlines a cross-Council review of the Ports of Auckland (POAL) Draft 30-year Master Plan. The purpose of the review was to ensure integration of the POAL proposals with cross-Council planning and delivery, including the recently-approved refresh of City Centre Master Plan and Waterfront Plan.

Ports of Auckland Ltd (POAL) presented their Draft 30-year Master Plan to a Councillor workshop on 2 November 2017, before it was released for public consultation. The Chair of the Planning Committee requested that there be a whole-of-Council approach to reviewing those proposed plans.

This review has been undertaken by a team from Auckland Council, Auckland Transport, Panuku and ATEED, in collaboration with POAL. The POAL representative was able to further explain their
underlying assumptions, to enable the team to interrogate the preferred options and to reach a shared view on the way forward.

In summary, the team notes that there was a high level of collaboration and consensus between the Council and POAL contributors. The POAL representative further explained the rationale for their proposed development programme, as well as more information about the proposed delivery timeline.

In general, the joint review team is recommending:

- The proposals align with the refresh of the City Centre Masterplan and the Waterfront Plan, and Council can continue to work with POAL on the delivery and phasing of the development proposals. The proposals enable the central wharves strategy preferred options for cruise, may assist with implementing Quay street upgrades for buses and public access and enable medium term operation of the Port.
- Support the early construction of the car park building to enable the eventual release of Captain Cook wharf for cruise, as the preferred scenario in the central wharves strategy. This does not extend to support for a hotel or public space on top of a car park (not considered necessary). Note that design will be critical and can be managed through the resource consent process.
- Further work with POAL and the design team developing the Quay Street bus terminal and streetscape proposals, to explore options to enable public access north of the red fence and to enable better an improved public realm without compromising port operational requirements.
- Continued work with Auckland Transport and POAL on evolving internal circulation requirements, access to Quay Street and impacts on the wider networks of increased port activity.
- Continued work with Auckland Transport (and other transport agencies, NZTA and KiwiRail) to ensure that adequate provision is made for freight on the rail network, and to explore ways to increase the rail mode share.
- Note that from a regulatory planning perspective, in general the proposed activities are permitted or restricted discretionary, with new buildings subject to design review if within 50m. of Quay Street. POAL notes that even though the car park building is not within the Area A, they intend to submit the proposed concept for urban design review.
- Note that confidential discussions are underway for the Quay Park master plan, which may require further review of Quay Street.
- POAL notes that the Biedslooe north extension follows the recommendations of the Port Future Study, to cater for the increasing freight demand, address existing capacity constraints, and ultimately move cargo off Captain Cook Wharf. The berth is a piled structure, not reclamation, and along with the car park building, provides replacement berth to enable POAL to remove freight from Captain Cook.
The proposed process to complete this technical review of the POAL plan is to workshop with elected members on a way forward.

2. Strategic context

A refresh of the direction and implementation of the City Centre Master Plan and the Waterfront Plan was adopted by the Planning Committee in 2017.

Earlier, Council had commissioned a Consensus Working Group study on options for the ports, resulting in the July 2016 publication of the Port Future Study. This study recommended additional infrastructure be provided for in the medium term (30 year horizon), particularly a carpark building and a berth on the north end of Eledisoe, and identified a ‘burning platform’ in relation to the capacity of the western end of the port.

The study recommended that port relocation options be considered in the longer-term. Further work on relocation options and an Upper North Island Port Strategy is awaiting direction from the new government.

POAL has prepared a draft 30-year Master Plan based on the Port Future Study recommendations. The Master Plan was designed to provide the necessary infrastructure to cater for the projected freight task until a new port can be built and to integrate with Council’s waterfront plans.

POAL is currently engaged in public consultation on the plan. Council has been asked to participate in this process. As directed by the ESG, this technical review by officers from across the Council whanau is to articulate the relationship of POAL’s planning with Council’s strategic planning and implementation, in particular:

- immediate impacts, risks or opportunities in relation to downtown programme, as well as medium and long-term outcomes
- impacts on agreed strategies, e.g. Central Wharves Strategy, cruise planning
- Opportunities for additional benefits by amending current plans in response to the POAL proposals
- Risks and issues for resolution or decision, which may need additional investigation beyond the scope of this assessment

3. Ports of Auckland – rationale and timeline

The following information has been provided by Ports of Auckland Ltd, to outline the rationale for their 30-year master plan and to provide an indicative timeline for development. See Attachment 1 for the full narrative from Alistair Kirk, Ports of Auckland General Manager Infrastructure and Property.
The Masterplan is essentially based on the concepts outlined in the Port Future Study. The port freight task is growing steadily as Auckland’s population grows. As an island nation, Auckland and New Zealand is dependent upon ports for the movement of freight imports and exports and cruise ship passengers. Ship are also increasing in size (length, width and/or depth) as international shipping lines order larger and larger ships to cater for the increasing global freight task and to reduce their operating costs.

Global shipping lines are ordering larger and larger ships for the main global trade routes. These larger ships displace existing ships from these routes, and the lines ‘cascade’ the displaced ships on to lower volume routes. This ‘cascading’ effect results in larger and larger ships being pushed in to the Australasian market. The container ships calling Auckland are likely to increase in size from the current 5,000 teu to 7,000 teu and 9,000 teu within the next 5 - 10 years.

Cruise ships are also getting larger, and the international lines are deploying larger and larger ships into the Australasian market.

Ship design is also evolving to include a new range of wider ‘Panamax’ ships which are designed to fit the widened Panama Canal.

A port provides berths (waterside capacity) for vessels, and yard areas (landside capacity) to handle the freight. These two (waterside capacity and landside capacity) must be in balance. Hence the Master Plan contains both elements which must be delivered to provide the necessary increase in capacity.

The Port operates 24/7 and it’s crucial that the operations are reliable, efficient and safe. The Port Master Plan has been developed and sequenced accordingly so that it can be implemented with minimal impact on existing operations.

The port is split in to two distinct (but linked) areas; Ferguson container terminal, and Multi Cargo. It is necessary to stage developments in the following sequence to minimise the impacts on port operations and Auckland’s imports and exports.

The table below outlines proposed timing for projects identified in the 30-year Plan (see Attachment 2 for further detail):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed timing</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>1. Dredging materials (dump at sea beyond Coromandel peninsula) – applying for consent to EPA – underway now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 - 2021</td>
<td>2. Carpark – design (February), consent &amp; construct – aim to complete 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. North Bledisloe expansion – apply for consent (Late 2018) + 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed timing</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>months construction – aim for operational 2021 (relocate berths from west Captain Cook)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Partially demolish B1 – 6 months (not dependent on car park building)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years +</td>
<td>5. Engineering workshop (3 years); office building within 10 years – demolish existing building for yard space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10 years</td>
<td>6. Consent to remove Marsden, dredge basin – triggered by growth, need for lower Bledisloe berth, demand for cruise (within 10 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Release Captain Cook for cruise (10 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Hotel – within 5 – 10 years, linked to cruise industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note that consents requested for long duration (10 – 15 years), flexible staging, gradually build out ahead of demand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Technical commentary on POAL draft plan

A team from across the Council whānau has worked with POAL (Alistair Kirk, General Manager Infrastructure and Property) on this review. Participants included:

- Auckland Transport – Strategy
- Auckland Council – DPO, ADO, Plans and Places
- ATEED – cruise
- Panuku – strategy & waterfront planning

The table below summarises the points discussed by POAL and the council team. More detailed commentary is provided in the attachments:

1. Narrative from Ports of Auckland Ltd – Alistair Kirk, General Manager Infrastructure and Property

In summary, the team notes that there was a high level of collaboration and consensus between the Council and POAL contributors. As noted above, POAL have outlined the rationale for their proposed development programme as well as more information about the proposed delivery timeline.

There was only brief discussion about public feedback received as part of the POAL engagement process, as the purpose of this review was to determine any technical issues relevant to Council’s planning and delivery. It is assumed that the public feedback and any issues that might arise from that (e.g. a difference between public perception and Council’s priorities) can be canvassed by the PCG, ESG and at workshops with elected members.
In general, the joint review team is recommending:

- The proposals align with the refresh of the City Centre Master Plan and the Waterfront Plan, and Council can continue to work with POAL on the delivery and phasing of the development proposals. The proposals enable the central wharves strategy preferred options for cruise, may assist with implementing Quay street upgrades for buses and public access and enable medium term operation of the Port.
- Support the early construction of the car park building to enable the eventual release of Captain Cook wharf for cruise, as the preferred scenario in the central wharves strategy. This does not extend to support for a hotel or public space on top of a car park (not considered necessary). Note that design will be critical and can be managed through the resource consent process.
- Further work with POAL and the design team developing the Quay Street bus terminal and streetscape proposals, to explore options to enable public access north of the red fence and to enable better an improved public realm without compromising port operational requirements.
- Continued work with Auckland Transport and POAL on evolving internal circulation requirements, access to Quay Street and impacts on the wider networks of increased port activity.
- Continued work with Auckland Transport (and other transport agencies, NZTA and KiwiRail) to ensure that adequate provision is made for freight on the rail network, and to explore ways to increase the rail mode share.
- Note that from a regulatory planning perspective, in general the proposed activities are permitted or restricted discretionary, with new buildings subject to design review if within 30m. of Quay Street. POAL notes that even though the car park building is not within the “Area A”, they intend to submit the proposed concept for urban design review.
- Note that confidential discussions are underway for the Quay Park master plan, which may require further review of Quay Street.
- POAL notes that the Bendside north extension follows the recommendations of the Port Future Study, to cater for the increasing freight demand, address existing capacity constraints, and ultimately move cargo off Captain Cook Wharf. The berth is a piled structure, not reclamation, and along with the car park building, provides replacement berth to enable POAL to remove freight from Captain Cook.

