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Terms of Reference

Responsibilities

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

- Relevant regional strategy and policy
- Infrastructure strategy and policy
- Unitary Plan
- Spatial plans
- Plan changes to operative plans
- Housing policy and projects
- Special Housing Areas
- City centre development
- Tamaki regeneration
- Built heritage
- Urban design
- Environmental matters relating to the committee’s responsibilities
- Acquisition of property relating to the committee’s responsibilities and within approved annual budgets
- Activities of the following Council Controlled Organisations:
  - Panuku Development Auckland
  - Auckland Transport
  - Watercare Services Limited
  - Regional Facilities Auckland (stadio)

Powers

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

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

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

Members of the public

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

Those who are not members of the public

General principles

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

Members of the meeting

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

Independent Māori Statutory Board

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

Staff

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

Local Board members

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

Council Controlled Organisations

- Representatives of a Council Controlled Organisation can remain only if required to for discussion of a matter relevant to the Council Controlled Organisation.
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1 Apologies

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

2 Declaration of Interest

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

3 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Planning Committee:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 2 April 2019, including the confidential section, as a true and correct record.

4 Petitions

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

5 Public Input

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

5.1 Public Input - PricewaterhouseCoopers - findings of Urban Competitiveness Project

Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report

1. Geoff Cooper, Chief Economist PricewaterhouseCoopers will speak to the committee about the findings of the Urban Competitiveness Project report. The report tracks the economic competitiveness changes of 6 New Zealand Cities and 4 Australian cities over the last decade and highlights some of the challenges that Auckland and NZ’s second tier growth cities face in an increasingly urbanised global economy.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s

That the Planning Committee:

a) receive the public input from the Chief Economist PricewaterhouseCoopers about the findings of the Urban Competitiveness Project report.
5.2 Public Input - Tree Council - Paturoa Road Kauri tree protection

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Dr Mels Barton will speak to the committee on behalf of the Tree Council about protecting kauri trees on Paturoa Road, Titirangi.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) receive the public input from the Tree Council about protecting kauri trees on Paturoa Road, Titirangi and thank them for attending.

Attachments
A Tree Council, presentation .......................................................... 229
B 30 April Tree Council letter to the Mayor of Auckland regarding a plan change to protect Auckland trees ......................................................... 247
C Statement from Te Kawerau a Maki in support of a permanent enforcement order ................................................................. 253

5.3 Public Input - Save Our Kauri Trust - Paturoa Road Kauri tree protection

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Steve Abel will speak to the committee on behalf of Save Our Kauri Trust about protecting kauri trees on Paturoa Road, Titirangi.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) receive the public input from Save Our Kauri Trust about protecting kauri trees on Paturoa Road, Titirangi and thank them for attending.

5.4 Public Input - Te Taou/Ngāti Whaatua - Paturoa Road Kauri

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Chris Pairama will speak to the committee on behalf of Te Taou/Ngāti Whaatua about the Paturoa Road kauri and its importance to mana whenua.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) receive the public input from Chris Pairama on behalf of Te Taou/Ngāti Whaatua about the Paturoa Road kauri and its importance to mana whenua and thank them for attending.
6  Local Board Input

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

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

6.1  Local Board Input - Albert Eden Local Board - delays to suburban trains at level crossings and stations

*Te take mō te pūrongo*

*Purpose of the report*

1. Graeme Easte, Albert-Eden Local Board Member, will speak to the committee about prolonged delays to suburban trains at level crossings and stations.

2. A summary paper is provided as Attachment A and Member Easte’s Notice of Motion for the Albert-Eden Local Board meeting on 1 May is included as Attachment B.

*Ngā tūtohunga*

*Recommendation/s*

That the Planning Committee:

a) receive the Albert-Eden Local Board input regarding delays to suburban trains at level crossings and stations and thank Member Graeme Easte for attending.

*Attachments*

A  Summary document, Unnecessary Delays on the Auckland Suburban Train Network .................................................................................................................................. 257

B  Graeme Easte Notice of Motion for 1 May Albert-Eden Local Board meeting.................................................................................................................. 261

6.2  Local Board Input - Rodney Local Board - Warkworth Structure Plan

*Te take mō te pūrongo*

*Purpose of the report*

1. Beth Houlbrooke, Chair Rodney Local Board, will speak to the committee about the Warkworth Structure Plan.

*Ngā tūtohunga*

*Recommendation/s*

That the Planning Committee:

a) receive the Rodney Local Board input regarding the Warkworth Structure Plan and thank Chair Beth Houlbrooke for attending.
6.3 Local Board Input - Franklin Local Board - Unlock Pukekohe High Level Project Plan

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. Andrew Baker, Deputy Chair Franklin Local Board, will speak to the committee about the Unlock Pukekohe High Level Project Plan.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) receive the Franklin Local Board input regarding the Unlock Pukekohe High Level Project Plan and thank Deputy Chair Andrew Baker for attending.

7 Extraordinary Business

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and

(ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but

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

Purpose of the report

1. To outline the content and seek Planning Committee approval of the High Level Project Plan for Pukekohe Town Centre and its surrounds known as Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary

2. The Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe High Level Project Plan (HLPP) will catalyse and reinvigorate wider private development potential in Pukekohe and its surrounding area. The HLPP takes a cross-council, centre wide view of property opportunities to potentially facilitate and enable a high quality, jobs focused development strategy.

3. In working with the Franklin Local Board, Auckland Council whānau, local mana whenua and Auckland Transport, Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe has an emerging draft vision of:

   “Pukekohe is growing up, with city smarts while celebrating our country hearts”

   Pukekohe will be a vibrant and dynamic satellite town offering a range of employment and residential opportunities, with excellent transport connections, infrastructure, open space and recreation facilities, and a thriving local economy.

