

# Memorandum

---

<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>Review of Ports of Auckland Draft 30-year Plan (DRAFT)</b>
<b>DATE</b>	3 April 2018
<b>TO</b>	City Centre & Waterfront – Project Control Group
<b>FROM</b>	Joanna Smith, Panuku John Smith, ATEED/Panuku
<b>VERSION</b>	Planning Committee workshop memo

---

## Contents

<b>Contents</b> .....	1
1. Summary.....	1
2. Strategic context .....	3
3. Ports of Auckland – rationale and timeline.....	3
4. Technical commentary on POAL draft plan .....	5
5. Recommended process from here.....	9
<b>Attachments</b> .....	9
Attachment 1: Memo from Ports of Auckland Ltd .....	10
Attachment 2: Memo from Auckland Council Plans and Places.....	13

---

## 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 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 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 Bledisloe, 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; 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.

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

Proposed timing	Notes
Underway	1. Dredging materials (dump at sea beyond Coromandel peninsula) – applying for consent to EPA – underway now
2018 - 2021	2. Carpark – design (February), consent & construct – aim to complete 2019 3. North Bledisloe extension – apply for consent (Late 2018) + 18

Proposed timing	Notes
	<p>months construction – aim for operational 2021 (relocate berths from west Captain Cook)</p> <p>4. Partially demolish B1 – 6 months (not dependant on car park building)</p>
3 years +	5. Engineering workshop (3 years); office building within 10 years – demolish existing building for yard space
5 – 10 years	<p>6. Consent to remove Marsden, dredge basin – triggered by growth, need for lower Bledisloe berth, demand for cruise (within 10 years)</p> <p>7. Release Captain Cook for cruise (10 years)</p> <p>8. Hotel – within 5 – 10 years, linked to cruise industry</p> <p>Note that consents requested for long duration (10 – 15 years), flexible staging, gradually build out ahead of demand</p>

#### 4. Technical commentary on POAL draft plan

A team from across the Council whanau 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
2. Memo from Auckland Council Plans and Places – Matt Spiro, Planning Central/South

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 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 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 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:

Topic	Key issues	Recommendations
<b>POAL proposed</b>	See Attachment 1 for narrative and implementation proposals from POAL.	

Topic	Key issues	Recommendations
<b>sequence</b>	<p>Summary of proposed development sequence:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dredging materials (dump at sea beyond Coromandel peninsula) – applying for consent to EPA – underway now</li> <li>2. Carpark – design (February), consent &amp; construct – aim to complete 2019</li> <li>3. North Bledisloe extension – apply for consent (Late 2018) + 18 months construction – aim for operational 2021 (relocate berths from west Captain Cook)</li> <li>4. Partially demolish B1 – 6 months (not dependant on other moves?)</li> <li>5. Engineering workshop (3 years); office building within 10 years – demolish existing building for yard space</li> <li>6. Consent to remove Marsden, dredge basin – triggered by growth, need for lower Bledisloe berth, demand for cruise (within 10 years)</li> <li>7. Release Captain Cook for cruise (10 years)</li> <li>8. Hotel – within 5 – 10 years, linked to cruise industry</li> </ol> <p>Note that consents requested for long duration (10 – 15 years), flexible staging, gradually build out ahead of demand</p>	
<b>Central wharves</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multi-cargo (including cars) is at capacity and growing – constrained infrastructure in this part of port.</li> <li>• 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 Tauranga, not including costs of roads/rail to move cars.</li> <li>• Construction of carpark building on Bledisloe (desired completion 2019)</li> <li>• North Bledisloe extension allows more berths along west and north and releases west side of Captain Cook. Releases Captain Cook wharf from parked cars</li> <li>• POAL is exploring various operating models to support cruise without need to extend Captain Cook.</li> </ul>	<p>Review team supports construction of car park to release Captain Cook from parked cars.</p> <p>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.</p>
<b>Quay Street interface</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assume that customs-controlled and Port staff parking area would be reduced and ultimately move eastwards, potentially freeing up more of the breastworks for public uses and enabling a better urban realm outcome along Quay St East.</li> <li>• AT seeks agreement with POAL on</li> </ul>	<p>Further work required with POAL and Quay Street design team to clarify breastworks operational requirements, implications for plans in that area, in particular how greater pedestrian,</p>