The table below summarise the key issues and recommendations for further collaboration between Council and POAL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Key issues</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POAL proposed</td>
<td>See Attachment 1 for narrative and implementation proposals from POAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Key issues</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sequence</td>
<td>Summary of proposed development sequence:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Dredging materials (dump at sea beyond Coromandel peninsula) – applying for consent to EPA – underway now.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Carpark – design (February), consent &amp; construct – aim to complete 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. North Bladesloe extension – apply for consent (Late 2018) + 18 months construction – aim for operational 2021 (relocate berths from west Captain Cook)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Partially demolish B1 – 6 months (not dependent on other moves?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Engineering workshop (3 years), office building within 10 years – demolish existing building for yard space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Consent to remove Mansden, dredge basin – triggered by growth, need for lower Bladesloe berth, demand for cruise (within 10 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Release Captain Cook for cruise (10 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Hotel – within 5 – 10 years, linked to cruise industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note that consents requested for long duration (10 – 15 years), flexible staging, gradually build out ahead of demand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central wharves</td>
<td>• Multi-cargo (including cars) is at capacity and growing – constrained infrastructure in this part of port.</td>
<td>Review team supports construction of car park to release Captain Cook from parked cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NZEIR report on car imports notes that there will be continued growth in car imports, most of which stay in Auckland. Also noted high cost of relocation to Northport or Taumarua, not including costs of roads/rail to move cars.</td>
<td>Further work required on implementation of Cruise Strategy, with cruise infrastructure focussed on Captain Cook. POAL have not shown extension of CC as part of our Masterplan, as didn’t want to undermine Queens Wharf dolphin decisions. If Council wants to extend CC, POAL would support this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction of carpark building on Bladesloe (desired completion 2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• North Bladesloe extension allows more berths along west and north and releases west side of Captain Cook. Releases Captain Cook wharf from parked cars.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• POAL is exploring various operating models to support cruise without need to extend Captain Cook.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quay Street interface</td>
<td>• Assume that customs-controlled and Port staff parking area would be reduced and ultimately move eastwards, potentially freeing up more of the brentworks for public use and enabling a better urban realm outcome along Quay St East.</td>
<td>Further work required with POAL and Quay Street design team to clarify brentworks operational requirements, implications for plans in that area, in particular how greater pedestrian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Key issues</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Transport and access  | • AT seeks to work with the Port to understand any implications for access arrangements as a result of the internal reconfiguration of the Port and operations, and how these change over time.  
• AT keen to work with the Port and NZTA on projected Port traffic volumes and how best to identify and co-ordinate any wider network improvements.  
• Support continued efforts to increase use of rail freight, improved truck capacity efficiencies, managing peak vehicle movements, and greater use of the SH16 corridor rather than streets in downtown area.  
• For all proposal, AT interested in construction requirements (including dredging) and any impacts on wider network. | Ongoing collaboration between AT and POAL on  
• Internal circulation and impact on wider network  
• Access to Quay Street and impacts on intersections  
• Work with Kiwirail and NZTA on wider network implications of changing and growing POAL operations |
| Car park building     | • As above, general support for need for car park building  
• Building itself will require design review  
• Scale and set back from Quay Street (15m building set back >50m from street) reduces visual impact  
• Roof-top park questioned – not part of open space strategy for that part of city; difficulty with visibility and access  
• Explore other ways to add amenity without requiring public access, e.g. green roof  
• Test options for adaptable or relocatable buildings  
• POAL notes that public submissions have mostly supported the idea of a roof-top park | Support building, subject to design review.  
Roof-top open space not required.  
POAL will review adaptable or relocatable options, with focus on operational needs for next 30 years. |
| Other buildings       | • Proposed workshop and office building subject to design review (within the Area A 50m deep along Quay Street).  
• AT needs to better understand access and servicing requirements for proposed hotel, including safety and pedestrian implications.  
• Similarly with proposed headquarters building. AT interested in managing interaction of various users and traffic, including pedestrians. | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Key issues</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Marine  | POAL see need to increase channel depth and width  
Disposal of dredging to sea as no new reclamation proposals – subject to consents from EPA                                                                 | Consider developing Regional Strategy with respect to disposal of dredging by POAL, Panuku (Marinas etc.) and AT (ferry berths).                   |
| Planning| Further detail on planning issues in attached memo from Plans and Places.  
Car park building (for ports’ purposes) is permitted activity. Design of building will be subject to conditions.                                  |                                                                                                                                                   |

5. **Recommended process from here**

The next step in this technical review of the POAL plan is a workshop with elected members, to discuss the general direction of the technical review prepared by the joint council team.

In February, Central Government announced a programme to develop an Upper North Island Supply Chain Strategy. Strategy development will involve a logistics and freight review, as well as planning for the long-term future of ports in the upper North Island. As well as identifying priorities for investment in rail, roads and supporting infrastructure, it will explore the feasibility of moving the location of the Ports of Auckland.

An independent working group of experts will be appointed by government, reporting to the Ministers of Finance, Transport and Regional Economic Development.

**Attachments**

1. Narrative from Ports of Auckland Ltd – Alistair Kirk, General Manager Infrastructure and Property
Attachment 1: Memo from Ports of Auckland Ltd

Alistair Kirk
General Manager Infrastructure and Property
Ports of Auckland Council

The following information has been provided by Ports of Auckland Ltd, to outline the rationale for their 30 year master plan and to provide an indicative timeline for development.

The Masterplan is essentially based on the concepts outlined in the Port Future Study. The port freight task is growing steadily as Auckland’s population grows. As an island nation, Auckland and New Zealand is dependent upon ports for the movement of freight imports and exports and cruise ship passengers. Ship are also increasing in size (length, width and / or depth) as international shipping lines order larger and larger ships to cater for the increasing global freight task and to reduce their operating costs.

Global shipping lines are ordering larger and larger ships for the main global trade routes. These larger ships displace existing ships from these routes, and the lines ‘cascade’ the displaced ships on to lower volume routes. This ‘cascading’ effect results in larger and larger ships being pushed in to the Australasian market. The container ships calling Auckland are likely to increase in size from the current 5,000 teu to 7,000 teu and 9,000 teu within the next 5 - 10 years.

Cruise ships are also getting larger, and the international lines are deploying larger and larger ships into the Australasian market.

Ship design is also evolving to include a new range of wider ‘Panamax’ ships which are designed to fit the widened Panama Canal.

A port provides berths (waterside capacity) for vessels, and yard areas (landside capacity) to handle the freight. These two (waterside capacity and landside capacity) must be in balance. Hence the Master Plan contains both elements which must be delivered to provide the necessary increase in capacity.

The Port operates 24/7 and it’s crucial that the operations are reliable, efficient and safe. The Port Master Plan has been developed and sequenced accordingly so that it can be implemented with minimal impact on existing operations. The port is split in to two distinct (but linked) areas; Fergusson container terminal, and Multi-Cargo. It is necessary to stage developments in the following sequence to minimise the impacts on port operations and Auckland’s imports and exports:
Fergusson Container Terminal

The Port Masterplan provides the necessary infrastructure to cater for a container freight task for an Auckland population of 2.7 million people, and to cater for bigger container ships.

1. Fergusson north berth – complete – awaiting delivery / commissioning of Quay Cranes late 2018;
2. Automate container yard, and increase stack height to 4 – underway – completion 2019;
3. Engineering Workshop – required within next 3 years to accommodate the larger automated yard equipment;
4. Office Building – required within next 10 years to enable existing office to be demolished to free up further yard space;
5. Extend Fergusson north berth – likely within next 5 – 10 years to cater for increasing ship size.

Multi Cargo

Multi Cargo is at capacity. EY, in the Port Future Study, identified a capacity ‘burning platform’. Since the Port Future Study, the cargo volumes have increased considerably and there is regular congestion and ship delays. The Port Master Plan provides the necessary infrastructure to cater for the growing Pacific Island Trade, increasing cement and construction material imports, and increasing vehicle / plant / machinery imports while also anticipating the relocation of freight off Captain Cook Wharf and the complete removal of Marsden Wharf. The phasing of the projects are as follows:

1. Construct car park building – a pressing need as the yard is regularly congested / ships are delayed. A significant construction footprint is required, hence the need to undertake this project now before volumes increase further. The loss of the construction footprint will put considerable pressure on other parts of the port, but the car park building is an important first step to address yard capacity.
2. Once car park building complete (anticipate late 2019), relocate point of entry for Toyota from Shed 51 on Bledisloe B1 Wharf to new car park.
3. Once Toyota point of entry relocated, demolish Shed 51 and part of Bledisloe B1 Wharf (eastern side of Bledisloe) to open up Bledisloe B2 wharf. The eastern side of B1 Wharf must remain to accommodate the Golden Bay Cement vessels.
4. Construct North Berth at Bledisloe (anticipate 2019/2021). This will be a piled wharf structure (like Fergusson north berth). In order to gain the maximum benefit, with less intrusion into the harbour, PCAL engaged with shipping lines to determine future ship sizes and shipping requirements. POAL has been able to reduce the northward extension from the 40m discussed in the Port Future Study to 13m. This will provide enough length along the western side of Bledisloe for 2 x 200m roll-on-roll-off ships; and increase the length of Bledisloe B2 for longer
220m general cargo ships. The Bledisloe north berth will accommodate 220m long ro-ro ships. The 265m long ships must be accommodated along the north face of Bledisloe, as there is not enough length along the western side of Bledisloe (B3) for a 220m ship plus 265m ship. If a 265m ship plus 265m ship were berthed on the western side, then these ships would extend some 65m out in to the harbour (and need the 90m wharf extension consented in 2014).

