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Item 8.2

HOBSVILLE MARINA

- 4.85ha landside
- Marina parking (0.7ha)
- Marine Industry (1.6ha)
- Existing apartments (0.25ha)
- Existing commercial (0.93ha)
- Parking and trailer parking (0.36ha)
- 12.95ha waterside
- 16.0ha potential marina expansion
PROJECT OBJECTIVES

1. Provide for the continuing operation of the marina, and provide for its future expansion
2. Provide for expansion of marina hardstand
3. Provide new public access along marina front
4. Provide for increased public ferry service, parking and resolve congestion
5. Provide better connectivity from parking to ferry
6. Provide for new homes
7. Delivery of public benefits first
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PROJECT PROCESS

- Engagement
- Agree Deliverables
- Resource Consent
- Delivery of Public Benefits
- Delivery of Apartments
MASTER PLAN BY HML

- Provides for current and future marina operations
- Provides for public access
- Provides for public transport
- Provides for marine industry
- Provides for new homes
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STAKEHOLDERS

- Berth holders
- Ferry commuters
- Bus patrons
- Residents (Clearwater cove)
- Boat ramp users
- Recreational users
- Employers/Businesses
- Marine industrial users
OTHER MATTERS

- Evidence which was preferred by UP panel in making decision (attached)
- Possibly considered non-notified – subject to usual tests
- Height
- Notification
Item 8.2

THANKYOU
I604. Hobsonville Marina Precinct

I604.1. Precinct description

Hobsonville Marina Precinct is located at Clearwater Cove, Hobsonville in Auckland’s upper Waitemata Harbour. The precinct includes the coastal marine area, the marina and 4.5 hectares of adjoining land.

The purpose of the Hobsonville Marina Precinct is to provide for a range of marine-related, commercial, retail and residential activities in addition to the activities provided for in the Coastal – Marina Zone, including the ferry terminal facility.

The precinct modifies the height standards of the Coastal – Marina Zone. The precinct provides for a range of activities similar to those presently undertaken within the precinct area. This includes marina, ferry terminal, marine-related, commercial, retail and residential activities. The need to maintain the amenity values of the surrounding area, including, where appropriate, views through and over the site to the harbour, and provide for public access to and along the coastal edge is also recognised.

The precinct is comprised of six sub-precincts as shown on the planning maps:

- Sub-precincts A, B, C provide for a broad range of activities and impose specific height standards;
- Sub-precinct D specifically provides access to the boat ramp, trailer parking and park-and-ride facility associated with the ferry terminal; and
- Sub-precincts E and F provide for marina and marine related uses.

The underlying zoning of land within this precinct is Coastal – Marina Zone.

I604.2. Objectives [rcpdp]

[The regional coastal plan – rcp provisions (or activities or resources in the coastal marine area) are not operative until the Minister of Conservation has formally approved the regional coastal plan part of the Auckland Unitary Plan]

1. The activities undertaken within the precinct enhance the existing marina, ferry terminal, marina and marine village activities.

2. Development within the precinct is sensitive to the unique marine location, and provides for public access and enjoyment of the coast.

3. The amenity values of land adjoining the precinct are maintained.

The overlay, Auckland-wide and underlying zone objectives apply in this precinct in addition to those specified above.

I604.3. Policies [rcpdp]

[The regional coastal plan – rcp provisions (or activities or resources in the coastal marine area) are not operative until the Minister of Conservation has formally approved the regional coastal plan part of the Auckland Unitary Plan]

1. Require new development to be designed and located in a manner that is:

   a) sensitive to the unique marine location;

   b) does not adversely affect the operation of the marina or ferry terminal;
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(c) avoids, to the extent practicable, adverse effects on the amenity values of land adjoining the precinct, including visual amenity; and

(d) maintains, and where possible enhances, public access to and along the coastal edge.

The overlay, Auckland-wide and underlying zone policies apply in this precinct in addition to those specified above.

I604.4. Activity table

The provisions in any relevant overlays, Auckland-wide provisions and the underlying zone apply in this precinct unless otherwise specified below.

For rules relating to works in the coastal marine area, refer to Table F3.4.1 of the Coastal – Marina Zone.