   (Pukekohe Area Plan Vision)

4. This vision focuses on the town centre and its immediate surrounds in Pukekohe where Panuku will focus its efforts. Pukekohe is an already bustling centre that services a large catchment which extends into southern Tāmaki Makaurau and northern Waikato. This wider area is experiencing unprecedented growth.

5. The Planning Committee received a presentation on Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe programme on 9 May 2019. The presentation received positive feedback from the councillors in attendance.

6. Pukekohe was chosen as an Unlock location because there are many strategic landholdings controlled by council that can be leveraged to enable growth and achieve the vision. There is also the potential to benefit from growth in the wider area, market attractiveness, favourable Unitary Plan zoning and good infrastructure along with strong community support for change.

7. Through discussions and collaboration with our partners and key stakeholders, themes have emerged for the future direction of Pukekohe. Through this engagement process, we identified that the community are wanting to see Pukekohe thrive as a competitive, safe and attractive, accessible, energetic and self-sufficient town centre, for future generations to enjoy. Maintaining a strong and proud identity of Pukekohe’s culturally rich and diverse community also emerged as a strong theme.

8. Key themes from mana whenua engagement included: Whenua (acknowledging the whenua as a mode of education, common ground and creating independence and acknowledging the unique relationship iwi have with the whenua), Economy (reinvesting in Pukekohe so that whānau can spend more time here), Culture (celebrating identity and history and enabling culture sharing in spaces as a way of establishing strong communities) and Mokopuna (meeting the needs of our mokopuna to grow and thrive in Pukekohe).
9. Within the HLPP area there is a good concentration of Auckland Council, Auckland Transport and Crown-owned land. Panuku will work together with our partners and community to lead the urban regeneration of Pukekohe and undertake property redevelopment, public realm projects and placemaking to achieve the vision and outcomes.

10. The property portfolio for Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe comprises 27 properties that are made up by eight surface car parks, a range of small open spaces, three commercial properties (with tenants) and the Auckland Council offices at 82 Manukau Road. Combined, they represent approximately 5.5ha of land valued at approximately $27 million (based on 2017 capital valuations) excluding the Auckland Council offices at 82 Manukau Road.

11. The ability for Panuku to develop this portfolio is reliant on support from Auckland Transport and the community for change to parking services and this includes some behavioural change.

12. These properties are geographically spread throughout the town centre and wider suburban area. However, there are several large sites that are strategically located within the town centre with significant opportunity for redevelopment for integrated mixed use and employment outcomes. These are contained within three connected precincts which is where we will focus our efforts called; The Edinburgh Street Superblock, The Eastern Gateway and The Station Precinct.

13. Within the HLPP project area we have developed principles that are focused around precinct development, public realm investment, partnerships and placemaking. These principles will guide the programme to achieve four outcomes below:

- **Outcome 1 – A competitive town centre is achieved** by leveraging our property portfolio to initiate regeneration, attracting new visitors, residents and quality employment opportunities. This will help meet the needs of a growing population and increased competition that will arise through the development of new centres in the surrounding growth areas.

- **Outcome 2 - A safe, walkable and vibrant town centre** is achieved through prioritising people in streetscape, intersection and redevelopment projects. This will then encourage new investment and housing choices within the town centre.

- **Outcome 3 - Better access to employment, education and healthcare opportunities** by leveraging strategic sites within the portfolio to attract these critical services and quality job opportunities.

- **Outcome 4 - The culture and diversity of Pukekohe’s communities will be celebrated** by reflecting the place and its people with an emphasis on recognising the Maori, Chinese, Indian and European communities.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendaions/s

That the Planning Committee:

a) approve the Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe High Level Project Plan.

b) approve Panuku Development Auckland as Auckland Council’s lead urban regeneration and delivery agency for Pukekohe within the Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe boundary.

c) recommend to the Finance and Performance Committees the disposal of the following properties, subject to the conclusion of any required statutory processes, to enable delivery of the Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe High Level Project Plan objectives:

**Panuku managed properties on behalf of Auckland Council:**

i) 27 Tobin Street, Pukekohe being Lot 1 DP 134911, held in NA79C/588;
ii) The land adjacent to 35 Tobin Street, Pukekohe being Lot 17 DP 117297 held in NA 66C/942;

iii) 172 Manukau Road, Pukekohe being Section 2 SO 440667 held in RT 599298;

iv) 174 Manukau Road, Pukekohe being Section 8 SO 440667 held in RT 599299;

v) 176 Manukau Road, Pukekohe being Section 6 and 9 SO 440667 held in RT 599300;

vi) 180 Manukau Road, Pukekohe being Section 4 SO 440667 held in 599301;

vii) 182 Manukau Road, Pukekohe being Section 11 SO 440667 held in 599297;

