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What is car share?

- It is a rental car by the hour.
  You book a car from our website/app, unlock with your smartcard, and drive away.

  Each car has its own home, you pick it up and return it to the same spot
  We cover parking, petrol, insurance, cleaning, and maintenance
Our booking engine creates efficiencies

- Cars used efficiently reduce large fleets - lowering costs
  Efficiently used cars don’t sit idle - they can be used by staff during work hours, then used by individuals after hours, and during weekends
Cityhop

- We are a social enterprise committed to helping people live one car less.

- We see mobility as a service, and we have influence on numerous modes of sustainability:
Benefits of Car share

- Cityhop has removed ~1,000 vehicles off the road
- We have opened up over 1,500 Kilometres of road space
- We have brought $5,000,000 in value back to the community
- Car share members use public transport 40% more than their car owner equivalent
Benefits of Car share Cont.

- Car share reduces traffic
- Car share creates space
- Car share reduces CO2 Emissions
Who uses Cityhop?

• ~45% of our members are Business members

• ~55% are Individual Members
Home without a car

Cityhop has cars at residential developments, such as:

‘The Daisy’ and ‘Wynyard Central’
Home without a car

Cityhop gives residents choices:
Work without a fleet

Cityhop allows businesses to reduce or replace their fleets
Currently....

Businesses have their own fleets
Businesses use one large shared fleet
Cars are not used efficiently

Work/Fleet cars are only used during work hours
The Future

With Cityhop, cars can be used at ANY TIME by ANYONE
Car share is part of the Transport mix

Cityhop is cheaper than a taxi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10 Km</th>
<th>30 Km</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cityhop</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Taxi fares based on estimates*
Pick a car and location that suits the moment
PORTS OF AUCKLAND - MASTER PLAN
EXISTING LAND FOOTPRINT

77 hectares = 770,000m² = 190 acres
PROPOSED ISLAND / ATOOLL FOOTPRINT

62.4 hectares = 624,000m$^2$ = 154 acres
THE GREEN PARK FOREGROUND TO THE CITY
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PUBLIC AND PRIVATE LAND AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PUBLIC SPACE</td>
<td>404,000m²</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PRIVATE LAND</td>
<td>220,000m²</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING POA FOOTPRINT</td>
<td>770,000m²</td>
<td>77.0ha, 190 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED ISLAND / ATOLL</td>
<td>625,000m²</td>
<td>62.5ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUAY STREET</td>
<td>42,000m²</td>
<td>4.2ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW QUAY STREET SOUTH DEVELOPMENT SITES</td>
<td>47,000m²</td>
<td>4.70ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE CHANNEL STREAM, ESTUARY, DECLAMATION</td>
<td>56,000m²</td>
<td>5.60ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE POINT BRITOMART CRUISE TERMINAL

PORTS OF AUCKLAND
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627,955 m³
622,800 m³

Item 5.2
### FAR

**TOTAL DEVELOPMENT SITE**  
217,630m²  
**TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AREA**  
648,025m²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Facilities</th>
<th>SITE AREA</th>
<th>LEVEL 01</th>
<th>LEVEL 02</th>
<th>LEVEL 03</th>
<th>LEVEL 04</th>
<th>LEVEL 05</th>
<th>LEVEL 06</th>
<th>LEVEL 07</th>
<th>LEVEL 08</th>
<th>TOTAL BY LOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>8,745</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Centre</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Community Land</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,245</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Community Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,245</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Commercial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Entertainment/Retail</td>
<td>110,840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workplace</td>
<td>110,840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Residential</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Private Commercial Land</strong></td>
<td><strong>159,385</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Private Commercial Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>159,385</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Development Site</strong></td>
<td><strong>231,680</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Development GFA</strong></td>
<td><strong>648,025</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL RESIDENTIAL GFA**  
330,000m² (Residential) + 35,000m² (CPT Residential) = 365,000

**MFA at 80% Efficiency**  
365,000 x 80% = 292,000

**No. of Apartments at 72.5m²**  
292,000 / 72.5 = 4000 apartments

**No. of Residents**  
Average 2 per apartment  
8000 residents
Ports of Auckland Future Master Plan

Auckland deserves a welcoming and representational foreground to the City that speaks not just of the historic pragmatics of maritime commerce, but about aspirational values and our identity in a new age – our people and their diversity, our place and the specifics of its topography, its flora and fauna; about sustainability and our place in the natural world.