Tables I604.4.1 and I604.4.2 Activity tables specify the activity status of land use, structures constructed in the coastal marine area and associated occupation of the common marine and coastal area activities in the Hobsonville Marina Precinct pursuant to section 9(3), 12 (1), 12(2) and 12(3) of the Resource Management Act 1991 or any combination of all of these sections where relevant.

Table I604.4.1 Activity table - use [rcp/dp]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-precincts A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A1) Camping grounds</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A2) Dwellings</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A3) Retirement villages</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A4) Visitor accommodation</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A5) Commercial services</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A6) Food and beverage</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A7) Licensed premises</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A8) Marine retail</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A9) Offices</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A10) Retail</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A11) Activities associated with the public boat ramp, boat and trailer parking and park-and-ride</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A12) Any activities associated with artworks</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A13) Care facilities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A14) Healthcare facilities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A15) Parks, playgrounds, walkways</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A16) Marine and port activities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A17) Marine industry</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A18) Maritime passenger operations</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A19) Public transport facilities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A20) Activities listed in this table not otherwise provided for in the sub-precinct</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### I604.4.2 Activity table - Structures [rcp/dp]

[The regional coastal plan [rcp] provisions (for activities or resources in the coastal marine area) are not operative until the Minister of Conservation has formally approved the regional coastal plan part of the Auckland Unitary Plan.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-precincts A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A21) Buildings and structures listed in this table not otherwise provided for in the sub-precinct</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A22) Construction or alteration of structures or buildings other than for marine and port facilities and marine and port accessory structures and services</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A23) Marine and port accessory structures and services</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A24) Marine and port facilities</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A25) Maritime passenger facilities</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### I604.5. Notification

1. An application for resource consent for a controlled activity listed in Table I604.4.2 Activity table will be considered without public or limited notification or the need to obtain written approval from affected parties unless the Council decides that special circumstances exist under section 95A(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991.

2. Any application for resource consent for an activity listed in Table I604.4.1 or Table I604.4.2 Activity tables and which is not listed in I604.5(1) will be subject to the normal tests for notification under the relevant sections of the Resource Management Act 1991.
(3) When deciding who is an affected person in relation to any activity for the purposes of section 95E of the Resource Management Act 1991 the Council will give specific consideration to those persons listed in Rule C1.13(4).

I604.6. Standards

The Auckland-wide, overlay and underlying zone standards apply in this precinct unless otherwise specified.

All activities listed as permitted in Tables I604.4.1 and I604.4.2 must comply with the following permitted activity standards.

I604.6.1. Building height

(1) Buildings must not exceed the following heights limit in the areas identified in I604.10.1 Hobsonville Marina: Precinct plan 1:

(a) Height area 1 – 8m (up to 14m Mean Sea Level);
(b) Height area 2 – 12m (up to 18m Mean Sea Level);
(c) Height area 3 – 15m (up to 18m Mean Sea Level);
(d) Height area 4 – 15m (up to 21m Mean Sea Level); and
(e) Height area 5 – 9m (up to 13m Mean Sea Level).

I604.6.2. Height in relation to boundary

(1) The height in relation to boundary standard does not apply to sub-precinct A and C.

(2) The western boundary of sub-precinct B is subject to the height to boundary standard of the Residential – Mixed Housing Urban Zone.

I604.6.3. Maximum building coverage

(1) Building coverage must not exceed the limit set out in Table I604.6.3.1.

Table I604.6.3.1 Maximum building coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-precinct</th>
<th>Building coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>60 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>60 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>60 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>25 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I604.6.4. Minimum landscaped area

(1) A landscaped area must be provided within sub-precincts A, B and C.

(2) The landscaped area provided must meet the minimum percentages as set out in Table I604.6.4.1.
Table 604.6.4.1 Minimum landscaped area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-precinct</th>
<th>Minimum landscaped area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10 per cent of each site must be landscaped in trees, shrubs or grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10 per cent of each site must be landscaped in trees, shrubs or grass, including an 8m wide strip within lot 5 adjoining the northern boundary with the esplanade reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>10 per cent of each site must be landscaped in trees, shrubs or grass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

604.7. Assessment – controlled activities

604.7.1. Matters of control

The Council will reserve its control to the following matters when assessing a controlled activity resource consent application:

(1) construction or alteration of structures or buildings other than for marine and port facilities and marine and port accessory structures and services:
   (a) construction or works methods, timing and hours of operation;
   (b) location, extent, design and material used; and
   (c) the visual impact of any building over 10m in height, in particular its permeability, enabling views through or around the building for people in the surrounding residential areas and people using the marina berths and harbour waters.