Auckland Transport managed properties on behalf of Auckland Council:

subject to agreement with Auckland Transport on the transport and parking outcomes for the town centre for the properties listed viii)- xvi)

viii) 1 Roulston Street, Pukekohe being Lot 2 DP 70196 held in NA25D/1435;

ix) 3 Roulston Street, Pukekohe being Lot 18 DP 7997 held in NA199/173;

x) 29 and 29a Edinburgh Street, Pukekohe being Lot 3 DP 78584 held in NA 91D/796 and Lot 12 DP 7997 held in NA380/104;

xi) 4 Tobin Street, Pukekohe being lot 3,4 and 5 DP 136696 Pts Lot 12 DP 4216 held In NA80/405, NA80C/406, NA80C/407, NA191/285 and NA 188/159;

xii) 9 Tobin Street, Pukekohe being Lot 1-9 DP 54202, Pt Lot 1 DP 4688 and Pt Lot 24 DP 4216 held in NA8B/881, Lot 1 DP 89841 held in NA46D/1063 and Lot 3 DP 92280 held in NA48D/877;

xiii) 7 Massey Avenue, Pukekohe being Lot 1 DP 80851 held in NA37C/583, Pt Lot 2 DP 32793 held in NA51D/1059, Lot 1 DP 51778 held in NA48C/248 and Pt Lot 2 DP 6976 (also known as Pt Allotment 30 Suburban Section 2 Pukekohe Parish) held in NA1077/34;


xv) 9 Hall Street, Pukekohe being Section 1 SO 489697 held in RT 717226;

xvi) 2 Golding Road, Pukekohe being Section 2 SO 476438 held in 682560;

Auckland Council managed properties:

Subject to completion of the reserve revocation process for properties listed xxi) to xxii).

xvii) the land adjacent to 603 Buckland Road, Pukekohe being Lot 1 DP 55095 held in NA7B/54;

xviii) 42 Seddon Street, Pukekohe being Lot 3 DP 133175 held in NA76D/465;

xix) 22 Edinburgh Street, Pukekohe being Lot 2 DP 154963 held in NA92C/446;

xx) The land adjacent to 176 Princess St West, Pukekohe being Section 1 SO 430835 held in RT 556921;

xxi) The land adjacent to 995 Paerata Road, Pukekohe being Lot 6 DP 16500 held in NA425/287 (cancelled);

xxii) 67 East Street, Pukekohe being Lot 2 DP 88435 held in NA592/145 (cancelled).
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note that Panuku will also dispose of the following properties previously approved for
disposal, to enable delivery of the Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe High Level Project
Plan objectives:

Item 8

d)

i)

82 Manukau Road, Pukekohe being Lot 1 DP 99706 held in NA54B/1241;

ii)

17 Massey Avenue, Pukekohe being Lot 3 DP 49318 held in NA1984/70;

iii)

21 Massey Avenue, Pukekohe being Pt Lot 3 DP 30052 held in NA91D/796;

iv)

33 Edinburgh Street, Pukekohe being Lot 2 DP 48584 held in NA34C/957;

v)

The land adjacent to 1173 Paerata Road, Pukekohe being Parts Allotment 79
Parish of Karaka held in NA767/242 and NA 38A/69.

e)

note that as part of this project, together with the council’s Service Strategy and
Integration team and the Franklin Local Board, Panuku Development Auckland will
consider other council owned properties that are currently providing a service to the
community. Panuku Development Auckland will seek further approval from the
Franklin Local Board if it recommends the optimisation of any of these properties.

f)

note that Panuku Development Auckland’s existing engagement strategy to give
early notification to Mana Whenua of intent to divest council property will be
implemented in this area.

Horopaki
Context
14.

Pukekohe was identified as an Unlock location as it: is market attractive; has good transport
infrastructure from which to leverage; a significant amount of council land with development
potential; strong community support for change; good zoning and the potential ability to
partner successfully with others, including mana whenua, the local board and the Crown.

15.

The specific Pukekohe attributes are outlined in the following table:

Strategic
landholdings

Auckland Council controls a range of properties in the Pukekohe area,
approximately 27 of which we consider having some potential for
development within the area of the High Level Project Plan. These
properties can play a strategic role in sparking private sector investment
and redevelopment, and financially supporting broader development within
Pukekohe.

Growth potential

Pukekohe town centre is strategically located within a wider 1,300ha of
future urban zoned land which will generate substantial residential and
commercial growth which the town centre is well placed to service. The
town itself is also well located to benefit from wider growth with
connections to Northern Waikato and links to the Bay of Plenty.

Market
attractiveness

The Pukekohe property market has a good demand for mixed use
residential, industrial, and retirement properties, while retail and office
space are growing alongside population growth.

Strong community
support for change

The Pukekohe community is a proud one, with a rich heritage and a
culturally diverse population. Feedback from the community to previous
plans such as the Unitary Plan, Pukekohe Area Plan and local board plans
support investment to improve the town centre and its transport
connections.

Population ready

Pukekohe has a large resident working-age population. There is scope to
develop increased and diverse employment opportunities in the town, with
employers having access to a ready pool of local workers and residents
enjoying a greater range of job options.

Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe High Level Project Plan
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| Favourable zoning and infrastructure ready | The Town Centre zoning allows for a wide range of activities and enables buildings of between 4 – 6 storeys. The town centre area is also well serviced for stormwater, water supply, waste, transport options and good community facilities. |

16. Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe focuses on the town centre, an already bustling centre that services a large catchment which extends into southern Tāmaki Makaurau and northern Waikato. This wider area is experiencing unprecedented growth.

17. Pukekohe’s population of 23,600 people (2013 Census) is forecast to grow to over 50,000 people by 2040. The community is also an aging one, which the town centre will need to respond to and accommodate into the future. A high proportion of current residents travel outside of Pukekohe for employment, healthcare services and learning. This is only likely to increase as the area grows.

18. Given the wider growth in southern Tāmaki Makaurau and northern Waikato in areas such as Drury, Paerata, Te Kauwhata, Pokeno, Opaheke and Hingaia it is important that the town centre retains its identity which is shaped by its rural setting, multi-cultural communities, historic character and strong local business network.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

19. The HLPP has been developed in partnership with the Franklin Local Board, Auckland Council whānau, some mana whenua and Auckland Transport, with support from Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development.