Archimedia have prepared this Master Plan study as a result of teaching the AD2 Studio “Deported” with Chris Barton at University of Auckland School of Architecture during 2016, and out of an aspiration to facilitate a public dialogue about the future potential of the site. This study assumes that the cargo port operation is progressively removed from the site, with the exception of Cruise Ship activity, which is retained in conjunction with a separate new Cruise Terminal on Captain Cook Wharf, which is outside the study area.

Urban Design Concepts

1. The Island / Atoll
2. The Green Park – a new landscaped foreground to the City
3. New Public Waterfront
4. The Waterfront Axis – a maritime Quay Street
5. The Stadium
6. The Headland Cultural History Centre and Waka Estuary
7. The Headlands and Bays / Ricges and Gullies topography
8. Green Valleys - city-to-water green landscape networks
9. New Water Stadium and Lido
10. The Channel / Stream
11. The Memory Bridges
12. Cruise Ship Terminal
13. Education Precinct
14. Axial links into the City
   a. Tinley Street Axis
   b. Jellicoe Bridge
   c. The Mahuhu ki te Rangi Park / Spac Arena Axis
   d. The Stadium axis
   e. Gladstone Road axis
15. Island Precincts and Building Heights
16. Sustainability and Public Transport
1. The Island / Atoll

The Ports of Auckland site is the result of over a century of accumulated reclamation from the Waitemata Harbour.

The original shoreline is shown as a red line on the Site Plan of the existing Port.

The most significant gesture of this proposal is to return this land to the Waitemata – to the water realm, by encircling it with a tidal, sea-water “channel” and creating a new, urban “island”.

In a cultural context, the island is seen as an “atoll”, which “opens ancient narratives” for tangata whenua.

The island retains the approximate footprint of the reclamation, but changing its status to that of a Gulf island only metres from the CBD dramatically changes its land value.

The existing port footprint is re-expressed to follow a “headlands and bays” typology / topography.

Public Landscape and open space take precedence over the built environment on the island. The island is approximately 625,000m2. Of this area, 405,000m2 or 65% is dedicated public space.

The island creates a multitude of public, aquatic “edges” for the city, totalling over 8 kilometres of new public waterfront.

An elevated pedestrian walkway and bike path encircles the island. The sea-walk mitigates the northwest fetch and creates a sheltered “lagoon” and “water stadium” within for active recreation.

The new ground plane of the island is adjusted to respond to a 2m sea-level rise over the coming century.

Some facts and figures (areas subject to confirmation):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Ports of Auckland Footprint:</th>
<th>Proposed Island / Atoll:</th>
<th>Quay Street:</th>
<th>New Quay Street South Development Sites:</th>
<th>New Channel, Estuary and Reclamation returned to Waitemata:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>770,000m2; 77.0ha (190 acres)</td>
<td>625,000m2; 52.5ha</td>
<td>42,000m2;</td>
<td>47,000m2; 4.70ha (approximately)</td>
<td>56,000m2; 5.60ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Realm:

In Sydney for example, the ratio between public space and private space is approximately 50/50 (Public Sydney, Peter John Cannill)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed island Aotearoa Area</th>
<th>625,000m²</th>
<th>62.5ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Public Footprint</td>
<td>405,000m²</td>
<td>65% (rounded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Private Commercial Footprint</td>
<td>220,000m²</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The Green Park foreground to the city

We see the city from the water. Historically the isthmus was approached from the ocean. Many visitors first see Auckland as they travel up Rangitoto Channel and turn into the sheltered waters of the Waitemata.