Topic	Key issues	Recommendations
	<p>potential access to the breastworks for reconfigured cycling facilities as part of the Quay St East bus interchange</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design team also needs to work with Heritage team on any issues affecting the red fence (e.g. gateways and access)</li> </ul>	<p>cyclist and bus volumes can be safely provided for, along with access for wharf-related movements (cruise and freight).</p>
<b>Transport and access</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• For all proposal, AT interested in construction requirements (including dredging) and any impacts on wider network.</li> </ul>	<p>Ongoing collaboration between AT and POAL on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Internal circulation and impact on wider network</li> <li>• Access to Quay Street and impacts on intersections</li> <li>• Work with Kiwirail and NZTA on wider network implications of changing and growing POAL operations</li> </ul>
<b>Car park building</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As above, general support for need for car park building</li> <li>• Building itself will require design review</li> <li>• Scale and set back from Quay Street (15m building set back &gt;50m from street) reduces visual impact</li> <li>• Roof-top park questioned – not part of open space strategy for that part of city; difficulty with visibility and access</li> <li>• Explore other ways to add amenity without requiring public access, e.g. green roof</li> <li>• Test options for adaptable or relocatable buildings</li> <li>• POAL notes that public submissions have mostly supported the idea of a roof-top park</li> </ul>	<p>Support building, subject to design review.</p> <p>Roof-top open space not required.</p> <p>POAL will review adaptable or relocatable options, with focus on operational needs for next 30 years.</p>
<b>Other buildings</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed workshop and office building subject to design review (within the Area A 50m deep along Quay Street).</li> <li>• AT needs to better understand access and servicing requirements for proposed hotel, including safety and pedestrian implications.</li> <li>• Similarly with proposed headquarters building, AT interested in managing interaction of various users and traffic, including pedestrians.</li> </ul>	

Topic	Key issues	Recommendations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted that confidential discussions underway for Quay Park, which will likely include proposals for visitor accommodation</li> </ul>	
<b>Marine</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>POAL see need to increase channel depth and width</li> <li>Disposal of dredging to sea as no new reclamations proposed – subject to consents from EPA</li> </ul>	Consider developing Regional Strategy with respect to disposal of dredging by POAL, Panuku (Marinas etc.) and AT (ferry berths).
<b>Planning</b>	<p>Further detail on planning issues in attached memo from Plans and Places.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Car park building (for ports' purposes) is permitted activity. Design of building will be subject to conditions.</li> </ul>	

## 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
2. Memo from Auckland Council Plans and Places – Matt Spiro, Planning Central/South

## 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 whilst 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 carpark 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 least intrusion in to the harbour, POAL 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 265m 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 200m ship plus 265m ship. If a 200m 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 roof top 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 roof top 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 reclamations.

## 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;
- Fergusson North Wharf completion then extension;
- Demolish part of Bledisloe B1 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 eg stormwater, land disturbance, contaminated land

**Summary of assessment**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Activity status</b>	<b>Key issues</b>
<p>New head office and engineering workshop (located on land adjacent to Quay Street within precinct plan 2 Area A (see map below))</p>	<p>New buildings within Port Precinct Area A require resource consent as restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The new building may require consent for land disturbance, discharges from contaminated land, changes to stormwater management etc.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The proposed activities are permitted subject to meeting the relevant controls for noise and lighting. Resource consent is required if these standards are not met.</p>	<p>New buildings in Area A are assessed against a number of urban design criteria.</p> <p>Of particular note, such buildings should have “defined public fronts that address 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” .</p>
<p>Vehicle handling storage – new car parking building (located on land adjacent to Quay Street outside precinct Area A)</p>	<p>New buildings outside Port Precinct Area A are a permitted activity (no resource consent required for the building).</p> <p>Resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity will be required if standards for construction noise or height are sought to be exceeded.</p> <p>The new building may require consent for land disturbance, discharges from contaminated land, changes to stormwater management etc.</p>	<p>The urban design criteria do not apply to new buildings outside of Area A.</p> <p>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.</p>