5. The rooftop park will be constructed on top of the car park building at the same time the Bledisloe north berth is constructed. This is an ‘offset’ for the northern berth. POAL’s Architect has identified a lack of public parks / spaces at the eastern end of the city, along with a significant increase in apartment construction. POAL intends to facilitate a public engagement process to input in to the park design with the aim of creating a space which meets the local community’s needs and aspirations.

6. Relocate ships and cargo from west side Captain Cook Wharf to Bledisloe North berth (earliest around 2021). This would allow cruise ships to berth on the western side of Captain Cook Wharf and public access to the wharf and breastworks.

7. Replace Kings Low Landing – wharf structure at south end of Bledisloe west. This structure needs to be replaced prior to deepening of the Captain Cook / Bledisloe basin – as the existing structure is founded at shallow depth.

8. Construct new seawall south of Marsden. This is required for two reasons; to found the seawall at greater depth to facilitate deepening of the basin; and to minimise the northern extension of the Bledisloe North Berth. The new seawall will be constructed approximately 5m southward of the existing seawall (to align with the projected face of the Breastworks) and this reduces the northern extension of Bledisloe in to the harbour.

9. Remove Marsden reclamation and deepen the Captain Cook / Bledisloe basin – within 10 years.

10. This then frees up the eastern side of Captain Cook for cruise ships or other vessels.

11. Hotel – within 5 – 10 years. POAL would seek a partner for this project and would not sell the land. The purpose of the Hotel is to ‘get the chicken across the road’ to access the rooftop park (on the car park building), and to also provide a link with the cruise industry for over-nighting cruise ship passengers.

**Marine Projects**

Deepen channel – need to increase channel depth and width (at the bends) for; ‘cascading’ container ships above; larger cruise ships and wider ships.

Dispose of dredgings to sea – required as POAL has committed to not undertaking any new reclamation.
Attachment 2: Memo from Auckland Council Plans and Places

POAL Draft 30-year Master Plan – Auckland Unitary Plan assessment

15 February 2018

Purpose and context

The following is an assessment of the key activities proposed in the Ports of Auckland Limited (POAL) Draft 30-year Master Plan (the Master Plan) against the relevant provisions of the Auckland Unitary Plan - Operative in Part (AUP). In particular, this assessment addresses the activities proposed by POAL at the port facility in Central Auckland.

The information used to compile this assessment are as follows:

- Power Point presentation entitled “POAL Draft 30-year Master Plan”; and
- Map entitled “Overall Master Plan 2017”.

The assessment is set out as follows:

- Key activities proposed in the Master Plan;
- Overview of relevant AUP provisions;
- Identification of activity status of key activities; and
- Assessment of key activities against AUP objectives and policies / assessment criteria.

The Master Plan – purpose and key activities

With specific reference to the Port Future Study (the wider consideration of the future of the POAL facility in its existing location to the east of the City Centre), the presentation states:

“Short-term pathways need to be created to enable the Port to continue to operate efficiently prior to a planned new Port being established due to the substantial lead times involved.”

To that extent, the key activities identified in the presentation and on the map and the key AUP considerations are as follows:

- New head office and engineering workshop;
- Ferguson North Wharf completion then extension;
- Demolish part of Bledisloe 81 Wharf (eastern side of Bledisloe);
- Extend Bledisloe Wharf for a new north berth;
- Demolition of Marsden Wharf, removal of breastwork and construction of new seawall;
- Dredging and disposal;
- Vehicle handling storage – new car parking building; and
- Waterfront hotel.

Overview of relevant Unitary Plan provisions

The relevant sections of the AUP are as follows:

- City Centre zone
- General Coastal Marine zone
- Port precinct
- City Centre Port Noise overlay
- Auckland-wide chapters ag stormwater, land disturbance, contaminated land
### Attachment A

#### Item 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
<th>Key issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New head office and engineering workshop (located on land adjacent to Quay Street within precinct area A)</td>
<td>New buildings within Port Precinct Area A require resource consent as restricted discretionary activity. The maximum permitted building height is 24 metres. Resource consent is required if this height is sought to be exceeded. A construction noise standard also applies to new buildings. The new building may require consent for land disturbance, discharges from contaminated land, changes to stormwater management etc. The proposed office and workshop activities fall within the categories of Marine and Port Activities and Offices accessory to Marine and Port Activities which are permitted activities in the Port Precinct. The proposed activities are permitted subject to subject to meeting the relevant controls for noise and lighting. Resource consent is required if these standards are not met.</td>
<td>New buildings in Area A are assessed against a number of urban design criteria. Of particular note, such buildings should have &quot;defined public fronts that address the street to positively contribute to the public realm and pedestrian safety&quot;, &quot;building mass [which] is visually broken up into distinct elements&quot; and &quot;quality of building design [that] reflects and recognizes Quay Street's importance as a gateway to the city centre&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle handling storage – new car parking building (located on land adjacent to Quay Street outside precinct area A)</td>
<td>New buildings outside Port Precinct Area A are a permitted activity (no resource consent required for the building). Resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity will be required if standards for construction noise or height are sought to be exceeded. The new building may require consent for land disturbance, discharges from contaminated land, changes to stormwater management etc.</td>
<td>The urban design criteria do not apply to new buildings outside of Area A. As a discretionary activity, the relevant objectives and policies of the City Centre zone and Port precinct are applicable to any resource consent application for open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Waterfront Hotel (located on land adjacent to Quay Street within precinct Area A)

| The proposed open space on the roof of the car parking building would be a discretionary activity. |
| New buildings within Port Precinct Area A require resource consent as restricted discretionary activity. |
| The maximum permitted building height is 24 metres. Resource consent is required if this height is sought to be exceeded. A construction noise standard also applies to new buildings. |
| The new building may require consent for land disturbance, discharges from contaminated land, changes to stormwater management etc. |
| Visitor accommodation is a discretionary activity in the Port Precinct. |
| The noise standards (i.e. noise generated by the accommodation and accessory activities) are not considered relevant due to the comparatively quiet nature of short stay accommodation. |
| The City Centre Port Noise Overlay does not apply to the proposed hotel as the overlay boundaries are external to the |
| precinct. | Matters for assessment are as follows:  
(a) location and design;  
(b) construction or works method, timing and hours of operation;  
(c) effects on coastal processes;  
(d) effects on navigation and safety;  
(e) effects on the visual amenity values of the Waitemata Harbour;  
(f) effects on Mana Whenua values; and  
(g) consent duration and monitoring.  

It is not clear how much of the extension to Fergusson Wharf is part of the already consented works and how much is additional to that.  

Further extensions to Fergusson Wharf may have issues in terms of coastal processes as it is the narrowest part of the harbour and acts as a headland structure. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson North Wharf completion and extension</td>
<td>In the Port Precinct, ‘wharves, landings and drydocks, including alterations and additions to these structures’ are a restricted discretionary activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Bledisloe Wharf for a new north berth</td>
<td>As for Ferguson Wharf above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Extension of Bledisloe Wharf would require an assessment of effects on coastal processes. There is less likely to be issues than at Fergusson Wharf as it is within the existing headland form of Wynyard and Ferguson wharves. Extension with a wharf structure is preferred to reclamation as it has less effect on coastal processes.  
The extension would require an assessment of visual amenity effects |
| Demolition of part of Bledisloe B1, Marsden Wharf, removal of breastwork | Demolition or removal of buildings or coastal marine area structures is a permitted activity. |
| Remove Marsden reclamation | Declaration is a restricted discretionary activity. |
| Construction of new seawall south of existing seawall | New hard protection structures are a restricted discretionary activity. |
| Dredging and disposal | The new seawall would require a resource consent. The matters considered focus on effects on existing activities, wave hydraulics and the harbour environment. |

**Dredging and disposal**

Maintenance dredging (to previously approved depths) in the Port Precinct is a controlled activity (consent must be granted but conditions may be imposed).

Capital works dredging (to new depths) is a restricted discretionary activity in the Port Precinct.

Disposal is proposed for a site 50km east of Curier Island. This is outside the territorial sea and requires approval of the Environmental Protection Authority, not the Council.

Dredging matters of control are:

1. maintenance dredging:
   a. effects on water quality.
   b. effects on harbour traffic, navigation and safety; and
   c. duration and monitoring.

Capital works dredging has similar matters of discretion with the addition of ecological values and water quality.