We believe the new island should be predominantly landscape, representative of New Zealand and Auckland’s natural landscapes.

We propose a transition from the natural aquatic world to the urban city through a recovered landscape – a headland park of native forest and constructed landscape forms, creating a green foreground to the city.

Within this parkland, an ahi kea beacon of fire is sited, a symbol of occupation, a navigational and territorial marker.

3. New public waterfront

Public access is proposed to every edge of the island. The island has a variety of edge conditions - sandy beaches, rock walls, elevated sea-walk, bridges, traditional wharves, the canal-like “Channel Stream” edges, public salt-water swimming pools, multiple water steps, active aquatic recreation ramps and pontoons, small craft jetty, paved and treed cycle and walk ways, public plazas, embankments, an amphitheatre for outdoor events, axial pathways, green fields, sports fields and a 10m deep, sheltered, north-facing, outdoor hospitality precinct, all in immediate proximity to the water’s edge.

In total 8.20km of new public waterfront is proposed, excluding the nine new bridges to the island.
4. The Waterfront Axis

The Waterfront Axis continues the Waterfront Spine, established by the Auckland Council Waterfront Plan 2012, including Quay Street within in the CBD; the Viaduct; and Wynyard Quarter beyond.

We propose that Quay Street east of Tinley Street is to be restored to its original axis. Apart from the historic resonance, this re-introduces the long view from Point Campbell to the Ferry Building and Te Wero Bridge urban markers.

In our view, it is essential that Quay Street retains its integrity as Auckland’s “waterfront” street, and is not consigned to an “inland” role by over-development of the Ports of Auckland land.

The re-alignment of Quay Street also creates a larger footprint of land between The Strand and Quay Street, which is now sufficient to accommodate an international best practice rectangular Stadium. This creates a cluster of major entertainment venues within walking distance of the CBD and integrated with the rail network.

To accommodate the flow of crowds accessing the new Stadium, a pedestrian plaza is created to the south of Quay Street. A new rail station is proposed east of the Gladstone Road / The Strand Bridge.

New mixed use buildings open onto this pedestrian boulevard, establishing a constructed urban edge aligned with the Stadium and forming an activated urban edge parallel to Quay Street.

The proposed Stadium is located on existing Ngati Whatua land. New commercial development sites are proposed adjoining the Stadium facing the Channel / Island across Quay Street.

5. The Stadium

There has been much debate over the role, capacity and location of a new National or Local stadium accessible to the CBD. In our opinion, this large and often empty structure should not be located on the seaward side of Quay Street.
Archimedia have not developed the design of the proposed Stadium, other than to research the footprint of international best-practice stadia focussed on a rectangular pitch and excellent spectator experience. The proposed footprint is comparable to that of Allianz Stadium, Turin, accommodating 45,000 spectators.

This option is compared with Suncorp Stadium, Brisbane; Trust Stadium, Wellington; and Eden Park. The Stadium

6. The Headland Cultural History Centre and Waka estuary

Proposed as a constructed “natural” landscape roof sitting above the building below, the cultural centre is dedicated to Ngati Whatua and the history of Maori settlement of the isthmus.

The evocative “volcanic motu”, illuminated red within at night, would create an evocative symbol of Auckland’s geology by day and night.

The centre is proposed with its own perimeter walkway recessed under the sculptured, constructed “green roof” and an open roofed atrium / courtyard – the walkway and “crater” opening are illuminated red at night, recalling the active volcanic field underlying the City.

The “motu” would be surrounded by a shallow “estuary” that covers and un-covers with the tides. The cultural centre is accessed by elevated bridges and may include a waka landing and preservation facility.

7. Headlands and Bays Topography

The existing form of the Port reclamation is exploited to create a “headlands and bays / ridges and gullies” typology, as promoted by Professor Richard Toy, as the topographical form characteristic of Tamaki Makaurau.