<p>Waterfront Hotel (located on land adjacent to Quay Street within precinct Area A)</p>	<p>The proposed open space on the roof of the car parking building would be a <b>discretionary activity</b>.</p>	<p>New buildings in Area A are assessed against a number of urban design criteria.</p> <p>Of particular note, such buildings should have “defined public fronts that address 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”.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p></p>	<p>New buildings within Port Precinct Area A require resource consent as restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The new building may require consent for land disturbance, discharges from contaminated land, changes to stormwater management etc.</p> <p>Visitor accommodation is a discretionary activity in the Port Precinct.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The City Centre Port Noise Overlay does not apply to the proposed hotel as the overlay boundaries are external to the</p>	<p></p>

	precinct.	
Fergusson North Wharf completion and extension	In the Port Precinct, 'wharves, landings and drydocks, including alterations and additions to these structures' are a restricted discretionary activity.	<p>Matters for assessment are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) location and design;</li> <li>(b) construction or works methods, timing and hours of operation;</li> <li>(c) effects on coastal processes;</li> <li>(d) effects on navigation and safety;</li> <li>(e) effects on the visual amenity values of the Waitemata Harbour;</li> <li>(f) effects on Mana Whenua values; and</li> <li>(g) consent duration and monitoring.</li> </ul> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Extend Bledisloe Wharf for a new north berth	As for Fergusson Wharf above.	<p>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.</p> <p>The extension would require an assessment of visual amenity effects</p>

		and may be blocking views from Queens Wharf to the Waitemata Harbour entrance.
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	Declamation is a restricted discretionary activity.	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.
Construction of new seawall south of existing seawall	New hard protection structures are a restricted discretionary activity.	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	<p>Maintenance dredging (to previously approved depths) in the Port Precinct is a controlled activity (consent must be granted but conditions may be imposed.</p> <p>Capital works dredging (to new depths) is a restricted discretionary activity in the Port Precinct.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Dredging matters of control are:</p> <p>(1) maintenance dredging:</p> <p>(a) effects on water quality;</p> <p>(b) effects on harbour traffic, navigation and safety; and</p> <p>(c) duration and monitoring.</p> <p>Capital works dredging has similar matters of discretion with the addition of ecological values and water quality.</p> <p>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.</p>

**Activity status and relevant provisions**

Activity	Relevant plan section	Activity status	Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria	Comments
<p>New head office and engineering workshop (located on land adjacent to Quay Street within precinct plan 2 Area A (see map below))</p>	<p>Port Precinct</p>	<p>The following activities are <b>permitted</b> in the Port Precinct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marine and Port Activities</li> <li>• Offices accessory to Marine and Port Activities</li> <li>• New buildings and alterations and additions to existing buildings outside Area A in the Port Precinct</li> </ul> <p>The following activities are <b>restricted discretionary</b> activities in the Port Precinct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New buildings and alterations and additions to existing buildings (other than minor cosmetic alterations) within Area A in the Port Precinct</li> </ul> <p>Note that the Port Precinct standards for noise and vibration,</p>	<p><b>Assessment criteria I208.8.2</b></p> <p>(5) new buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for within Area A shown on Precinct plan 2:</p> <p>(a) the assessment H8.8.2(1)(a)(i), (ix), (xii), (xiii), (xv), (xvi), (xviii), (xix) and (c)(xi) of the Business – City Centre Zone rules apply in addition to the criteria below;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(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</p>	<p>The Port Precinct is permissive for port-related office and industrial activities, subject to the relevant standards.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Of particular note, such buildings should have “defined public fronts that address</p>

Activity	Relevant plan section	Activity status	Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria	Comments
		<p>construction noise, lighting and building height (Precinct Plan 1 – 24m) apply.</p> <p>The new building may require consent for land disturbance, discharges from contaminated land, changes to stormwater management etc. Further information would be needed to assess fully.</p>	<p>modulation and articulation;</p> <p>(d) 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;</p> <p>(e) 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</p> <p>(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</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(12) building height:</p> <p>(a) building height may be exceeded where it would provide an attractive and integrated roof form that also</p>	<p>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”.</p> <p>In addition, the development of new buildings is permitted subject to height and construction noise controls.</p> <p>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).</p>