20. Through korero with our partners and key stakeholders we saw strong themes emerging that had synergy across the varied backgrounds and world views. In short people want to see Pukekohe thrive as a competitive, safe and attractive, accessible, energetic and self-sufficient town centre, for future generations and our mokopuna to enjoy. Whilst we have an eye on the future it also came across strongly that the future of Pukekohe needs to be anchored in the strong and proud identity of its culturally rich and diverse community.

21. The HLPP sets out a draft vision for Pukekohe;

   **Pukekohe Area Plan Vision**

   “Pukekohe is growing up, with city smarts while celebrating our country hearts.”

   Pukekohe will be a vibrant and dynamic satellite town offering a range of employment and residential opportunities, with excellent transport connections, infrastructure, open space and recreation facilities, and a thriving local economy.

   A refined vision will be progressed with the aspirations, narrative and guidance of mana whenua.

22. Panuku will use the tools we have from Council to progress towards this vision using our strengths in property development, public realm investment associated with council properties, a focus on partnering with others, and placemaking with the community.

23. Applying these strengths the HLPP has identified several principles that will guide the Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe programme;
24. The HLPP scope will enable four outcomes to be achieved:

- **Outcome 1** - A competitive town centre is achieved by leveraging our property portfolio to initiate regeneration, attracting new visitors, residents and quality employment opportunities. This will help protect it from increased competition that will arise through the development of new centres in the surrounding growth areas.

- **Outcome 2** - A safe, walkable and vibrant town centre is achieved through prioritising people in streetscape, intersection and redevelopment projects. This will then encourage new investment and housing choices within the town centre.

- **Outcome 3** - Better access to employment, education and healthcare opportunities by leveraging strategic sites within the portfolio to attract these critical services and quality job opportunities.

- **Outcome 4** - The culture and diversity of Pukekohe’s communities will be celebrated by reflecting the place and its people with an emphasis on recognising the Maori, Chinese, Indian and European communities.

25. We will achieve these outcomes by adopting the following high-level development strategy:

- focus on the most valuable properties within the portfolio that are located within the town centre
- collaborate with Auckland Transport to navigate the necessary process to achieve regeneration of the three development precincts
- prioritise effort on three redevelopment precincts of the Edinburgh Street Superblock, the Eastern Gateway and the Station Precinct, as they have the greatest influence on achieving the outcomes
- prioritise attracting quality employment creation, education providers and healthcare services
- catalyse new housing choices in the town centre integrated with non-residential uses
- leverage the remainder of the portfolio outside of the town centre for housing and optimal financial return
- align timing and priority of adjacent public realm projects with the development site sales.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

26. The project principles and goals proposed as part of the Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe HLPP are aligned with the overarching themes in the Auckland Unitary Plan – Operative in Part 2016 and Auckland Plan 2050.

27. Currently Auckland Council’s Plans and Places team are focusing on the new growth areas that are outside the town centre through the Pukekohe-Paerata Draft Structure Plan 2019. The HLPP is focused on the town centre that is outside these areas but has been developed to respond to this growth.

28. Ongoing consultation with the council whānau has been undertaken to ensure the principles, goals, proposed initiatives and management of landholdings are consistent with the views shared across the Council whānau.

29. The Auckland Council Corporate Property team are working with Panuku on the wider Corporate Property Office Strategy. This includes the sale of the council offices site at 82 Manukau Road. The Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe HLPP sets the wider planning context for the divestment of this site.

30. This is a key site in the Station Precinct redevelopment key move. The goal is to partner with a developer on this site to seek a transformational outcome, leveraging the recent investment in the train station. The future of the site aspires to offer an anchor destination with a range of activities that attracts pedestrians and shoppers down the mainstreet and towards the Station. The future use should also prioritise an activity that provides quality jobs, potentially supporting one of the key needs in the area being education and/or healthcare services outcomes.

31. Auckland Transport (AT) including the Southern Growth Alliance (SGA) has been engaged throughout the formation of the HLPP to understand the future of parking and transport outcomes for the wider town centre in relation to the potential redevelopment and regeneration programme. This has included exploring opportunities for potential redevelopment of eight carparks, five industrial sites as well as one rural property all held previously for roading projects.

32. Looking forward as Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe moves into implementation, Panuku acknowledges that AT needs to assess and approve the release of carparks. We will also work with AT on all matters related to the road corridor. We will work together to achieve the optimal transport outcomes that support the committee approved HLPP and vision.

33. Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED) has been engaged on opportunities focused primarily on how the properties and public realm reinvestment programme identified can support increased access and availability of quality local jobs and learning.

34. Auckland Council Parks, Community Services and Healthy Waters have been engaged regarding six open spaces and any opportunities on Community Facilities sites for optimisation. We will work with them potential projects and outcomes that support the vision.

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

35. Partnering with the Franklin Local Board has been an integral part to the development of the HLPP. The principles and goals proposed as part of Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe HLPP reflect those within the Franklin Local Board Plan 2017 and Pukekohe Area Plan 2014.

36. Regular workshops and interactions helped to ensure that the processes we took to develop the Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe HLPP are consistent with the views of the Franklin Local Board. This has been reflected in their support the outcomes and content of the HLPP.
37. Through our engagement process, we identified that the community is seeking:

- Better connections between the train station, the town centre, schools, retirement villages and the places that families visit for recreation
- More art initiatives, such as the performing arts, and fine art facilities
- Strengthened working relationships and partnerships between Panuku, Māori and other community groups
- Protection of the fertile volcanic soils located in a unique frost free micro climate close to consumer markets, so that Pukekohe can continue to produce and process high-value produce for New Zealand and the world
- Job creation, tertiary education and employment opportunities, so that locals can grow the economy.
- A variety of parking options, so that local businesses are not negatively affected and people can still easily access the town centre.