8. Green Valleys

The Master Plan extends the green landscaped valleys of Judges Bay, the Domain and Grafton Gully to the edge of the Waitakere, planting new lungs and carbon-sinks for the city and extending the existing Ngati Whatua initiative to encourage pathways for native birds through the city.
9. The Water Stadium and Lido

The elevated sea-walk defines the reef of the atoll and creates within a sheltered lagoon that is available for cultural, recreational and sporting events.

The sea-walk is suspended on piles between which are strung hangers for aquaculture, filtering the water and creating a dynamic partial barrier to wind waves and ferry wakes.

A paired-bascule bridge opens the lagoon to the harbour, allowing higher-vessel entrance and providing a “gateway” finish marks for water events. The perimeter board walk and beaches create a series of natural amphitheatres for spectators, who might attend / observe events hosted on the water.

Sea-water and storm-water remediation initiatives on the sea-walk and in the Channel / Stream improve water quality to permit swimming at new sand beaches within and outside the lagoon.

The proposal includes a public outdoor sea-water Lido and floating salt-water pools.

The lagoon is targeted at active recreation for paddle-boards, kayaks, waka ama and small sailing craft. These are accessed directly from public car parking via ramps and pontoons to the water’s edge.

10. The Channel Stream

The island is separated from the mainland by a tidal channel, 40m wide and of varying depths, which ebbs and flows with each tide and which contains sea-water filtering and storm-water run-off mitigation gardens in two of its six fairways between seven shared and two pedestrian bridges.

The Channel creates an edge on its southern side which continues the relationship between land and harbour experienced along Tamaki Drive right into the CBD.

Tidal turbines generate energy for the island and mitigate the current within the channel.

The northern edge of the estuary creates a kilometre of new, canal-like, habitable urban waterfront.
11. The Memory Bridges

Two elevated sculptural pedestrian bridges extend over the estuary at the eastern and western margins of the island. These two bridges trace the original outline of Point Britomart (Te Rāenga-ora-i-te) and Campbells Point (Wai-a-Taikehu), recalling their historic geological footprint.

12. The Point Britomart Cruise Terminal

We understand a new Cruise Terminal is proposed for a re-developed Captain Cook Wharf. This will involve almost double the length of its current extension into the harbour. In conjunction with Princes or Queens Wharves, this new terminal may cope with demand over the next twenty five years or so. It may be that by the time the Ports redevelopment is underway, that demand for cruise liner berthing exceeds this capacity.

The existing Bledisloe Wharf significantly exceeds the length of the largest cruise ships currently visiting Auckland - Royal Caribbean “Solstice of the Seas” 230,000t; 370m long).

Utilising this existing wharf places cruise ships in a fairway on axis with Britomart Place, creating a dramatic urban experience and allowing passengers access to the Queen Street valley via a pedestrian orientated network of lanes and transport hub, as well as along the proposed upgraded Quay Street Boulevard.

We propose a mixed-use multi-storey terminal where the lowest two levels are allocated to Cruise Ship activities when required, which is approximately one-third of the year. Above the terminal entertainment, workplace and residential activities would assist the feasibility of the Cruise Terminal development.

A functional transport and servicing loop accessed from the Tinley Street bridge, which links axially to Beach Road and thence to all transport infrastructure is proposed.

13. Education Precinct

An education precinct on the eastern end of the island flanks the axial boulevard to the cultural history centre. The open fields allow Early Childhood, Primary and Secondary education to occur for families living on the island. To the west of the boulevard, tertiary and cultural education facilities are proposed.
14. Axial Connections into existing City