The Port area has been dredged for many years with no more than minor environmental effects. Consent conditions would address effects on other harbour users and management of contaminated sediments.
### Activity status and relevant provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Relevant plan section</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
<th>Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New head office and engineering workshop located on land adjacent to Quay Street within precinct plan 2 Area A (see map below)</td>
<td>Port Precinct</td>
<td>The following activities are permitted in the Port Precinct:</td>
<td>Assessment criteria D208.8.2:</td>
<td>The Port Precinct is permissive for port-related office and industrial activities, subject to the relevant standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Marine and Port Activities</td>
<td>(5) new buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for within Area A shown on Precinct plan 2:</td>
<td>Based on the information provided, the proposed head office and engineering workshop will be located within Precinct Area A (a 50m wide strip along Quay St and the western side of Bledisloe Wharf). Therefore as consent is required for the building and the relevant assessment criteria for building design will apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Offices necessary to Marine and Port Activities</td>
<td>(e) the assessment H8.8.2(1)(a)(i), (ix), (xii), (xiii), (xiv), (xvi), (xvii), (xix), (xix) and (c)(ix) of the Business - City Centre Zone rules apply in addition to the criteria below;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- New buildings and alterations and additions to existing buildings outside Area A in the Port Precinct</td>
<td>(b) the extent to which buildings within Area A shown on precinct plan 2 have clearly defined public fronts that address the street to positively contribute to the public realm and pedestrian safety. Where this is not possible, where practicable be designed to avoid long, unrelieved frontages and excessive bulk and scale when viewed from Quay Street;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The following activities are restricted discretionary activities in the Port Precinct:</td>
<td>(c) the extent to which building mass is visually broken up into distinct elements. Techniques include the use of recesses, variation in building height and roof form, horizontal and vertical rhythms and façade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- New buildings and alterations and additions to existing buildings (other than minor cosmetic alterations) within Area A in the Port Precinct</td>
<td></td>
<td>Of particular note, such buildings should have “defined public fronts” that address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Relevant plan section</td>
<td>Activity status</td>
<td>Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>construction noise, lighting and building height (Precinct Plan 1 – 24m) apply.</td>
<td>modulation and articulation; (c) the extent to which any parking, loading and servicing activities including the storage and collection of wastes associated with a building is screened and occur behind the buildings and away from Quay Street; (d) the extent to which the quality of building design reflects and recognizes Quay Street’s importance as a gateway to the city centre. In particular, it should have regard to the area’s high visibility in views along Quay Street; (f) the extent to which the functional and operational requirements of marine and port activities to be accommodated within the building are recognised when considering the assessment criteria above; and (g) the extent to which the adverse effects of any ponding or diversion of floodwater upstream of the Port Precinct caused by changes to the overland flow path will be avoided or mitigated.</td>
<td>the street to positively contribute to the public realm and pedestrian safety”, “building mass (which) is visually broken up into distinct elements” and “quality of building design [that] reflects and recognizes Quay Street’s importance as a gateway to the city centre”. In addition, the development of new buildings is permitted subject to height and construction noise controls. Noise from activities carried out within the Port Precinct is permitted provided that it complies with the relevant standards measured 1 metre from the façade of buildings beyond the inner and outer control boundaries (outside the precinct boundaries).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further information would be needed to assess fully.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Relevant plan section</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
<th>Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>meets the purpose of the standard; (b) where building height is exceeded, Policy 1208.3/1 and (d) of the Port Precinct and Policy 98.5(30) of the Business – City Centre Zone should be considered.</td>
<td>Construction noise carried out within the Port Precinct is permitted provided that it complies with specified standard measured 1 metre from the façade of any building outside the precinct. Where noise or construction noise do not comply with these standards the exceedance must be assessed against the health and amenity values of people who may be affected beyond the Port precinct balanced against the existing noise environment and the operational requirements of the Port of Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Port Precinct Policy (1): Enable the consolidation, intensification, redevelopment and growth within the precinct for a wide range of marine and port activities and associated structures, to provide for the development of the Port’s capacity for shipping, and its connections with other transport modes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Port Precinct Policy (8): Limit maximum building height to an appropriate scale to provide a transition in height between the city centre core and the harbour, with the exception of specifically identified container and cargo-handling facilities, vessels, structures and equipment associated with marine and port activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• City Centre Policy (30):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Relevant plan section</td>
<td>Activity status</td>
<td>Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manage adverse effects associated with building height and form by: (a) transitioning building height and development densities down to neighbourhoods adjoining the city centre and to the harbour edge; (b) protecting sunlight to identified public open spaces and view shafts; (c) requiring the height and form of new buildings to respect the valley and ridgeline form of the city centre and building design to be complementary to existing or planned character of precincts; and (d) managing the scale, form and design of buildings to: (i) avoid adverse dominance and/or amenity effects on streets and public open space; and (10) noise and construction noise: (a) the extent to which adverse effects on the health and amenity values of people who may be affected beyond the Port precinct are avoided, remedied and mitigated, taking into account the existing noise environment, the frequency and duration of the proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Relevant plan section</td>
<td>Activity status</td>
<td>Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Vehicle handling storage – new car parking building (located on land adjacent to Quay Street; within precinct Area A) | Port Precinct City Centre zone | The following activities are permitted in the Port Precinct:  
- Marine and Port Activities (this includes the unloading of cars and related transfer operations)  
- Offices accessory to Marine and Port Activities  
- New buildings and alterations and additions to existing buildings outside Area A in the Port Precinct | From the information provided the proposed new car parking building sits partially within Area A. However there is no frontage to Quay Street.  
The height control is 24m in the identified location.  
Public open spaces are not anticipated in the port precinct and therefore the policy framework does not support open space activities. | |
| | | | The relevant assessment criteria for the new building design and construction noise are the same as those listed above for new the head office and engineering workshop.  
The noise controls remain relevant although it is noted that car parking is unlikely to exceed these standards (compared to an engineering workshop). | |
| | | | The new building may | |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Relevant plan section</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
<th>Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront hotel (located on land adjacent to Quay Street within precinct Area A)</td>
<td>Port Precinct</td>
<td>Visitor accommodation is a discretionary activity in the Port Precinct. As the activities, standards and assessment criteria in the Business – City Centre Zone do not apply to land in the Port Precinct unless otherwise specified in the Precinct activity table, and residential accommodation</td>
<td>The following City Centre zone objectives and policies are considered relevant to the accommodation activity:</td>
<td>As a discretionary activity, the relevant objectives and policies of the City Centre zone and Port precinct are applicable to any resource consent application for visitor accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Precinct</td>
<td>City Centre zone Noise overlay</td>
<td>require consent for land disturbance, discharges from contaminated land, changes to stormwater management etc. Further information would be needed to assess fully.</td>
<td>Policies: (2) Enable an increase in the density, diversity and quality of housing in the centres</td>
<td>From the information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Relevant plan section</td>
<td>Activity status</td>
<td>Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(other than worker accommodation) is not listed, the default status of discretionary activity applies (Rule C1.7(1)).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>zones and Business – Mixed Use Zone while managing any reverse sensitivity effects including from the higher levels of ambient noise and reduced privacy that may result from non-residential activities.</td>
<td>provided the proposed new waterfront hotel building sits partially within Area A. Therefore the design criteria noted above are relevant. While the application would be considered as discretionary overall, the design criteria of the precinct would be considered in the assessment of the building’s design. The height control is 24m in the identified location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(19) Provide for a wide range of activities along the waterfront, while continuing to provide for those activities requiring a harbour location.</td>
<td>The Port Precinct places a priority on port-related activities. A consent application would need to demonstrate that the proposed development would not compromise the operation of the port.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20) Enhance the waterfront as a major gateway to the city centre and Auckland.</td>
<td>The noise standards (i.e. noise generated by the accommodation and accessory activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(21) Enable the efficient use and development of the Port of Auckland and identified marine and port activity areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(24) Encourage comprehensive and integrated development of key development sites or precincts in the city centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(25) Limit activities that would have reverse sensitivity effects on established and future marine and port activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Relevant plan section</td>
<td>Activity status</td>
<td>Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The following Port Precinct objectives and policies are considered relevant to the accommodation activity:</td>
<td>are not considered relevant due to the comparatively quiet nature of short-stay accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objectives:</td>
<td>The City Centre Port Noise Overlay does not apply to the proposed hotel as the overlay boundaries are external to the precinct. Therefore while reverse sensitivity issues may arise (for hotel guests) from the port’s operational noise, this would not be a matter for the consent authority. Such potential noise issues would therefore be dealt with as a compliance matter (under section 16 of the Resource Management Act 1991) or through building design and possibly implementation of a non-complaints covenant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) The use and development of non-port related activities and buildings do not compromise the existing or future operation of the precinct.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Adverse reverse sensitivity effects on the efficient and safe operation of marine and port activities are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Buildings adjacent to Quay Street complement and enhance the gateway to the city centre, while recognising any functional and operational requirements of marine and port activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policies:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Ensure that non-port related activities or non-port related development within the precinct does not compromise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Relevant plan section</td>
<td>Activity status</td>
<td>Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fergusson North Wharf completion and extension</td>
<td>Port Precinct, General Coastal Marine zone</td>
<td>In the Port Precinct, wharves, landings and drydocks, including alterations and additions to these structures are a restricted discretionary activity.</td>
<td>(9) encourage buildings within Area A on Precinct plan 2, to be of a high quality design to complement and enhance this city centre gateway and to contribute positively to the visual quality, amenity, interest and public safety of streets and public open spaces, while recognising any functional and operational requirements of marine and port activities. The relevant assessment criteria for the new building design and construction noise are the same as those listed above for new the head office and engineering workshop.</td>
<td>It is not clear how much of the extension to Fergusson Wharf is part of the already consented works and how much is additional to that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matters of discretion: (5) wharves, landings and drydocks within the Port Precinct: (a) location and design; (b) construction or works methods, timing and hours of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Relevant plan section</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
<th>Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>operation;</td>
<td>Further extensions to Ferguson Wharf may have issues in terms of coastal processes as it is the narrowest part of the harbour and acts as a headland structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) effects on coastal processes;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d) effects on navigation and safety;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e) effects on the visual amenity values of the Waitemata Harbour;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(f) effects on Mana Whenua values; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(g) consent duration and monitoring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment criteria:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(9) wharves, landings and drydocks within the Port Precinct:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a) whether the location and design of the structure avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on existing activities, marine related industries, other marine and port activities and navigation and safety;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) whether the location and design of the structure avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on coastal processes and on other users of the coastal marine area;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) whether construction works avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of construction, particularly through the management of silt, contaminated sediments, and other contaminants;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Relevant plan section</td>
<td>Activity status</td>
<td>Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend Bledisloe Wharf for a new north berth</td>
<td>Port Precinct General Coastal Marine zone</td>
<td>In the Port Precinct, ‘wharves, landings and drydocks, including alterations and additions to these structures’ are a restricted discretionary activity.</td>
<td>(d) whether duration for construction is limited to the minimum duration reasonably necessary. (e) the extent to which monitoring of construction is required in order to demonstrate the extent and type of effects of the activity, and the degree to which the effects are remedied or mitigated during and after the activity; and (f) whether the form, scale and design of the wharf, landing or drydock structures avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse visual amenity effects to and from the Waitemata Harbour;</td>
<td>Extension of Bledisloe Wharf would require an assessment of effects on coastal processes. There is less likely to be issues than at Fergusson Wharf as it is within the existing headland forms of Wynyard and Fergusson wharves. Extension with a wharf structure is preferred to reclamation as it has less effect on coastal processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment criteria as for ‘wharves, landings and drydocks, including alterations and additions to these structures’ above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Relevant plan section</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
<th>Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demolition of part of Bledisloe B1, Marsden Wharf, removal of breastwork</td>
<td></td>
<td>Demolition or removal of buildings or coastal marine area structures is a permitted activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The extension would require an assessment of visual amenity effects and may be blocking views from Queens Wharf to the Waitemata Harbour entrance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Remove Marsden reclamation | Port Precinct General Coastal Marine zone | Declaration is a restricted discretionary activity. | Assessment criteria for declaration:  
(a) whether the adverse effects of declaration are avoided, remedied or mitigated in respect of the effects of the final land/water configuration on:  
(i) the marine environment including coastal processes, water quality, sediment quality and ecology of the coastal marine area;  
(ii) hydrogeology (ground water) and hydrology; and  
(iii) sediment accumulation and the need for on-going maintenance dredging of the coastal marine area.  
(b) whether declaration works; | Removal of the land part of Marsden Wharf would require a consent. The matters considered focus on the environmental effects of the work on the marine environment and on Mana Whenua values. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Relevant plan section</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
<th>Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction of new seawall south of existing seawall</td>
<td>Port Precinct General Coastal Marine zone</td>
<td>New hard protection structures are a restricted discretionary activity.</td>
<td>including the construction of seawalls, avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of construction, particularly through the management of silt, contaminated soils and groundwater, and other contaminants; and (c) ...; (d) the extent to which declaration will affect Mana Whenua values.</td>
<td>The new seawall would require a resource consent. The matters considered focus on effects on existing activities, wave hydraulics and the harbour environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d) hard protection structures including wave attenuation devices; (a) whether the location and design of the hard protection structure avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on existing activities including marine related industries, other marine activities and/or adjoining coastal activities; (b) whether the location and design of the hard protection structure avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of wave hydraulics on other users of the coastal marine area and on the adjacent coastline; and (c) whether construction works avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of construction, particularly through the management of silt, contaminated sediments, and other contaminants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Relevant plan section</td>
<td>Activity status</td>
<td>Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredging and disposal</td>
<td>Port Precinct</td>
<td>Maintenance dredging (to previously approved depths) is a controlled activity in the Port Precinct.</td>
<td>Dredging matters of control:</td>
<td>The Port area has been dredged for many years with no more than minor environmental effects. Consent conditions would address effects on other harbour users and management of contaminated sediments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Coastal</td>
<td>Capital works dredging (to new depths) is a restricted discretionary activity in the Port Precinct.</td>
<td>(1) maintenance dredging:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marine zone</td>
<td>Disposal is proposed for a site 50km east of Cuvier Island. This is outside the territorial sea and requires approval of the Environmental Protection Authority, not the Council.</td>
<td>(a) effects on water quality; (b) effects on harbour traffic, navigation and safety; and (c) duration and monitoring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment criteria:
(1) maintenance dredging:
(a) effects on water quality;
(i) whether methods are implemented to avoid, remedy or mitigate the release of contaminated sediments.
(b) effects on harbour traffic, navigation and safety:
(ii) whether methods are implemented to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on harbour traffic, navigation and safety.
(c) duration and monitoring:
(iii) whether monitoring, including periodic monitoring of sediment quality, is required in order to demonstrate the extent and type of effects of the dredging on water and sediment quality and the degree to which the effects are remedied or mitigated during the activity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Relevant plan section</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
<th>Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capital works dredging has similar matters of discretion with the addition of ecological values and water quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24 April 2018