38. The HLPP has taken these views into account wherever possible, noting that some aspects either relate to land outside the town centre, or matters that our outside the mandate of Panuku. We expect that implementing the HLPP will have a positive impact on the local community.

39. The Franklin Local Board endorsed the HLPP on 16 April. Positive feedback from the Planning Committee workshop on 9 May was also received from councillors in attendance.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

40. We anticipate that mana whenua will play an integrated cultural, social and economic part in the unlocking of Pukekohe. Exploring a genuine partnership and tikanga based approach with local mana whenua will help define the overall approach and narrative of the project.

41. We are seeking to authentically hear the Māori voice and support the development of outcomes defined in their own terms. We are in the early stage of co-design a partnership framework with mana whenua in part by using a wānanga engagement methodology – a culturally appropriate and effective way of engagement that uses Māori cultural concepts and protocols to seek constructive input into solution design. Wānanga frames issues / problems in the context of participants’ own experiences. We understand that doing things properly may take more time up front, however it will provide more surety and lead to better outcomes.

42. Early engagement has highlighted the importance of mana whenua being able to practise kaitiakitanga roles and responsibilities towards sustainable management of land and water where possible across this project. Additionally, the importance of upholding the cultural values of the place and its narrative and designing for people has emerged through early korero.

43. Opportunities for mana whenua may extend to joint ventures, land purchase and development, as well as material involvement in capital project design and overall master planning.

44. The partnership strategy will also expressly look at how Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe will stand to benefit mataawaka and urban Māori; the broader Māori population.

45. Panuku will work in partnership with mana whenua towards high quality outcomes through planning and implementation of Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe which will see the enhancement of mauri (the life essence of place and people) and opportunities to strengthen their role in the programme.

46. Panuku has also undertaken preliminary engagement with the Independent Māori Statutory Board to identify opportunities to support this programme.
Financial implications

47. Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe will require funding for capital projects and adequate resourcing to progress the programme. The Transform and Unlock programme, approved by Auckland Council, is funded in the Long-Term Plan 2018-2028 by the reinvestment of the proceeds of property sales across the wider Panuku portfolio.

48. Panuku will seek to partner with others, combining funding and resourcing with a number of other council organisations, and community groups to get the best value out of the programmes funding envelope. Potential partners include Franklin Local Board, Auckland Council, Auckland Transport, Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development to explore any potential reprioritisation of existing budgets and integrate and align funding towards agreed project priorities. These funding strategies will be developed following the adoption of the HLPP.

Risks and mitigations

49. Looking ahead the main consideration to work through is in relation to the future of public parking in the town centre. In particular, the community expectation in regard to parking and whether the identified car park sites are approved for disposal by the Auckland Transport Board.

50. We will manage this dependency in partnership with our stakeholders, which may include the development of a parking and community communications strategy.

Next steps

51. After the Finance and Performance Committee, Panuku will progress a parking strategy with Auckland Transport and Franklin Local Board to determine the agreed approach to future parking provision. More detailed planning will begin for the key town centre sites and priority investment project. Interim placemaking will commence with planning for a potential trial relocation of the farmers market from one of the carparks into the town square. One of the first properties that will go to market is the Council offices site at 82 Manukau Road. This will be done under the Corporate Property programme which has already achieved approval to dispose of this site.

52. The key milestones that are planned prior to formally starting the programme from 1 July 2019 are set out in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Body</th>
<th>Target approval dates to meet SOI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Local Board and Council approval to scope Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe</td>
<td>October and November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mana whenua Governance Forum</td>
<td>1 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Franklin Local Board – endorsement of HLPP</td>
<td>16 April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Planning Committee – workshop on HLPP content</td>
<td>9 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Independent Māori Statutory Board – involvement</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Panuku Board – approves HLPP progressing to council</td>
<td>28 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Planning Committee – approves the HLPP</td>
<td>4 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Finance and Performance – approves the property disposals</td>
<td>18 June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KIA PUĀWAI A PUKEKOHE
UNLOCK PUKEKOHE-HIGH LEVEL PROJECT PLAN
MAY 2019

Pukekohe will be a vibrant and dynamic satellite town offering a range of employment and residential opportunities, with excellent transport connections, infrastructure, open space and recreation facilities, and a thriving local economy.
(Pukekohe Area Plan Vision)

"Pukekohe is growing up, with city smarts while celebrating our country hearts."

A refined vision will be developed with the guidance of mana whenua
CONTENTS

1. Introduction
   1.1 Mihi
   1.2 Panuku – who we are
   1.3 What we do - shaping spaces for Aucklanders to love
   1.4 Why Pukekohe?