- Britomart Place – visual access to harbour foreshore
- Tangihua / Tīneley Street – road and pedestrian access
- Jellicoe Bridge – recalling the axis of Jellicoe Wharf, pedestrian and street car route
- Mahuhu ki te Rangi Park – pedestrian bridge connecting the Mahuhu ki te Rangi Park with the headland park
- Waipapa Green Axis – pedestrian bridge - fingers of green landscape extending down Aucklands historic valleys are reinforced along the Parnell rail-line and into the space between Saorc Arena and the new Stadium – this green “lung” is extended across the island and the water re-mediation gardens to a waterfront plaza and sandy bay
- Stadium Lane – pedestrian bridge connecting the Stadium and its east-west pedestrian access boulevard with the hospitality precinct and the waterfront point.
- The Strand Bridge Axis – a road and pedestrian bridge – connecting The Strand directly to the water in the Bay.
- Gladstone Road – visual connection only to park-side boulevard on island, framed by Memory Bridge
- Judges Bay Bridge – road, street car, pedestrian and cycleway bridge, accessing skate park and car-parking for the retained Marine Rescue Centre, Heliport and restaurants.

15. Island Precincts and Building Intensity

- Cruise Terminal
- Tangihua / Tīneley Street – retail, hospitality, workplace, entertainment, residential
- Jellicoe Bridge axis – retail, hospitality, workplace, entertainment, residential
- Mahuhu ki te Rangi Park laneways
- Waipapa Green Axis – pedestrian bridge - fingers of green landscape extending down Aucklands historic valleys are reinforced along the Parnell rail-line and into the space between Saorc Arena and the new Stadium – this green “lung” is extended across the island and the water re-mediation gardens to a waterfront plaza and sandy bay - hospitality, workplace, entertainment, residential
- Stadium Lane – pedestrian bridge connecting the Stadium and its east-west pedestrian access boulevard with the hospitality precinct and the waterfront point - retail, hospitality, workplace, entertainment, residential
- The Strand Bridge Axis – a road and pedestrian bridge – connecting The Strand directly to the water in the Bay - retail, hospitality, workplace, entertainment, residential
- Gladstone Road – visual connection only to park-side boulevard on island, framed by Memory Bridge
16. Sustainability and Public Transport

- An energy strategy for the island is being prepared by Ecubed Building Workshop.
- Roof mounted photo-voltaic panels are supplemented by tidal turbines located in the Channel Stream.
- Motor vehicles are restricted to arterial roads only to key facilities – all other surface circulation is by shared spaces and walkways.
- The island is in easy walking distance of proposed street cars on Quay Street, heavy rail stations at The Strand and Britomart; and ferry terminals on the sea- walk and at Downtown.
- Basement space in building footprints future-proofing against sea-level rise is flexible and may accommodate cars, storage or other activities depending on the requirements of a post-car society.

Consultation and Collaboration

- Ngati Whatua – Ngarimu Blair, Bernard Makoare (19th March)
- Auckland Council – Chris Darby (11th April)
- Auckland Design Office - Ludo Campbell Reid; Tim Fitzgerald; George Weeks (24th April)
- Auckland Council Planning Committee (1st May)
- Penku – Roger MacDonald, Rod Marler, Alan Young (24th April)
- Sustainability – Ecubed Building Workshop – David Fullbrook (10th April)
- Landscape Architects – LandLab – Henry Crothers (17th April)
- Town Planners – Doles Consultancy Services – Brooke Dales (11th April)
- Property industry – Colliers International – Jimmy O’Brien, Alan McMahon (20th April)
- Urban Auckland; Stop Stealing our Harbour – Michael Goldwater (27th April)
- UoA School of Architecture – Chris Barton (17th April)
- Greater Auckland / Innovation Incubator - Patrick Reynolds; Bruce Copeland (18th April)
- Identity – ALT Group – Dean Poole, Ben Corban (23rd April)
- Master Plan – Archimedia – Lindsay Mackie, Sean Park, Mehul Patel, Mick Charoenphan, Kavita Sharma, Archimedia Studio staff
Allowing companion animals on public transport

Dr Sarah Zito BVetMed MANZCVS PhD
1st May 2018
The SPCA supports the motion to allow companion animals to be carried on all modes of public transport across Auckland.