604.7.2. Assessment criteria

The Council will consider the relevant assessment criteria below for controlled activities, in addition to the assessment criteria specified for the relevant controlled activities in the zone or Auckland wide provisions:

(1) construction or works methods, timing and hours of operation:
   (a) whether the proposed construction or works methods avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, on water quality and sedimentation, on marine mammals, bird roosting, nesting and feeding, and recreational users of the coastal marine area; and
   (b) the extent to which the construction or works hours of operation are limited to minimise effects of noise and disruption on existing activities, and on nearby residential and public open space areas.

(2) location, extent, design and material used:
   (a) whether the development is of a scale, design and materials and located so that it remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the coastal environment and adjacent residential and public open space zoned land, particularly the following:
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(i) the natural character of the coastal environment;
(ii) effects on the recreational, visual, amenity and ecological values in the locality, including lighting effects;
(iii) public access to, along and within the coastal marine area;
(iv) effects on the landscape elements and features;
(v) effects on cultural and historic heritage values in the locality;
(vi) noise effects including ongoing operational noise, such as halyard slap;
(vii) effects on coastal processes including wave sheltering, downstream effects, sediment movement, erosion and deposits, littoral drift, and localised effects on water currents and water quality;
(viii) effects on existing activities in the coastal marine area and on adjacent land;
(ix) effects on navigation and safety and the need for any aids to navigation; and
(x) the provision of shore-based facilities including car and trailer parking, boat storage and maintenance areas, administration buildings, public toilets, boat racks, lockers, public access and esplanade reserves and urban design treatment.

(3) the extent to which the design of any building over 10m in height provides permeability enabling views through or around the building for people in the surrounding residential areas and people using the marina berths and harbour waters.

I604.8. Assessment – restricted discretionary activities
There are no restricted discretionary activities in this precinct.

I604.9. Special information requirements
There are no special information requirements in this precinct.

I604.10. Precinct plans
I604.10.1 Hobsonville Marina: Precinct plan 1 – Height
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Kia ora

- 19 years old, Part Greek
- Part Samoan, Albany Senior High School
- Founder, GirlBoss New Zealand & Changemaker Australia
- Passionate about innovation, business & community

Attachment A
From a place of isolation to...

8000 Members

2200 Ambassadors

Spoken at over 50 events to 30,000+ New Zealanders
Empower confident, resilient, future-ready young women to lead and change the world.

@girlbossnz
What percent of the world’s top CEOs are women?
We’re Changing That
1. Personal Branding
2. Employment (Interview/Networking)
3. Leadership (Community Impact)
After the Future CEO summit do you have increased confidence in your ability to lead a project and impact your community?

- Yes: 98%
- Maybe: 2%
What was the key message you took away from today?

"To be a changemaker and become a confident leader/CEO"

"I should be proud of my achievements and express them in interviews."

"That women are capable of generating change if they set their minds to it."

"That it is possible to create an empowering company that builds people up."

"I can achieve anything and my age and gender won’t hinder that achievement."

Item 8.1
What did you like most about the workshop?

"It was such a cool experience to spend the day with girls just like me."

Priyanka, 16

Amazing experience - essential skills for how to conduct ourselves in a professional setting."

Suzie, 16

I loved meeting so many diverse and passionate people and discussing issues we all care about."

Fatuma, 15
Community & Friendship
Would you attend a GirlBoss workshop on event planning?

- No: 20%
- Yes: 80%

Would you attend a GirlBoss workshop on financial strategies?

- No: 15%
- Yes: 85%

Would you attend a GirlBoss workshop on setting up a business or social enterprise?