Activity	Relevant plan section	Activity status	Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria	Comments
			<p>meets the purpose of the standard;</p> <p>(b) where building height is exceeded, Policy I208.3(1) and (8) of the Port Precinct and Policy H8.3(30) of the Business – City Centre Zone should be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• City Centre Policy (30) -</li> </ul>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Activity	Relevant plan section	Activity status	Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria	Comments
			<p>Manage adverse effects associated with building height and form by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) transitioning building height and development densities down to neighbourhoods adjoining the city centre and to the harbour edge;</li> <li>(b) protecting sunlight to identified public open spaces and view shafts;</li> <li>(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</li> <li>(d) managing the scale, form and design of buildings to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) avoid adverse dominance and/or amenity effects on streets and public open space; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>(10) noise and construction noise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(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</li> </ul>	

Activity	Relevant plan section	Activity status	Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria	Comments
			<p>infringement and the practicality of managing the noise emissions;</p> <p>(b) the operational requirements of the Port of Auckland</p>	
<p>Vehicle handling storage – new car parking building (located on land adjacent to Quay Street within precinct Area A)</p>	<p>Port Precinct  City Centre zone</p>	<p>The following activities are <b>permitted</b> in the Port Precinct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marine and Port Activities (this includes the unloading of cars and related transfer operations)</li> <li>• Offices accessory to Marine and Port Activities</li> <li>• New buildings and alterations and additions to existing buildings outside Area A in the Port Precinct</li> </ul> <p>The following activities are restricted discretionary activities in the Port Precinct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New buildings and alterations and additions to existing buildings within Area A in the Port Precinct</li> </ul> <p>The new building may</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The noise controls remain relevant although it is noted that car parking is unlikely to exceed these standards (compared to an engineering workshop).</p>	<p>From the information provided the proposed new car parking building sits partially within Area A. However there is no frontage to Quay Street.</p> <p>The height control is 24m in the identified location.</p> <p>Public open spaces are not anticipated in the port precinct and therefore the policy framework does not support open space activities.</p>

Activity	Relevant plan section	Activity status	Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria	Comments
		<p>require consent for land disturbance, discharges from contaminated land, changes to stormwater management etc. Further information would be needed to assess fully.</p> <p>The Master Plan proposes a public open space on the roof of the car parking building. As an activity not provided for in the Port Precinct, and given that the City Centre zone rules do not apply, the proposed open space would be a <b>discretionary activity</b>.</p>		
Waterfront Hotel (located on land adjacent to Quay Street within precinct Area A)	Port Precinct City Centre zone Noise overlay	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	<p>The following <b>City Centre zone objectives and policies</b> are considered relevant to the accommodation activity:</p> <p>Objectives H8.2(4)(c) &amp;(7)</p> <p>Policies:</p> <p>(2) Enable an increase in the density, diversity and quality of housing in the centres</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>From the information</p>

Activity	Relevant plan section	Activity status	Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria	Comments
		<p>(other than worker accommodation) is not listed, the default status of discretionary activity applies (Rule C1.7(1)).</p> <p>New buildings and alterations and additions to existing buildings within Area A in the Port Precinct are restricted discretionary activities.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>(19) Provide for a wide range of activities along the waterfront, while continuing to provide for those activities requiring a harbour location.</p> <p>(20) Enhance the waterfront as a major gateway to the city centre and Auckland.</p> <p>(21) Enable the efficient use and development of the Port of Auckland and identified marine and port activity areas.</p> <p>(24) Encourage comprehensive and integrated development of key development sites or precincts in the city centre.</p> <p>(25) Limit activities that would have reverse sensitivity effects on established and future marine and port activities.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The height control is 24m in the identified location.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The noise standards (i.e. noise generated by the accommodation and accessory activities)</p>

Activity	Relevant plan section	Activity status	Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria	Comments
			<p>The following <b>Port Precinct objectives and policies</b> are considered relevant to the accommodation activity:</p> <p>Objectives:</p> <p>(2) The use and development of non-port related activities and buildings do not compromise the existing or future operation of the precinct.</p> <p>(4) Adverse reverse sensitivity effects on the efficient and safe operation of marine and port activities are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>Policies:</p> <p>(3) Ensure that non-port related activities or non-port related development within the precinct does not compromise</p>	<p>are not considered relevant due to the comparatively quiet nature of short-stay accommodation.</p> <p>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.</p>