This could have numerous benefits for both animals and people.
Potential benefits for animals

- It is important that people are not restricted in their ability to transport animals to the veterinarian.
- Allowing animals on public transport gives people more options and more affordable ways to get their companion animals to the veterinarian.
Potential benefits for animals

- Access to exercise areas is particularly important for people with dogs, but safe and enjoyable exercise areas may not always be available within safe walking distance.

- Allowing companion animals to travel on public transport with their guardian can allow them to access more safe and enjoyable exercise areas.
Potential benefits for animals

- Leaving animals at home for long periods can have a negative impact on their welfare.
- If animals can accompany their guardians on public transport it is more likely that the animals will get to spend more time out of the home, with their people, and be left home alone less.
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Potential benefits for people and society

- It is important to encourage people to have and exercise with dogs – there are proven benefits to human health and well-being, and to the wider community (Wood et al 2005 & 2007, Cutt et al 2008, Wood et al 2015, Christian et al 2016, Kent and Mulley 2017).

- Facilitating people to spend more time with their companion animals and include them in their everyday activities helps to develop, nurture, and maintain the strong bond and important bond that people have with their animals.
Potential benefits for people and society

Allowing companion animals on public transport has potential to discourage car trips that are related to the need to transport animals and may help normalise public transport use in car dependent cities (Kent and Mulley 2017).
Concerns

- The main concerns that people express about allowing animals on public transport include hygiene, safety, and nuisance issues but these concerns can be managed by responsible animal guardians.

- Guidelines to help achieve this include:
  - Cats and other small animals should be carried inside a suitable animal carrier.
  - Dogs should be on leash and under control at all times.
  - The person in charge of the animal would be responsible for cleaning up any mess caused immediately and should carry the items required for that at all times.

SPCA
The SPCA supports the move to allow suitably controlled or contained and appropriate animals on public transport as this could have significant benefits for animal welfare and health, and human well-being.
References

Memorandum

26 April 2018

To: Planning Committee, Auckland Council
cc: Kalinda Gopal, Senior Governance Advisor
     Nina Siers, Relationship Manager Franklin Local Board

Subject: Franklin Local Board - Submission on Draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018

From: Angela Fulljames, Chair, Franklin Local Board

Purpose

1. To:
   • Supplement the verbal presentation by Local Board Deputy Chair Andrew Baker.

Summary

• The Franklin Local Board suggests a stronger representation of the issues faced by emerging urban areas/population nodes on Auckland extremities, specifically within section 3 “Strategic directions and priorities”
• The Franklin Local Board requests that the submission emphasises the need for balance for transport development in urban areas already enjoying multiple transport options and those emerging areas that have limited options but are anticipating significant growth.

Context/Background

1. The Franklin Local Board area, on Auckland’s south and east extremity, is not adequately serviced in terms of commuter (public) transport choices, suffers from under-investment in active transport options and local contribution to economic growth is limited by road and freight-servicing infrastructure.

2. The Franklin Local Board is anticipating significant increases in population over the next 10 years that dramatically increase demand for transport choices.

3. The Franklin Local Board have anticipated this demand within the Franklin Local Board plan, prioritising the need to build a local economy/local jobs, deal with growth by advocating for adequate infrastructure (including roading) and more specifically, advocating for an improved transport system.

Comment on the Auckland Council submission

4. The Franklin Local Board supports the Auckland Council Submission on the draft policy statement on Land Transport.

5. The Board requests that the submission is amended to reference a need for balance between the needs of urban areas where transport choices are plentiful with the needs of the outer and emerging population nodes with significant congestion and limited transport choices.