- No: 20%
- Yes: 80%
Next Steps

- Financial Capabilities
- Setting up a business/social enterprise
- Event Planning
- Interview preparation/CV writing
- Women leaders
- Support in putting ideas into action
Thanks!

Any Questions?

alexia@girlboss.nz
www.girlboss.nz
Upper Harbour Local Board feedback on the Draft Regional Land Transport Plan

Introduction

Thank you for the opportunity for the Upper Harbour Local Board (the board) to provide comment on the draft Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). The board regrets that the consultation period for the RLTP has been so short as it reduces the opportunity for our community to provide its views. Notwithstanding that concern, the board acknowledges the challenges that Auckland Transport has faced preparing the RLTP, due to the timing and changes to Government’s Draft Government Policy Statement for transport and the revision of the Auckland Transport Alignment Project.

Executive Summary

The board congratulates Auckland Transport on the RLTP proposal. The RLTP correctly identifies the challenges facing Auckland and the board believes that, in the main, the document is well thought through. The board welcomes the funded projects identified for the Upper Harbour area.

In the board’s view there are a number of areas where further thought and consideration is needed, before the final RLTP is adopted. The board believes that its suggestions provide a local lens through which Auckland Transport can consider the issues important to our community.

Recommendations

The board recommends that:

- Auckland Transport notes the board’s preferred projects identified from Appendix 1 Table 1B – Auckland Transport Capital Programme – additional items currently unfunded, for further consideration should additional funding become available:
  - Northern busway enhancements
  - West Harbour ferry terminal
  - Enhanced park and ride programme
  - Westgate to Greenhithe RTN stations
  - Albany Heights intersection improvements
  - Albany Highway (Sunset to SH18) corridor improvements
  - Investigation and route protection for future priorities (Henderson to Albany / Constellation …)
  - NZTA SH16/SH18 connection and Squadron Drive improvements
- early engagement with local boards takes place as regional programme budgets start to be disaggregated to the project level
- Auckland Transport provide assurance that local roads will not be allowed to deteriorate beyond acceptable service standards as a result of re-prioritisation of renewals budgets
- greater emphasis and funding is provided to encourage mode, switching to active and public transport for shorter journeys
- increased investment in park and ride facilities at the Northern Busway Stations is made, and that the new northern network feeder bus system is reviewed 6 to 12 months after implementation to allow for it to be fine-tuned
- increased ferry services are commissioned (together with integrated local bus services) for Hobsonville Point and Hobsonville Marina
- planning for a rapid transit route alongside State Highway 18 be progressed, so that it can be actively considered for construction during the next RLTP
- further consideration of the proposed outcome measures for; cycling, public transport, commuting active and sustainable mode share, and school active and sustainable mode share be undertaken
- local road and public transport prioritisation improvements are undertaken to support the success of the Rosedale Busway Station
- demand responsive transport be considered for growth areas such as Whenuapai, to ensure that new residents have the opportunity to develop the public transport habit
- local road network improvements around Whenuapai be undertaken to increase safety and functionality to support the planned population growth.

Upper Harbour Context

The Upper Harbour Local Board area is currently on the periphery of the substantive Auckland metropolitan area. It includes the suburbs of Whenuapai, Herald Island and Hobsonville in the west, Paremomo, Greenhithe, Albany, Rosedale, Northcross, Unsworth and Pinehill in the east.

The Draft Auckland Plan projects growth from the current estimated 63,810 to 148,420 by 2051. This equates to some 233 percent above current levels. The distribution of this population is projected to change, with increasing density overall and a substantial greenfields growth in the Whenuapai area.

---

1 Draft Auckland Plan, belonging and participation population growth
2 Graphic taken from Strategic Plan Provision Assessment, UHLB commissioned research 2018.
Figure 1 Upper Harbour population density and growth projection

As this projected development occurs, Upper Harbour will no longer be at the edge, but enveloped into the metropolitan area as Auckland expands North and North West. Over time it will far more resemble current board areas, such as Kaipōtiki and Whāru. These areas are metropolitan in nature, and residents expect better service provision by Auckland Transport, given their higher population numbers and population density. Due to the long lead in times for infrastructure provision, the board believes it is essential that planning for future infrastructure and service provision is underway now.