Activity	Relevant plan section	Activity status	Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria	Comments
			<p>the primary function or development of the precinct for marine and port activities and marine and port facilities</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
Fergusson North Wharf completion and extension	Port Precinct General Coastal Marine zone	In the Port Precinct, 'wharves, landings and drydocks, including alterations and additions to these structures' are a restricted discretionary activity.	<p>Matters of discretion:</p> <p>(9) wharves, landings and drydocks within the Port Precinct:</p> <p>(a) location and design;</p> <p>(b) construction or works methods, timing and hours of</p>	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.

Activity	Relevant plan section	Activity status	Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria	Comments
			<p>operation;</p> <p>(c) effects on coastal processes;</p> <p>(d) effects on navigation and safety;</p> <p>(e) effects on the visual amenity values of the Waitemata Harbour;</p> <p>(f) effects on Mana Whenua values; and</p> <p>(g) consent duration and monitoring.</p> <p>Assessment criteria:</p> <p>(9) wharves, landings and drydocks within the Port Precinct:</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(c) whether construction works avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of construction, particularly through the management of silt, contaminated sediments, and other contaminants;</p>	<p>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.</p>

Activity	Relevant plan section	Activity status	Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria	Comments
			<p>(d) whether duration for construction is limited to the minimum duration reasonably necessary;</p> <p>(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</p> <p>(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;</p>	
Extend Bledisloe Wharf for a new north berth	Port Precinct  General Coastal Marine zone	In the Port Precinct, 'wharves, landings and drydocks, including alterations and additions to these structures' are a restricted discretionary activity.	Assessment criteria as for 'wharves, landings and drydocks, including alterations and additions to these structures' above.	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.

Activity	Relevant plan section	Activity status	Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria	Comments
				The extension would require an assessment of visual amenity effects and may be blocking views from Queens Wharf to the Waitemata Harbour entrance.
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	Port Precinct  General Coastal Marine zone	Declamation is a restricted discretionary activity.	Assesment criteria for declamation:  (a) whether the adverse effects of declamation 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 declamation 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.

Activity	Relevant plan section	Activity status	Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria	Comments
			<p>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</p> <p>(c) ...;</p> <p>(d) the extent to which declamation will affect Mana Whenua values.</p>	
Construction of new seawall south of existing seawall	Port Precinct  General Coastal Marine zone	New hard protection structures are a restricted discretionary activity.	<p>(4) hard protection structures including wave attenuation devices:</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(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</p> <p>(c) whether construction works avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of construction, particularly through the management of silt, contaminated sediments, and other contaminants.</p>	The new seawall would require a resource consent. The matters considered focus on effects on existing activities, wave hydraulics and the harbour environment.

Activity	Relevant plan section	Activity status	Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria	Comments
Dredging and disposal	Port Precinct  General Coastal Marine zone	<p>Maintenance dredging (to previously approved depths) is a controlled activity in the Port Precinct.</p> <p>Capital works dredging (to new depths) is a restricted discretionary activity in the Port Precinct.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Dredging matters of control:</p> <p>(1) maintenance dredging:</p> <p>(a) effects on water quality;</p> <p>(b) effects on harbour traffic, navigation and safety; and</p> <p>(c) duration and monitoring.</p> <p>Assessment criteria:</p> <p>(1) maintenance dredging:</p> <p>(a) effects on water quality:</p> <p>(i) whether methods are implemented to avoid, remedy or mitigate the release of contaminated sediment.</p> <p>(b) effects on harbour traffic, navigation and safety:</p> <p>(i) whether methods are implemented to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on harbour traffic, navigation and safety.</p> <p>(c) duration and monitoring:</p> <p>(i) 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.</p>	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	Relevant plan section	Activity status	Objectives and policies / Assessment criteria	Comments
			Capital works dredging has similar matters of discretion with the addition of ecological values and water quality.	

I208.10.2 Port: Precinct plan 2 - Extent of Area A