Draft Master Plan

Summary of public feedback

1. Since 2016, Ports of Auckland Limited (POAL) has undertaken extensive work to develop a new master plan based on the recommendations of the Port Future Study (PFS).
2. The PFS identified that additional berth length was needed to fulfill the short and medium term capacity requirements for general cargo handling (vehicles, bulk and other freight).
3. The time period chosen for the draft master plan was 30 years. This was based on a reasonable estimate of the time it could take to plan and build a new port for Auckland.
4. A number of other inputs influenced the shape of the plan:
   a. Council plans for the wider waterfront, including the need for additional cruise and ferry infrastructure, public space and transport needs.
   b. Public input on previous port development plans dating back to 2011
   c. Focus group and survey work carried out for Ports of Auckland by UMR
   d. Discussions with stakeholder groups
   e. Discussions with freight owners and shipping lines to better understand likely freight flows and the expected size and shape of ships over the 30-year plan period.
5. The draft 30-year master plan was released for public comment on 2 November 2018. It received extensive media coverage, which was backed up with a three-month advertising campaign across Auckland print media, outdoor, online and at POAL’s SeePort Festival. All public promotion directed people to a dedicated master plan website where they were able to give feedback.
6. When surveyed in December 2018, 29% of Aucklanders said they were aware of the plan, a reasonable number.
7. The digital advertisements were ‘served’ over 8 million times, which converted to nearly 36,000 unique visits to the master plan website. Facebook and Instagram posts reached 245,759 people. SeePort Festival was attended by over 72,000 people, which is equivalent to nearly 5% of the Auckland population.
8. Despite the wide coverage, the response rate was relatively low. 265 people responded to the website survey and 547 people reacted to the Facebook posts. 57% of people who responded to the website survey supported the proposals, with 27% opposed. On Facebook, 89% ‘liked’ the plans and 6% were ‘angry’.
9. In addition to the public information campaign, we contacted directly all 366 people who emailed us in 2015 to express their opposition to the Bledisloe wharf extensions. 11 people responded: 0 were opposed to the master plan, 2 were neutral and one was supportive of the new approach.
10. POAL has also met with a number of key stakeholders to discuss the plan in more detail. This includes representatives from Urban Auckland, the Royal New Zealand Yacht Squadron, Port User Groups, the Waitematā and Devonport & Takapuna Local Boards, Heart of the City, Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei, Tainui and others. In general, the response has been supportive, with some specific questions raised with regard to aspects of particular projects.
11. Overall, Ports of Auckland has found that the response to this draft master plan has been low-key and more supportive compared to the response to previous port development plans.

Local Board input

12. Both the Waitamata Local Board and the Devonport & Takapuna Local Board have been briefed and have given verbal feedback to POAL. The Waitamata Local Board, in which Ports of Auckland is located, has a key role in place-making in the Central City and POAL expects to work closely with the Board on relevant projects. POAL will continue to engage with both Boards on relevant master plan projects and keep both Boards updated on port matters.

Maori Outcomes

13. As noted Ports of Auckland has met with Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei as Mana Whenua, and also Tainui. Our meeting with Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei was the start of relationship building, and POAL has given a commitment to engage with them over individual projects which may have specific impacts. There is potential for commercial opportunities and/or partnerships with iwi. POAL will continue to engage with iwi on individual master plan projects and keep iwi updated on port matters and we will look to broaden our engagement beyond the two iwi noted above.
Planning Committee
01 May 2018

Draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018 Submission

File No.: CP2018/04898

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (GPS) sets out the Government’s strategy to guide land transport investment over the next 10 years, particularly through influencing how the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) invests across activity classes such as State highways and public transport.

3. The draft GPS was released on 3 April 2018, with feedback due by 2 May 2018.

4. A submission has been prepared in consultation with the political reference group that was established at the 6 March 2018 Planning Committee.

5. The submission contains the following main points:
   - support for the GPS’s strategic direction
   - support for the increased investment priority given to safety and demand management, public transport, walking and cycling, and local road improvements and local road maintenance
   - support for the new activity class framework
   - support for the mode neutral approach to transport planning and investment decisions
   - a request that the GPS enables Auckland to receive an appropriate share of the National Land Transport Fund
   - a request for incremental implementation of road safety improvements
   - support “road policing” being funded from a specific dedicated / ‘ring-fenced’ fund
   - a request for an appropriate level of government funding of Rapid Transit Network / Strategic Public Transport.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) approve the submission attached to the agenda report on the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018/19 – 2027/28, inclusive of changes agreed by the committee.

b) authorise the Chair of the Planning Committee to make any minor amendments and corrections to the submission prior to lodgement on Wednesday, 2 May 2018.
Horopaki / Context

6. The GPS plays an important role in guiding transport investment decisions across New Zealand. It is the Government’s key statutory transport strategy that guides how funding from Fuel Excise Duty, Road User Charges and vehicle licensing is allocated between activities such as state highways, local roads, public transport, active transport, and road policing. This investment is administered by the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA).