While Upper Harbour is often thought of as being an affluent area with high access to private vehicles, there are many in the community who are transport disadvantaged due to disability, age (young and old), recent immigration status or income, and whom are reliant on other transport modes.

The Albany area is an important sub-regional employment hub, with some 28,000 jobs in the North Harbour Business Association Area. It is also home to Massey University's Albany campus. The northern busway provides a further traffic generator for the area, with the current park and ride areas overflowing into neighbouring streets and reserves, part way through the morning traffic peak.

The Albany employment area attracts workers from across the wider northern part of the region.

---

3 North Harbour Business Association submission to Auckland Transport, Albany Parking Consultation 2017
4 N.B. the North Harbour Business Association business improvement district only covers part of the wider Albany area
Figure 2 Journey to work patterns to the Albany area.

Many residents also work in the Takapuna and central business district areas.

Figure 3 Journey patterns to Takapuna and the Central Business District

The board acknowledges that as part of the northern bus network review, additional feeder bus services will be provided to the two current busway stations (Albany and Constellation), and that an additional busway station (Rosedale) is planned as part of the Northern Corridor Improvement project.

The position of these stations near the edge of the current metropolitan area means that for many busway patrons, private vehicle use will remain the only practicable means of accessing the rapid transit busway services. This may be one of the reasons that access to employment by public transport is projected to remain relatively low.6

---

This situation will lead to an increased reliance on private vehicles as the Upper Harbour population burgeons, and access to public transport remains low.

**RLTP Consultation Questions**

The draft RLTP requests comment on three questions:

- Have we correctly identified the challenges facing Auckland?
- Have we allocated available funding to the highest priorities?
- Have we excluded any projects or activities from the proposed transport programme that should be included?

**Have we correctly identified the challenges facing Auckland?**

In the board’s view the range of challenges have been correctly identified. Depending on where in Auckland a commentator lives the weighting to each aspect may be different, but overall Auckland Transport is to be congratulated on its assessment of the transport challenges facing our communities.
**Have we allocated available funding to the highest priorities?**

The proposed direction aligns well with the local priorities and preferences of the Upper Harbour community, as identified in the Upper Harbour Local Board Plan as set out below:

- Efficient and effective transport links
  - Improve roads and connections in and around Upper Harbour
  - An affordable frequent and reliable public transport network that encourages higher user uptake
  - A quality walking and cycling network within our neighbourhoods

**Identified projects**

The board welcomes the many projects relevant to the Upper Harbour, area identified in Appendix 1 Table 1A – Auckland Transport Proposed Funded Capital Programme, Appendix 1 Table 1B – Auckland Transport Capital Programme – additional items currently unfunded, and Appendix 2 New Zealand Transport Agency Investment Programme.

Should additional funding become available, in terms of the projects listed in Appendix 1 Table 1B, the board views the following as priorities for its community:

- Northern busway enhancements
- West Harbour ferry terminal
- Enhanced park and ride programme
- Westgate to Greenhithe RTN stations
- Albany Heights intersection improvements
- Albany Highway (Sunset to SH18) corridor improvements
- Investigation and route protection for future priorities (Henderson to Albany / Constellation ...)
- NZTA SH16/SH18 connection and Squadron Drive improvements

**Disaggregation of regional budgets**

The board notes that many of the budgets identified in the RLTP are regional budgets from which local projects will be identified and funded. The board would like clarification as to when the regional budgets will be disaggregated to the local level, and what involvement local boards will have in the identification and prioritisation of local projects. The board would like early engagement from Auckland Transport in this identification and prioritisation process.

---

Renewals re-prioritisation

The board appreciates the rationale for prioritising renewals funding to regional and arterial roads. The board is however, concerned that service levels on local roads will deteriorate, and that this will lead to community complaints. The board would like assurance from Auckland Transport that reductions in service levels will not lead to a substantial deterioration in local road condition rating.

Shorter journeys

The board notes the statement in the RLTP that “Nearly half of peak time trips are less than six kilometres…”. The February draft of the RLTP contained the statement “Across the region the majority of journeys between 8am and 9am are education related, with an average journey length of less than 2km. Encouraging people to walk or cycle for these journeys frees up capacity in the transport network for journeys that need to be made by vehicle.”