6. The Board suggests a stronger representation of the issues faced by emerging urban areas/population nodes on Auckland extremities, specifically within section 3 “Strategic directions and priorities” to emphasise;
- That road safety initiatives go beyond signs and speeds limits. That resource should go into better methods and technology to improve the function and durability of road surfaces and that can enable repair beyond the limited road works season.
- A need to fund and/or require wider roads with designated and separated cycle lanes in those rural areas experiencing new and significant development i.e. to enable and cater for the increasing number recreational cyclists and active commuters.
- Support for policy that requires all new major roads and arterials to facilitate multiple transport options and needs e.g. dedicated separated cycle / walking paths, dedicated bus and heavy transport lanes, dedicated motor cycle lanes.
- The significant impact on the economy through lost time and lower productivity caused by congestion, adds cost to food production and transport. This can be addressed by accelerating dedicated freight transport provisions (one example is the Pukekohe Freight bypass project).
Feedback on the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport
(Planning Committee submission)

From: The Rodney Local Board
Date: 13 April 2018

Executive Summary

1. The Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (the GPS) helps guide investment in transport by providing a longer term strategic view of how we prioritise things in the transport network, and why. This includes an overall focus of improving our land transport network by prioritising safety, access, environment and value for money.

2. Submissions on the GPS can be made by council, submission close on 2 May 2018.

3. The Planning Committee will adopt the council’s submission at their meeting on 1 May 2018. Local boards can make comments to feed into the council’s submission.

Rodney Local Board Feedback:
The Rodney Local Board:

a) Provides the following feedback to the Planning Committee on the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport (the GPS) for inclusion in a submission to the Government:

   i. The Rodney Local Board supports the joint local board statement on the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018, but adds the points below.

   ii. The GPS includes a specific focus on access in “urban centres” which, on its natural meaning, would exclude the majority of the Auckland area that is rural land (predominantly found in the Rodney and Franklin Local Board areas) from being a focus for improved access under the GPS.

   iii. Auckland is not classed as “regional New Zealand” and does not, for example, qualify for funding from the Provincial Growth Fund.

   iv. There is a risk that the rural parts of Auckland will fall into a gap between “regional New Zealand” and “urban centres”, the GPS needs to ensure that rural Auckland will be included within the access priority of the GPS to allow better transport solutions for our rural communities.

   v. The Rodney Local Board notes that key rural priorities, including road sealing (and by extension reintroducing the NZTA subsidy for road sealing) and better road maintenance, clearly align with both of the GPS’s key strategic priorities of safety and access as well as the supporting priority on the environment (noting that dust and run off from unsealed roads has a significant impact on the environment); the local board anticipates therefore that rural issues will be high priorities for funding in future budgets and plans (including the Auckland Transport Alignment Project and the Regional Land Transport Plan).

   vi. The Government should be encouraged to complete the proposed “Safety Strategy and Action Plan” as soon as possible and much faster than the 12-18 months stated so that priority can be given to addressing road safety, particularly on rural roads which, as the GPS states, were designed for faster movement of vehicles, not for safety.
Authorisation

The Rodney Local Board Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee members have been consulted and asked to provide feedback regarding the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport.

This feedback is authorised in accordance with the delegation to the Chairperson and the Deputy Chairperson of the Transport Planning and Infrastructure Committee, resolution RODTP/2017/57:

That the Rodney Local Board Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee:

  a) delegate the following responsibilities to the Chairperson of the Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee:

  ...

  iii) the final approval of any informal feedback relating to matters delegated to this committee.

Cameron Brewer
Chairperson
Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee
Rodney Local Board

Date: 16 April 2018

Contact Details

Name: Rodney Local Board, Auckland Council
Postal Address: C/- Kathryn Martin, Senior Local Board Advisor, Rodney Local Board, Auckland Council, Orewa Service Centre, Private Bag 92300 Auckland
Phone number: Kathryn Martin, Senior Local Board Advisor 09 427 3252
Email contact: Kathryn.aileen.martin@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Auckland Council Submission
1 May 2018
What is the GPS

- Outlines Government’s transport expenditure priorities
- Sets national allocations of funding to “activity classes.”
GPS direction

- Investing an increased amount of money each year.
- But a different investment focus to achieve new transport priorities and objectives including:
  - Safety
  - Access
  - Environment
  - Value for money
Attachment A

Item 11

To achieve these results, the draft GPS gives greater funding priority to:

- Safety improvements for road users, cyclists and pedestrians
- Public transport in cities and expanding the public transport system to support new housing and interregional commuting
- 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
Key Submission Points – Mainly in support

GPS investment priorities are generally well aligned with council’s priorities.