2. Purpose of this plan
   2.1 Approach to this high level project plan
   2.2 Developing the Kia Puawai a Pukekohe story
   2.3 How we work with others

3. Vision

4. Context
   4.1 Background and location
   4.2 Working with mana whenua
   4.3 A diverse and growing community
   4.4 The Unlock project area

5. Principles

6. Goals
   6.1 Goal 1: Encourage new growth in the town centre
   6.2 Goal 2: Facilitate better access for all
   6.3 Goal 3: Attract new businesses and critical services
   6.4 Goal 4: Build local community identity

7. Key moves to achieve the vision and goals
   7.1 Three precinct redevelopment key moves
   7.2 Three public realm key moves
   7.3 Two placemaking key moves
   7.4 A range of partnering key moves

8. Project implementation
   8.1 Development strategy
   8.2 Key town centre and surrounding sites
   8.3 Funding

9. Pukekohe snapshot
   9.1 Planning
   9.2 Transport and connectivity
   9.3 Infrastructure capacity
   9.4 Market dynamics and housing demand

10. Community engagement and communication
    10.1 Place-led engagement
    10.2 Listening to the community
    10.3 Engagement with Māori
    10.4 Communications approach

11. Next steps
    11.1 Dependencies
    11.2 Timeframes
    11.3 Resourcing
    11.4 Monitoring

Appendix 1:
Property map of town centre sites (excluding sites outside of the programme boundary)

Appendix 2:
Property map of all sites and the full extent of the programme area investment boundary
1. INTRODUCTION

This high level project plan (HLPP) aims to help unlock the potential of Pukekohe’s town centre.

It has been developed by Panuku Development Auckland (Panuku) in partnership with the Franklin Local Board, Auckland Council whenau and mana whenua, and from previous feedback from the Pukekohe community on other plans.

‘Nā te kākano’, translated means ‘from the seed’ and symbolises doing things together. We seek inspiration from this phrase and have worked with our partners and key stakeholders from the outset to influence better outcomes for the people and place of Pukekohe.

It is important to note, though, that the kōrero to date is just the start for the regeneration of this unique place and that we will continue to work together to help bring the visions and aspirations for Pukekohe to life in the coming years.

The future of Pukekohe will be realised through the voice and efforts of many, in shaping the vision for Pukekohe’s future we have sought to identify and amplify those different voices and world views.

Through kōrero with our partners and key stakeholders we saw strong themes emerging across these varied backgrounds and world views. In short, people want to see Pukekohe thrive as a competitive, safe and attractive, accessible, energetic and self-sufficient town centre, for our mokopuna and future generations to enjoy. While people have an eye on the future it also came across strongly that Pukekohe’s future needs to be anchored in the strong and proud identity of its culturally rich and diverse community.

To realise these aspirations, we will continue to work with our partners, other agencies and the community, as we action the four primary tools that Panuku uses to effect change:

• precinct redevelopment
• public realm projects
• placemaking
• partnering

These tools, and how we intend to use them, are described further in this plan.

Within the Pukekohe town centre, there is a significant concentration of Auckland Council owned land. Together with our partners, we will champion integrated development on this land and investment in amenity and placemaking, to meet the needs of the community.

1.1 Mihi

NAU MAI TAKU IWI, PIKI MAI E TAKU RAHL.
NĀKU KOE I TIKI ATU I TE PAE-O-TE-RANGI.
KA TŌIA MAI, KA KŪMEA MAI KIA EKE
TANGAROA, EKE PANUKU.

Panuku, panuku, kia haumi e, kia hui e
kia ara mai he tāki ngāpara.
Ka whakairihia e te rangi hei hua tipua,
ka poua ā-whenua hei tupuranga hōu.

Mana e huaki te mana tangata
o hora ai aku mahi.
Kia hua ko te pai,
kia piki ko te ora,
he tohu kaitiaki o tuku tuakiri tuku iho.
Nōku te wāhi, nōku te tūmārere.
Ka tōhono a Rangi, ka tōhono ki a Papa,
taku taura here whanaungatanga;
he mea nō tua whakarere mai.
E kore e memeha; ū te ao, ū te pō,
mauri tau, mauri ora.

WELCOME ONE. WELCOME ALL.
YOU, FROM BEYOND THE HORIZON I HAVE TAKEN.
I DRAW YOU NIGH, I DRAW YOU HITHER
TO RAISE EXPECTATIONS AND TO FULFIL POTENTIAL.

Upward, onward until all is met and done and that
which rises will endure still.
From high it heralds divine aspirations, grounded
in visions of new beginnings.

It empowers in essence our very being
and pervades all that we have achieved.
Let good be rife
and may good health be assured,
as guardianship defines a legacy given.

As destiny beckons, peace is mine.
The sky itself seems to greet the earth, epitomising
all I hold and revere;
a token from that distant past.
It abides as day and night without fail,
with a gentle heart and a lively spirit.

1.2 Panuku – who we are

Panuku Development Auckland is the council-controlled organisation that delivers urban regeneration in Tāmaki Makaurau (Auckland). We’re here to radically improve your quality of living.

We manage close to $3 billion in land and buildings that Auckland Council owns. We continuously review this portfolio to find smart ways to generate income for the region, grow the portfolio or release land or properties that others can use better.

Our city is facing rapid growth. Quality development is required to accommodate this growth, and to ensure people love and can afford to live in Tāmaki Makaurau.

We’re building a city of strong neighbourhoods.

Panuku is a steward of land on behalf of the Auckland Council and the population of Tāmaki Makaurau. Tāmaki Makaurau’s mana whenua are the acknowledged kaitiaki (guardians) of the land. Panuku recognises that, through the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the importance of land to Māori, our relationship with the 19 mana whenua iwi and hapū is one of partnership.

About 800 people move to Tāmaki Makaurau each week and current projections suggest the population could reach two million by 2033 (Statistics New Zealand subnational population projection 2013) – an increase of more than 517,000 people within the next two decades.

We work in many locations across Tāmaki Makaurau to deliver urban regeneration. Urban regeneration involves planning of neighbourhoods and improving buildings to strengthen communities and the economy to make the city an even better place to live.
Panuku is an abbreviated form of the whakatauki, or proverbial saying, ‘Eke Panuku, Eke Tangaroa!’