These shorter trips are capable of being undertaken by active transport (walking and cycling) as well as public transport, and the board believes that greater investment and priority should be given to encouraging mode switching, to reduce single occupancy vehicle use.

The focus should be on access to schools, metropolitan and urban centres, and public transport FTN and RTN routes and interchanges. In the board’s view this will deliver a substantial return on investment in reducing congestion to help public transport to maintain its schedules, create space for freight and for those who need to use private vehicles. It will also deliver health and environmental benefits through increased physical activity for those using active transport and reduced emissions from vehicles.

Public transport improvements

The board supports the prioritisation of public transport. There are a number of areas where the board has specific comments:

- **Passengers accessing the Northern busway park and ride stations.** - The Northern busway has been a great success, and has shown that if public transport is good enough many Aucklanders will use it in preference to using private vehicles to access the central business district. The current park and ride stations are not big enough, and this has created a situation where there is substantial overflow parking on adjacent streets and reserves. The new northern network will deliver better feeder services to the busway. This should reduce pressure on the park and rides. Due to the Upper Harbour area’s location on/near the periphery of the metropolitan area, there will always be a proportion of Northern busway users who live in areas not
serviced by public transport, and the feeder bus network will help free up space for these individuals. To encourage the use of the new feeder buses, the board requests Auckland Transport to review the new northern bus network after six to 12 months, so that the network can be fine-tuned and feeder bus services improved.

- **Hobsonville Point and Hobsonville Marina ferry Services.** – The board welcomes Auckland Transport’s view that “Ferries have the potential to play a significantly increased role during the next decade, to assist with addressing Auckland’s growth and improving the resilience of the transport system.” The board shares that view, and believes that much greater utilisation of the ferry facilities at Hobsonville Point and Hobsonville Marina is desirable. In the board’s view this means more frequent services (including all day, weekend and evening). These services should be ‘clock faced’ timetabled, and vessels used on these services should be big enough to cater for demand. These services, in turn need to be supported by integrated bus services that serve the ferry catchments, and which align with the ferry timetable to allow passengers to seamlessly transfer from bus to ferry and vice versa.

- **State Highway 18 rapid transit services.** – The board welcomes the proposed investment in RTN stations at Greenhithe and Hobsonville (even though these projects are currently unfunded). Missing from the RLTP, however, is a clear commitment to progress a rapid transit route along the State Highway 18 corridor. Given the projected growth in Whenapai, Hobsonville, and the Albany basin’s role as a sub-regional employment centre, the board suggests that plans for a rapid transit route be progressed with a view to starting construction during the next decade’s RLTP.

**Outcome measures**

It is a truism that what’s measured becomes important. It is also true that the incorrect selection of performance measures can lead to less than optimum outcomes, due to the failure to provide the best information to decision-makers. In the board’s view the following outcome measures should be re-considered:

- **Cycling.** – The network of cycling counter sites should be comprehensive enough to provide an accurate picture of the uptake of cycling across the region. Focusing on the strategic routes developed out of the urban cycleways programme, will not deliver investment to support cycling for the shorter journeys around schools, urban centres and RTN and FTN routes across the region.

- **Public transport.** – Total public transport boardings and regional public transport mode share are important metrics for the public transport system. As important is the percentage of residents living within a short walk of a RTN or FTN stop. Unless this percentage steadily moves higher there will always
be a fundamental reason (access) why many individuals chose not to use public transport.

- **Commuting active and sustainable mode share.** – The RLTP contains no definition of what a commute programme is. The board suggests that the number / geographical range of commute programmes across the region is also important, and should be measured if system wide increases in the active and sustainable mode share is to be achieved.

- **School active and sustainable mode share.** – The take up of active and sustainable modes at Travelwise schools is an important metric. Equally important is the proportion of schools qualifying as Travelwise schools. Unless this proportion continually increases, the number of pupils travelling in their care givers vehicles to and from school will remain too high.