7. NZTA will be guided by the GPS 2018 into how it can invest in Auckland over the next 10 years. Much of the transport investment in Auckland is co-funded by Auckland Council and NZTA, particularly local roads and public transport.

8. The draft GPS was released on 3 April 2018, with feedback due by 2 May 2018.

9. A political reference group was established at the 6 March 2018 Planning Committee to provide guidance on the drafting of Auckland Council’s submission on the draft GPS. The political reference group comprises the Mayor, Deputy Mayor, the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Planning Committee, Cr Fletcher and Independent Maori Statutory Board Member Liane Ngamane.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

10. Since 2010 Auckland’s population has increased by over 250,000 to around 1.7 million. In recent years, annual growth has spiked to more than 40,000 people per year, one of the fastest growth rates in the developed world. While this very high rate of growth may tail off over time, Stats NZ projections suggest that over the next 30 years, up to a million more people may call Auckland home. Over the next decade, around 55 per cent of New Zealand’s population growth is expected to occur in Auckland.

11. Ongoing growth brings great opportunities and much progress has been made over the past 10-15 years to support Auckland’s evolution into a modern, world-class city. This includes a sustained increase in investment for transport and a willingness of Aucklanders to change the way they live and travel. Use of public transport has tripled since the mid-1990s, the city centre is New Zealand’s fastest growing residential neighbourhood and, most recently, Aucklanders are rapidly taking up cycling where quality infrastructure is provided.

12. However, a combination of the sheer scale and pace of growth, a longer history of under-investment and insufficient levels of housing construction means that despite this progress, Auckland faces significant transport and housing challenges. Our transport challenge is not just one of congestion, but also:
   - poor travel choice beyond private vehicles, especially in lower income areas
   - a near doubling of deaths and serious injuries on our 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 our streets to play a growing role in creating vibrant and inclusive places.

13. Through this Government Policy Statement on land transport and the Auckland Plan, the Government and Auckland Council have both recognised the critical role of transport in delivering a successful Auckland.
14. Key revisions to the draft GPS released by the new Government include:
   - giving public transport greater priority in cities and expanding the public transport system to support new housing and interregional commuting
   - increasing the use of rail to enable efficient passenger and freight use
   - supporting regional development
   - increasing support for active modes – walking and cycling
   - delivering health, safety and environmental improvements
   - reducing the environmental impact of transport
   - mode neutrality in freight transport planning.

15. The Minister of Transport has also:
   - signalled that more fundamental changes to the scope of the GPS and changes to local, regional and national transport planning are likely to occur later but will not affect the GPS 2018
   - noted some of the government’s priorities may require more fundamental changes to the scope of the GPS that cannot be immediately accommodated in this amendment.
   - indicated it is likely the GPS will be amended again during the 2018-21 National Land Transport Programme cycle.

16. In consultation with the political reference group, a draft submission has been prepared and includes the following submission points:
   - **supporting** the GPS’s strategic direction, particularly the stronger focus on:
     - the safety of people
     - providing travel choices
     - enabling and supporting growth
     - the key role of streets in creating high quality public spaces
     - environmental outcomes
     - value for money
   - **supporting** the Government’s increased investment priority given to safety and demand management, public transport, walking and cycling, and local road improvements and local road maintenance, especially how this should translate into full co-funding for the Auckland Transport’s renewals programme
   - **supporting** the new activity class framework - especially the creation of a mass transit activity class and the commitment to a more sustainable funding source for rail (GPS stage 2) - and its flexibility to enable delivery of the Auckland Transport Alignment Project
   - **supporting** the mode neutral approach to transport planning and investment decisions
   - **requesting** the GPS enables Auckland to receive an appropriate share of the National Land Transport Fund
   - **requesting** incremental implementation of road safety improvements (while the proposed Road Safety Strategy is being developed)
   - **supporting** “Road policing” being funded from a specific dedicated / ‘ring-fenced’ fund
   - **requesting** an appropriate level of government funding of Rapid Transit Network / Strategic Public Transport
   - **suggesting** minor wording changes for clarification and completeness purposes.

17. The draft submission to the Ministry of Transport on the Draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2017/18 – 2027/28 is attached to this report for the Planning Committee’s approval.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe /
Local impacts and local board views

18. Under the Local Government (Auckland) Act 2009 provisions, Auckland local boards are responsible for decision-making on local issues, activities and services, have a direct role in placemaking and provide input into regional strategies, policies, plans and decisions.

19. The final GPS will influence NZTA’s transport investment. Projects identified to be funded form the Local Board Transport Capital Fund are potentially eligible for NZTA co-funding where they align with the GPS’s strategic direction and NZTA’s processes for assessing value for money.

20. A briefing was given by officers and feedback received at the Local Board Chairs Forum on 9 April. Further briefing sessions were held on 11 and 12 April with officers and Local Board Chairs.

21. A submission, reflecting the views of some local boards, was subsequently received and the feedback incorporated into the Auckland Council submission. These submission points were closely aligned to those made by the Political Reference Group, supporting the GPS’s four strategic priorities of safety, access, environment and value for money.

22. The local boards supported the draft GPS 2018 alignment with the priorities of local board plans, enabling local boards to deliver on local board plan outcomes. The GPS 2018 four strategic priorities can be recognised throughout the 21 local board plans, generating opportunities to deliver on placemaking and local transport initiatives that positively contribute to the Auckland transport network.

23. The local boards particularly supported priority given to:
   - improvements to roads, identifying better road safety strategies for all road users, particularly including investment in better footpaths and cycleways
   - improved access to public transport (including financial accessibility), investing more in public transport infrastructure (including growth areas) and investment in rapid transit
   - increased investment for active modes – walking and cycling in a manner that aligns with local priorities
   - a focus on improved environmental outcomes for the transport network
   - collaboration between Auckland Transport and NZTA to deliver the intent of the draft GPS 2018 in line with the 21 local board plans.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

24. Members of the Independent Māori Statutory Board have been advised of the submission process and a board member has participated on the Political Reference Group.

25. The final GPS will impact Māori as it will direct NZTA on how it can allocate funds to projects that have an impact on Māori communities. The priority of these projects will be determined through the upcoming Auckland Regional Land Transport Plan process and be informed by the on-going Auckland Transport Alignment Project refresh process.

26. As agreed at the 6 March Planning Committee meeting, mana whenua organisation chairs were advised of the new draft GPS 2018 so that they could make a direct submission if they so wished.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

27. There are no financial implications from deciding to make a submission.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

28. There are no risks in deciding to make a submission.
Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

29. The draft GPS indicates that the final GPS will be released in mid-2018 to inform the development of the Auckland Regional Land Transport Plan and the National Land Transport Plan.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
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</tr>
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</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories
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He mihi ki te kaahui iūpuna,  
te taura-here mō tātou te muka tāngata,  
ki ngā mana ātua, kia tau te mauri.

He kura tangihia, he maimai aroha,  
rātou kua whetūrongitia ki o rātou  
tātou te hunga mata-rerehua ki o tātou

E ngā mana, e ngā reo, e ngā karangatanga maha,  
tēnā rā koutou katouc.

1. Overview

This is Auckland Council’s submission in response to the draft Government Policy Statement on  

The address for service is Auckland Council, Private Bag 92300, Victoria Street West,  
Auckland 1142. Please direct any enquiries to Phil Haidecn, Team Leader Transport  
Strategy, Auckland Council.

This submission has been approved by the Planning Committee of Auckland Council.

2. Introduction and Summary

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the draft Government Policy Statement on Land  

Since 2010 Auckland’s population has increased by over 250,000 to around 1.7 million. In  
recent years, annual growth has spiked to more than 40,000 people per year, one of the  
fasted growth rates in the developed world. While this very high rate of growth may tail off  
over time, Stats NZ projections suggest that over the next 30 years, up to a million more  
people may call Auckland home. Over the next decade, around 55% of New Zealand’s  
population growth is expected to occur in Auckland.

Ongoing growth brings great opportunities and much progress has been made over the past  
10-15 years to support Auckland’s evolution into a modern, world-class city. This includes a
sustained increase in investment for transport and a willingness of Aucklanders to change
the way they live and travel. Use of public transport has tripled since the mid-1990s, the city
centre is New Zealand’s fastest growing residential neighbourhood and, most recently,
Aucklanders are rapidly taking up cycling where quality infrastructure is provided.

However, a combination of the sheer scale and pace of growth, a longer history of under-
investment and insufficient levels of housing construction means that despite this progress
Auckland faces significant transport and housing challenges.

Our transport challenge is not just one of congestion, but also:

- Poor travel choice beyond private vehicles, especially in lower income areas
- A near doubling of deaths and serious injuries on our 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 our streets to play a growing role in creating vibrant and inclusive places.

Through this Government Policy Statement on land transport and the Auckland Plan, the
Government and Auckland Council have both recognised the critical role of transport in
delivering a successful Auckland.

To unlock the benefits of this 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 our housing challenges.

*The Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP)*

Over the past three years, Auckland Council and the Government have worked together to
develop an aligned strategic approach to the development of Auckland’s transport system
over the next 30 years. In 2016 a recommended strategic approach was agreed, based on
three integrated components:

- Making better use of existing networks
- Targeting new investment to the most significant challenges
- Maximising new opportunities to influence travel demand.