Support for:

• GPS’s strategic direction
• the increased investment priority given to safety and demand management, public transport, walking and cycling, and local road improvements and local road maintenance
• the new activity class framework
• the mode neutral approach to transport planning and investment decisions
• “road policing” being funded from a specific dedicated / 'ring-fenced' fund
Some requests and suggested changes

Request:
- that the GPS enables Auckland to receive an appropriate share of the National Land Transport Fund
- for an appropriate level of government funding of Rapid Transit Network / Strategic Public Transport
- for early incremental implementation of road safety improvements

Suggested minor word changes

Submission points incorporates joint feedback received from six Local Boards. Recently received feedback received from Rodney Local Board and Franklin Local Board to be attached to Council's submission.
Auckland Council Submission:
Draft Government Policy Statement on
Land Transport 2018/19-2027/28

Date: 2 May 2018

He mihi ki te kaahui ūpuna,
te tauro-teke mō tātou te muka tāngata,
ki ngā mana ātua, kia tau te mauri.

He kura tangihia, he maimai aroha,
rātou kia whetūrongotia ki o rātou
tātou te hunga mata-rerehua ki o tatou

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

1. Overview

This is Auckland Council’s submission in response to the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2018/19-2027/28.

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

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

2. Introduction and Summary


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% 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.

**Submission Summary:**

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 49% over the past four years, from a low of 421 in 2012 to 633 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.

Rural parts of Auckland also face significant safety challenges, requiring tailored solutions such as median and side barriers, rural intersection upgrades, improved skid resistance, signage, targeted seal widening and speed management. We support the specific mention of rural road safety in paragraph 35 of the draft GPS.

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.

Aucklander’s 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 Aucklander’s 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 Aucklander’s 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.

1. **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 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 renewals programme.

6. **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 8.8 million in 2008 to 25 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

The Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP) provides detail on transport funding in Auckland over the next decade. This includes an assumption of $16.3 billion from the National Land Transport Fund. Realising this level of funding may require changes to current funding approaches, including:

- Greater flexibility across activity classes
- Changes to funding assistance rates
- Ensuring all transport investment areas are eligible for co-funding (for example, footpath renewals and road seal extensions)

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).

Because the draft GPS was prepared before ATAP was completed, the funding arrangements required to deliver ATAP are not yet detailed in the GPS. To ensure the GPS reflects ATAP, it would be helpful for it to reference ATAP’s NLTF assumptions and the potential changes to funding arrangements detailed above.

8. Incremental Early safety funding

Council supports the development of a new road safety strategy and action plan but requests incremental early implementation (rather than waiting 18 months to its completion) 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

---

1 AT RoadSafe Strategy 2018-2023
2 Needs a footnote
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.

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 para 25 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 52</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 56</td>
<td>Include reference to the key transport priorities, updated to reflect the ATAP update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section/Paragraph</td>
<td>Suggested Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</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 70</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 considered ahead of providing extra capacity through road widening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 15 Section 2.3.2</td>
<td>Section 2.3.2 talks about transport choice and para 53 refers to walking and cycling but nothing related to PT. There needs to be a similar paragraph to cover off GPS investment in PT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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>Section 2.5 Value for money</td>
<td>Needs to discuss the value created by transport investment and how this can benefit others. For example, there is a case for supporting suboptimal transport investment where it supports other govt investments (such as housing developments) and provides better value overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 20 Para 129.</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>Page 26 Safety</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).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add stronger wording regarding reducing speed limits in urban areas and rolling this out faster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add specific reference to making motorcycling safer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 27 Access:</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>Page 36 Para 152</td>
<td>Needs to include that NZTA investment supports and respects local authority land use planning and growth strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 38 Para 190</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>Page 38 Para 197</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>