*Have we excluded any projects or activities from the proposed transport programme that should be included?*

In the board’s view there are three Upper Harbour projects missing from the proposed RLTP. These are:

- **Rosedale busway station.** - The board welcomes the provision of the new Rosedale busway station as part of the Northern Corridor Improvement project. This busway station will not have its own dedicated park and ride. The board hopes that most passengers will access the Rosedale station by local feeder buses or walking and cycling. In the board’s view the new busway station needs to be supported by bus priority measures on the local roads e.g. Rosedale Road that provide access to the busway. Some widening of the carriage way may also be needed. The board is disappointed that this issue isn’t an identified project in the RLTP.

- **Whenuapai greenfields public transport.** – As noted previously, there is substantial population growth projected in the Whenuapai area. In the board’s view it is important that residents moving into the area develop the public transport habit. They will not do this, if there are no (or limited) services available. The board understands that Auckland Transport is trialling demand responsive transport (DRT) in the Devonport peninsula. The board suggests that DRT be provided in greenfields growth areas, until population densities are sufficient to justify regular bus schedules. This approach would give new residents the chance to develop the public transport habit.

- **Whenuapai area road network.** – Historically most of the road network in the Whenuapai area was of a standard appropriate for its largely rural character. There have been a number of localised improvements made over the years, however most of the network remains at the original design and engineering standard. As noted previously Whenuapai is facing substantial greenfields growth. The area also provides a popular recreational cycle network. The
safety of the roads is of increasing concern to the local community and the board shares this concern. The board believes that implementing more systematic upgrades to the roading system in Whenuapai should be part of the RLTP.

Conclusion

The board believes that the draft RLTP correctly identifies the challenges facing Auckland. The board welcomes the funded projects identified for the Upper Harbour area. In the board’s view there are a number of areas where further thought and consideration is needed, before the final RLTP is adopted. The board believes that its suggestions provide a local lens through which Auckland Transport can consider the issues important to our community.
Upper Harbour Local Board – Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill

Thank you for the opportunity for the Upper Harbour Local Board (the board) to provide comment on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill (the Bill) which amends the Local Government Act 2002 (the principal Act).

The board wishes to make the following comments on the content of the Bill.

Part 1 Reinstatement of 4 aspects of community well-being

Local government works in a constrained funding environment. There are always more projects being requested by the community than there are funds available to provide for them. In areas of growth, such as Auckland, the cost of creating new infrastructure has pushed council’s ability to fund to its limits, and it is near to the caps in its financial management policies. Conversely areas of declining population, face the problem of maintaining services with a shrinking revenue base.

If councils cannot meet their core requirements, then issues such as the 2016 Havelock North water quality failure become more likely.

The board believes that it is unwise to re-introduce the requirement “for local authorities to play a broad role in promoting the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of their communities” and repeal the requirement for “local authorities to play a broad role in meeting the current and future needs of their communities for good-quality infrastructure, local public services and performance of regulatory functions”.

The amendments to the principal Act’s sections 3, 10, 11, 14, 101 and the repeal of section 11A will create an environment which will allow local government licence to undertake a far wider range of activities than it currently can. These amendments will dilute the focus on the provision of core services and risks creating an environment where pet projects and pork barrel politics lead to poor decisions and substantial liabilities being incurred.

In the board’s view it would be imprudent to repeal the requirement expressed in section 10(1)(b) for local government to perform its functions “…in a way that is most cost-effective for households and businesses”. The board recommends that this part of section 10(1)(b) not be repealed.

In announcing a Productivity Commission inquiry into local government funding the Minister of Local Government said “Local government is facing a number of funding challenges which if not met will have consequences for our local communities and our country as a whole.” This inquiry acknowledges the financial management challenges faced by all local authorities. The board believes it would be preferable
to defer enactment of Part 1 of the Bill until the Productivity Commission’s inquiry is complete. Once the inquiry is complete it will provide a much more robust evidence base within which to consider the amendments, set out in part one of the Bill, to the principal Act.

Part 2 Other Amendments

The board welcomes and supports the amendments proposed to sections 197, 198A and 200 of the principal Act. The proposed changes recognise the reality that new development requires appropriate council infrastructure and community facilities. In the board’s view it is appropriate that the ‘developer’ generating this demand contributes to meeting the capital costs that council must incur to support this increased demand.