In late 2017 the new Government requested an update to the ATAP indicative package.
Around the same time Auckland Council approved the draft Auckland Plan, which reflects
the long-term strategic approach of the original ATAP, but with a greater and earlier focus on improving travel choices and reducing harm to people and the environment.

The latest ATAP update will ensure transport investment priorities reflect the increasingly aligned transport vision of both the Government and Auckland Council and this consistency of approach is reflected in this submission on the GPS.

Our key submission points are:

- **Support** for the GPS’s strategic direction, particularly the stronger focus on:
  - the safety of people
  - providing travel choices
  - enabling and supporting growth
  - the key role of streets in creating high quality public spaces
  - environmental outcomes
  - value for money

- **Support** for the Government’s increased investment priority given to safety and demand management, public transport, walking and cycling, and local road improvements and local road maintenance, especially how this should translate into full co-funding for the AT renewal programme.

- **Support** for the new activity class framework - especially the creation of a mass transit activity class and the commitment to a more sustainable funding source for rail (GPS stage 2) - and its flexibility to enable delivery of the ATAP indicative package.

- **Support** the mode neutral approach to transport planning and investment decisions

- **Request** the GPS enables Auckland to receive an appropriate share of the National Land Transport Fund.

- **Request** incremental implementation of road safety improvements

- **Support** for ‘Road policing’ being funded from a specific dedicated/ring-fenced’ fund

- **Request** an appropriate level of government funding of RTN/Strategic Public Transport

- **Suggest** minor wording changes

These main submission points are expanded upon below.

3. **Strategic directions and priorities**

Council supports the GPS’s strategic direction and its closer alignment with the Auckland Plan, particularly the stronger focus on:

a. **the safety of people**

Council strongly supports the top-priority given to requiring a transport system that considers people’s safety and the greater focus on investment in safety improvements, particularly in improving the safety of vulnerable road users like people walking and cycling, and effective enforcement in promoting safe behavior by road users.
As recognised in the draft GPS, there is an urgent need to improve road safety outcomes and reverse the increase in deaths and serious injuries that has occurred in recent years. In Auckland the number of deaths and serious injuries has increased by 48% over the past four years, from a low of 421 in 2012 to 635 in 2016.

Because of Auckland’s highly urbanised environment and the intense use of its transport networks by different users, vulnerable road users (pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists) make up a higher proportion of deaths and serious injuries in Auckland (43%) than in the rest of New Zealand (33%). This suggests a need to tailor approaches to safety for large urban areas like Auckland. For example, lower speeds in urban areas dramatically reduce pedestrian harm if collisions occur.

Reversing recent safety trends will require new approaches and interventions, particularly in Auckland. We support the proposed increase in investment in road safety promotion and road policing and the tilt in the balance towards safety when trade-offs are being made against travel-time.

b. travel choices

Council supports priority given to improving access to opportunities (particularly for people living in the western and southern parts of Auckland) and supporting investment in measures that incentivise increased mode shift from private vehicle travel to walking, cycling and public transport.

ATAP identified the decline in access to opportunities as a key transport challenge for Auckland, particularly for people living in the west and south. ATAP also identified the limited opportunity to create additional capacity on the road network to accommodate growth and the need for more people to walk, cycle or travel by public transport to reduce pressure on our roads and free up room for freight and commercial travel.

Aucklanders’ have demonstrated and expressed a desire and willingness to walk, cycle and use public transport for more journeys if it is efficient, reliable, safe, and attractive. Currently
many Aucklanders lack travel choice, particularly for lower income households in western and southern parts of Auckland and in rural areas. This creates more pressure on household budgets due to the high cost of car dependency and means that travel in Auckland is often long and unreliable, with Aucklanders unable to avoid congestion that wastes precious time and reduces life quality.

c. enabling and supporting growth

Council supports prioritising the role of transport investment in enabling and supporting growth – supporting investment in modes such as public transport and walking and cycling in opening access to existing and new housing developments.

Transport infrastructure and services are important for enabling and supporting population and housing growth in new and existing urban areas, while the location of growth affects how well the transport system performs. Stronger integration between transport and land use decisions is required so that housing, business and employment growth occurs in areas with better travel options. Council supports prioritising investment in areas that supports intensification in the existing urban area, and supports growth in new urban areas and improves connections between these newly developing areas and the rest of Auckland.

d. creating high quality public spaces

Council strongly supports the recognition of streets playing a key role in creating high quality public spaces – supporting investments that make streets more inviting places for people and promotes equitable access.

Roads and streets exert an immense influence upon Aucklanders’ lifestyle and travel behaviour. How we use and design our roads and streets directly influences place identity, accessibility, public health, social equity, inclusivity and local and regional economies, amongst other factors. Council, including our Local Boards have an expectation that Auckland’s roads and streets need to deliver a wider range of benefits across the four well-beings (social, cultural, economic and environment) than has historically been provided for.

The scale and pace of growth in Auckland is placing increased pressure on an already constrained road and street network, resulting in a greater need to make conscious investments that balance the sometimes-competing demands of movement and place values. The recognition given to place making in the draft GPS is welcomed and will assist in the funding and delivery in regional and local projects of all scales.

e. environmental outcomes

Council supports the priority given to reducing the harm from transport, supporting reducing transport’s negative effects on global climate, the local environment and public health.

Auckland’s future growth will bring greater levels of investment. Transport and stormwater investments will be some of the largest ever made in Auckland. Council supports ensuring these investments not only perform their technical function but to protect or enhance the overall health of the environment and ecosystems.

Council is a signatory to the C40 Fossil Fuel Streets Declaration, which commits to transforming our streets into greener, healthier, and more prosperous places to live. Our streets must be safe and accessible for everybody and our air must be clean and free from harmful emissions.
f. value for money

Council supports the increased emphasis on delivering the right infrastructure and services to the right level, at the best cost.

ATAP has identified a significant funding gap for transport investment in Auckland. Council needs to meet its fair share of this and is investigating new funding mechanisms. However, Council already spends approximately half of its revenue on transport, and therefore supports a strong focus on value for money for both local and centrally funded transport investments.

4. Investment priorities

Council supports the Governments increased investment priority given to safety and demand management, public transport, walking and cycling, and local road improvements and local road maintenance, especially how this should translate into full co-funding for the AT renewals programme.

5. Activity class framework

Council supports the new activity class framework - especially the creation of a mass transit activity class and the commitment to a more sustainable funding source for rail (GPS stage 2) - and its flexibility to enable delivery of the ATAP indicative package.

Rapid transit forms the backbone of Auckland’s public transport network, providing fast, frequent, high capacity services operating along corridors separated from general traffic and unaffected by road congestion. Rapid transit can also have a particularly significant impact on shaping urban form and development. The speed and reliability of rapid transit delivers a long-lasting step-change in the accessibility of an area.

Auckland’s rapid transit network barely existed a decade ago, but sustained effort and investment has increased annual boardings on the Northern Busway and the rail network from 6.8 million in 2008 to 23 million today. However, major parts of Auckland are still not served by the rapid transit network, while existing parts of the network need substantial capacity improvements to meet current and future demand.

Through ATAP, Auckland has undertaken a comprehensive planning process with Government to agree the main transport challenges and to develop a strategic approach for addressing these challenges. This provides both parties with a higher level of assurance that investment will focus on the biggest transport challenges facing Auckland.

Because of this alignment, there are significant benefits from ensuring funds available for transport investment can be directed towards the area of highest priority. Council supports the GPS activity class structure having broader funding bands that enable greater flexibility to direct funding to the most important investments.

6. Mode neutral approach

Council supports the mode neutral approach to transport planning and investment decisions.

7. Appropriate funding allocation for Auckland

Council requests the GPS enables Auckland to receive an appropriate share of the National Land Transport Fund.
As noted earlier, over half of New Zealand’s population growth is expected to occur in Auckland over the next decade. Growth is a key driver of the need for many transport improvements, particularly those relating to network improvements (as opposed to maintenance, operations and renewals).

In ATAP an assumption has been made around the amount of NLTF funding Auckland may receive over the next 10 years (noting that funding is ultimately allocated on merit). Realising this level of funding may require changes to current funding approaches, particularly greater flexibility across activity classes and in relation to funding assistance rates.

While the detail of these changes will largely rest with the NZ Transport Agency, it will be helpful for the GPS to clearly articulate two points:

- Auckland’s high share of the country’s population growth and the implications of this for transport investment.
- The likely need for more flexible approaches to funding arrangements to enable delivery of ATAP.

8. Incremental safety funding

Council supports the development of a new road safety strategy and action plan but request incremental implementation (rather than waiting 18 months to its competition) to address current pressing road safety issues.

Strong growth and changing travel patterns have exposed safety gaps on Auckland’s transport network. On average one person that is walking gets hit by a motor vehicle every day in Auckland and every third day that person dies or is seriously injured, resulting in $1.14 billion/year in social costs. Council has a strong understanding of our most significant road safety risks. Immediate funding would allow these risks to be addressed within the timeframe of the Road Safety Strategy being prepared.

9. Road policing funding allocation

Council supports “Road policing” being funded from a specific dedicated/’ring-fenced’ fund rather than from a general fund.

In the past funding for road policing has been directed towards other transport activities. The work of the Howard Commission has shown the need to increase road policing funding to reverse the recent increase in road deaths and injuries.

10. Funding for RTN/Strategic Public Transport

Council supports the inclusion of a new rapid transit category in the GPS and looks forward to further clarification regarding how rapid transit is to be funded on a more sustainable basis.