This saying acknowledges unseen energies from the realm of the land and sea, which are often called upon through Māori oratory traditions to help invigorate, inspire and manifest success, excellence and progress within groups.

Our organisation, like a waka, not only requires strength to move forward, but skill to navigate, balance to ride smoothly and teamwork to propel.

It’s important we understand the diversity and aspirations of the communities we work in. We are proud to say that we let the people speak for the place and that the place speaks for itself.

1.3 What we do - shaping spaces for Aucklanders to love

Panuku Development Auckland’s structure is the first of its kind in New Zealand.

We work across multiple locations and scales – from large, long-term urban renewal projects, to small projects on specific sites. We operate in a commercial way but with good public outcomes. We make a profit and deliver returns to the council, but at the same time ensure that our developments and community outcomes are positive and sustainable.

Panuku has been established to provide leadership and unlock barriers to enable urban transformation. We have three different types of project categories to benefit Tāmaki Makaurau: Transform, Unlock, Support.

**TRANSFORM**

Creating change through urban renewal

We lead the transformation of select parts of our region; working alongside others and using our custodianship of land and planning expertise. For example,

Wynyard Quarter and Manukau.

**UNLOCK / KIA PUĀWAI**

Unlocking development potential for others

We are the facilitator; using our relationships to break down barriers and influence others, including our council whānau, to create development opportunities. For example,

Whangaparaoa.

**SUPPORT**

Making the most of what we’ve got

Intensification is a key driver in the Auckland Plan. We support housing demands by enabling development of council-owned land. For example,

New Lynn.
1.4 Why Pukekohe?

Pukekohe was chosen as an Unlock location because of its specific attributes.

- **Strategic landholdings**: Auckland Council controls a range of properties in the Pukekohe area, 27 of which we consider have some potential for development and are within the area covered by this HLPP. These properties can play a strategic role in sparking private sector investment and redevelopment, and financially supporting broader development within Pukekohe.

- **Growth potential**: Pukekohe town centre is strategically located within a wider 1,300 hectares of Future Urban zoned land. This land will generate substantial residential and commercial growth, which the town centre is well placed to service. The town itself is also well located to benefit from wider national growth, with connections to northern Waikato and links to the Bay of Plenty.

- **Market attractiveness**: The Pukekohe property market has good demand for mixed use residential, industrial and retirement properties, while demand for retail and office space is growing alongside population growth.

- **Strong community support for change**: The Pukekohe community is a proud one, with a rich heritage and a culturally diverse population. Feedback from the community on previous plans, such as the Auckland Unitary Plan, Pukekohe Area Plan and local board plans, supports investment to improve the town centre and its transport connections.

- **Population ready**: Pukekohe has a large resident working-age population. There is scope to develop increased and diverse employment opportunities in the town, with employers having access to a ready pool of local workers and residents enjoying a greater range of job options.

- **Favourable zoning and infrastructure ready**: Pukekohe's Town Centre zoning allows for a wide range of activities and enables buildings of between four and six storeys. The town centre area is also well serviced in terms of stormwater, water supply, waste and transport options, and enjoys good community facilities.

2. PURPOSE OF THIS PLAN

2.1 Approach to this high level project plan

This HLPP details the short, medium and long-term goals for the Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe programme.

The HLPP is the central strategic scoping document that mandates Panuku to initiate regeneration work within the area covered by the plan. It also enables Panuku to dispose of and develop sites, once they have been fully assessed, and to investigate potential public realm and placemaking projects.

The plan sets out a vision, goals and key moves for the Unlock Pukekohe project area.

**Vision**

The vision is the strategic rationale for all the decision-making in this HLPP. It describes what success looks like and informs how Pukekohe will develop if the vision is achieved in the future. It is critical that the vision for Pukekohe is referred to and aligned with all stages of this Unlock programme.
Goals

The goals will respond to Pukekohe’s existing challenges and opportunities. To get the best outcomes four distinct goals have been developed. This informs and guides the specific strategic direction for the key moves.

Key moves

This HLPP organises its key moves into four distinct categories. They are all areas where Panuku can make a strong contribution and influence what occurs.

The key moves are:
1. property redevelopment (of surplus council properties)
2. public realm investment
3. placemaking
4. partnership.

This plan also:

- outlines the context for the existing and proposed projects, including the strategic rationale for Kia Puawai/Unlock Pukekohe, the existing statutory and non-statutory plans that inform the proposals, known market opportunities, statutory issues and stakeholder requirements
- provides a summary of the existing and proposed projects, including the specific properties involved, and the anticipated timeframes and potential outcomes
- provides a summary of our approach to placemaking and engagement with the community
- provides a high-level description of our proposed funding strategy.
2.2 Developing the Kia Puawai a Pukekohe story

The future of Pukekohe will be realised through the voice and efforts of many, so in shaping the vision for Pukekohe’s future we have sought to identify and amplify these different voices and world views.

The content of this plan is also informed by previous community engagement and feedback gathered through the Auckland Unitary Plan and Pukekohe Area Plan, as well as the Pukekohe–Paorata Structure Plan process, which is currently underway. Workshops with the Franklin Local Board enabled previous ideas from community feedback to be shared and new initiatives to be proposed, which together have been used to develop the vision, goals and key moves for this plan.

Our engagement identified that the community is seeking:

- better connections between the train station, the town centre, schools, retirement villages and the places that families visit for recreation
- job creation, tertiary education and employment opportunities, so that locals can grow the local economy
- more art initiatives, such as the performing arts, and fine art facilities
- strengthened working relationships and partnerships between Panuku, Māori and other community groups
- Protection of the fertile volcanic soils located in a unique frost free micro climate close to consumer markets, so that Pukekohe can continue to grow and process high-value produce for New Zealand and the world
- a variety of parking options, so that local businesses are not negatively affected, and people can still easily access the town centre.