In an urban context rapid transit serves a similarly strategic role to motorways and as such should be funded in a similar way. The acceleration of Auckland’s rapid transit network is a core priority of both the Government and Auckland Council, and the ATAP indicative package allocates substantial investment into rail, light rail and busways over the first decade.
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Providing certainty of funding for these investments is critical to their delivery in a timely and effective manner.

As such, Council welcomes the inclusion of a new rapid transit category in the GPS. We see this as a first step in fulfilling the Government’s intention to place RTN funding on a more sustainable footing than has been possible in the past, given previous ad hoc arrangements for major projects. We look forward to further clarification in this regard through subsequent iterations of the GPS and other policy announcements. In the meantime, the Council reiterates its desire to continue working with the Government on options to close the funding gap for Auckland’s transport needs.

11. Minor Wording Changes

In addition to these high-level points, we have identified several minor changes that we would like to see in the final version of the GPS 2018. These changes are outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Paragraph</th>
<th>Suggested Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment in GPS 2018 Page 8</td>
<td>Inclusion of a bullet point acknowledging the localised negative impacts of transport infrastructure and transport activities – particularly air/water pollution and quality of life impacts (noise, light, vibration, severance, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2.2 – Safety Page 9</td>
<td>Inclusion of a clearer message regarding trade-offs – e.g. that historically we’ve traded vehicle delay against safety outcomes. Also, should give direction on how to better address these trade-offs – for example; safety improvement projects should have lower consideration of vehicle delay that may result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 9 Para 25</td>
<td>Insert new paragraph between para25 and 26 that discusses issues around motorcycle safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 10 Para 35</td>
<td>Inclusion of additional sub-bullet point to the second bullet point that specifically identifies motorcycle travel as an area of high-risk and an area for increased investment in primary safe system treatments to reduce the risk of motorcycle crashes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 13 Para 62</td>
<td>Needs to include point regarding transport investment to support re-development, regeneration areas. Currently this para is weighted towards opening new serviced land for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 13 Para 66</td>
<td>Include reference to the key transport priorities, updated to reflect the ATAP update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 13 Para 74</td>
<td>Remove “at-peak travelling hours” from the sentence. The first sentence over emphasises PT as a peak hour service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 14 Para 76</td>
<td>Replace “off peak public transport” with “all day public transport”. Bullet point 3 should also cover regeneration/redevelopment areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 14 Para 80</td>
<td>Rephrase bullet point one to be about matching capacity to demand rather than providing extra capacity. As an example, reallocation of existing road space to more efficient transport modes should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section/Paragraph</td>
<td>Suggested Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 15</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Section 2.3.2</strong></td>
<td>Considered ahead of providing extra capacity through road widening. Section 2.3.2 talks about transport choice and para 93 refers to walking and cycling but nothing related to PT. There needs to be a similar paragraph to cover off GPS investment in PT. Needs also to discuss reallocation of existing capacity to support more efficient transport modes (including freight) i.e. using what we have more efficiently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 20</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Para 129.</strong></td>
<td>Should include route protection and cover funding consequential OPEX particularly when PT is a lead investment in growth areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 26</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Safety</strong></td>
<td>Add short term result of addressing key safety issues this year (not waiting for the new road safety strategy and action plan in the next 12-18 months). Add stronger wording regarding reducing speed limits in urban areas and rolling this out faster. Add specific reference to making motorcycling safer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 27</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Access:</strong></td>
<td>Should include a bullet point about the number of people who have access to frequent all day public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 36</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Para 152</strong></td>
<td>Needs to include that NZTA investment supports and respects local authority land use planning and growth strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 38</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Para 156</strong></td>
<td>NZTA need to not just shape urban form, they need to support it (Auckland’s growth strategies) as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 38</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Para 157</strong></td>
<td>Replace reference to greenfield areas with ‘Auckland Council growth strategies’. Section should be amended to reflect updated ATAP priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval for council to draft a submission on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill and to establish a political working group to approve the final submission.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The Government introduced the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill (the Bill) into Parliament on 5 April 2018. The Bill has been referred to Select Committee and submissions are now open.
3. The Bill seeks to address two main areas:
   - to reinstate the purpose of local government to promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of communities
   - to restore the power to collect development contributions for a wider group of infrastructure projects.
4. Both of these areas can have significant impact on Auckland Council’s way of working, as they define local government’s purpose and its ability to collect funds.
5. In both 2012 and 2014 changes were made to the Local Government Act 2002 (the Act) regarding these two main themes. Auckland Council made submissions opposing those changes. The submission to this new Bill will be founded on the evidence from those previous submissions.
6. Broadly the submission intends to support the amendment. However, staff require time to ensure a robust analysis of any potential impact, particularly of the development contribution changes.
7. To develop a submission, staff will work across the council family, including council-controlled organisations (CCOs), and with the Independent Māori Statutory Board.
8. Submissions on the Bill close on 25 May 2018. Due to the tight timeframes, it is recommended that the Planning Committee establish a political working group with delegated authority to review and approve the final council submission.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) approve staff developing a submission on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill.

b) establish a political working group consisting of the chair and deputy chair of the Planning Committee, chair and deputy chair of the Environment and Community Committee, a member of the Independent Māori Statutory Board and two local board chairs to provide direction on and approve the final council submission on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill.

c) delegate authority to the political working group to approve the final council submission on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill.
Horopaki / Context
9. The Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill (the Bill) has two main themes;
   • to reinstate the purpose of local government to promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of communities
   • to restore the power to collect development contributions for a wider group of infrastructure projects.
10. Specifically, the Bill seeks to
   • restore the purpose of local government to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities, taking a sustainable development approach
   • restore territorial authorities' power to collect development contributions for any public amenities needed as a consequence of development
   • make a minor technical modification to the development contributions power to allow territorial authorities to collect development contributions for projects financed through financial advances from the New Zealand Transport Authority.
11. The Governance and Administration Select Committee deadline for submissions on the Bill is 25 May 2018.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice
12. The Local Government Act 2002 Amendment Act 2012 made significant changes to the purpose of local government through an amendment to section 10. This removed the focus on social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of communities and reoriented the purpose towards the provision of cost-effective infrastructure and core services.
13. In 2014, there was another amendment to the Act which made an array of changes including to the development contributions regime. This limited territorial authorities' ability to collect development contributions for community amenities (e.g. sports grounds, swimming pools and libraries).
15. The development of this submission will be based on the evidence of the council’s previous submissions on the Act.
16. Broadly the submission intends to support the amendment. However, staff require the remaining time to gain input from subject matter experts across the council family and ensure a robust analysis of the impact, particularly of the development contribution changes.
17. Due to the tight constraints on time, it is recommended that a political working group be established, with the delegated authority to approve the final council submission on the Bill.
18. The composition of the political working group could consist of the chair and deputy chair of the Planning Committee as the committee with oversight, an Independent Māori Statutory Board member, chair and deputy chair of Environment and Community Committee as this committee will have particular interest in the well-being aspect of the Bill and two local board chairs who will be able to bring a local perspective.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views
19. Staff will seek formal feedback from local boards. Additionally, it is recommended that two local board chairs are invited to participate on the political working group that endorses the final council submission.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

20. The Bill’s proposed changes align well with the Independent Māori Statutory Board’s Māori Plan for Tāmaki Makaurau that describes the implementation of their key directions through the lens of the four pou of social, cultural, economic and environmental wellbeing areas.

21. Māori experience disproportionately high negative social, economic and health outcomes. The reinstating of a more holistic purpose of local government could have a positive impact on Māori by refocusing local government decisions to require consideration of broader outcomes.

22. Council staff will seek to engage and receive input from mana whenua either by email or through the Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum. Staff will also seek input from the Independent Māori Statutory Board.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

23. There are no anticipated negative financial implications from supporting the Bill, however, staff will work with the finance team to identify and analyse any impact.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Bonnie-May Shantz - Principal Policy Analyst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jacques Victor - GM Auckland Plan Strategy and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Quinn - Chief of Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Planning Committee information memos and briefings - 1 May 2018

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To receive a summary and provide a public record of memos or briefing papers that have been distributed to committee members.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. This is a regular information-only report which aims to provide greater visibility of information circulated to committee members via memo/briefing or other means, where no decisions are required.
3. The following information items are attached:
   - Schedule of workshops May 2018 (Attachment A)
4. The Planning Committee forward work programme will be tabled at the meeting on 1 May 2018.
5. The following workshops/briefings have taken place:
   - 5 April 2018 – Confidential Technical Review of Ports of Auckland Draft 30-year Plan (no attachment)
6. This document can be found on the Auckland Council website, at the following link: http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/
   - at the top of the page, select meeting “Planning Committee” from the drop-down tab and click ‘View’;
   - under ‘Attachments’, select either the HTML or PDF version of the document entitled ‘Extra Attachments’.
7. Note that staff will not be present to answer questions about the items referred to in this summary. Committee members should direct any questions to the authors.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:
  a) receive the Summary of Planning Committee information memos and briefings – 1 May 2018.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Planning Committee workshop schedule May 2018</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Kalinda Gopal - Senior Governance Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Jim Quinn - Chief of Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 3 May 2018</td>
<td>1.30pm - 4.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 10 May 2018</td>
<td>1.30pm - 4.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 14 May 2018</td>
<td>9.30am - 12.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 28 May 2018</td>
<td>2.00pm - 4.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, 30 May 2018</td>
<td>9.30am - 10.30am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>