Engagement with local iwi:

Early kōrero with some mana whenua has revealed the desire to see their unique relationship with the whenua acknowledged as a means of unlocking potential for future generations and the prosperity of the place itself.
Several strong themes that resonate with mana whenua emerged in early hui. These include:

- **whenua**
  - acknowledging the whenua as a means of providing education, establishing common ground and creating independence
  - acknowledging the unique relationship iwi have with the whenua
- **the economy**
  - investing in Pukekohe, so that whānau can spend more time here through education, training, employment and business opportunities
- **culture**
  - celebrating identity and history
  - develop spaces that enable cultural sharing as a way of establishing strong communities
- **kaitiakitanga**
  - strengthening our ability to care for and provide stewardship for the environment, and to live off the land
- **mokopuna**
  - meeting the needs of our mokopuna to grow and thrive in Pukekohe.

### 2.3 How we work with others

Panuku will work closely with the following organisations and entities.

- **Auckland Transport** – We will collaborate with Auckland Transport. Auckland Transport is the road controlling authority responsible for the transport network, has a regulatory role as asset owner for all roads (excluding state highways) and is the transport specialist for Auckland Council. For example, the parking sites identified in this HLPP are currently under Auckland Transport’s control and management. The future transport needs of these sites have not yet been assessed by Auckland Transport. If sites (or part of a site) are deemed surplus to transport requirements, they will be transferred to Auckland Council before being redeveloped with approval of the Auckland Transport board. We will also work with Auckland Transport on investment projects.

- **Auckland Tourism, Events and Economic Development (ATEED)** – ATEED will support us in attracting local economic development opportunities. It will also support us in relation to any significant events, and with potential repositioning and value proposition work for the town centre.

- **Mana whenua** – We are authentically seeking to hear the Māori voice and support the development of outcomes defined in mana whenua’s terms. To this end we are currently co-designing a partnership framework (or equivalent) with mana whenua, in part by using a wānanga engagement methodology. This methodology is a culturally appropriate and effective way of engagement that uses Māori cultural concepts and protocols to seek constructive input into solution design.

- **Franklin Local Board** – We will partner with the Franklin Local Board, working together to align and prioritise projects and engage with key stakeholders and community groups. The board will support and collaborate with us on placemaking and events where appropriate.

- **Auckland Council departments** – Our whānau within Auckland Council will support, guide and navigate us across a range of matters, from regulatory and planning matters, to asset ownership and specialist support for stormwater, open space and community needs provision.

- **Pukekohe Business Association** – We would like to help empower the business association to achieve its own goals, and potentially with our support, to facilitate and enable new opportunities.
3. VISION

The vision for the Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe HLPP has been developed in partnership with the Franklin Local Board, and through iterative korero and hui with some mana whenua and our Auckland Council whānau, and with the strong support of Auckland Transport.

This vision will be refined with the aspirations, narrative and guidance of mana whenua.

At present, the vision is that:

Pukekohe will be a vibrant and dynamic satellite town offering a range of employment and residential opportunities, with excellent transport connections, infrastructure, open space and recreation facilities, and a thriving local economy.

“Pukekohe is growing up, with city smarts while celebrating our country hearts.”

The vision focuses on the Pukekohe town centre, an already bustling centre that services a large catchment extending into southern Tamaki Makaurau and northern Waikato. This area is experiencing unprecedented growth, and it is vital that the town centre continues to be enhanced, so that it can capitalise on the opportunities that growth provides.

Pukekohe’s population is forecast to grow to over 50,000 people by 2040. The community is also an aging one, and the town centre will need to respond to and accommodate these changes in the future, including through providing the facilities and services required for an aging population.

Given the forecast growth, it is important that the town centre retains its identity. This identity is shaped by the town’s rural setting, strong historical and cultural association of mana whenua, the subsequent multi-cultural communities, and the strong local business network.

At present, a high proportion of residents are forced to travel outside Pukekohe for employment, healthcare services and learning. This is only likely to increase as the area grows.

The HLPP will enable four outcomes to be achieved:

- **Outcome 1 — A competitive town centre.** This outcome will be achieved by leveraging our property portfolio to initiate regeneration, thereby attracting new visitors, residents and quality employment opportunities. This will position Pukekohe to serve the growing population and protect it from the increased competition that will flow from new centres in surrounding growth areas.

- **Outcome 2 — A safe, walkable and vibrant town centre.** This outcome will be achieved through prioritising people in streetscape, intersection and redevelopment projects.

- **Outcome 3 — Better access to employment, education and healthcare opportunities.** This outcome will be achieved by leveraging strategic sites within our property portfolio to attract critical services and quality job opportunities.

- **Outcome 4 — The diversity of Pukekohe’s communities will be celebrated.** This outcome will be achieved by reflecting the place and its people, with an emphasis on recognising the Māori, Chinese, Indian and European communities.
4. CONTEXT

4.1 Background and location

Pupekeohe is an established rural centre, in the heart of the Franklin district and on the southern edge of the Ōtāhuhu region. It sits between the southern shore of the Manukau Harbour and the mouth of the Waikato River, approximately 50 kilometres south of Ōtāhuhu’s city centre.

The local volcanic soil was ideally suited to raising crops, so Pupekeohe has an established reputation in Ōtāhuhu as an important market garden and horticultural hub, with potatoes and onions grown intensively amongst other key fresh produce.

Today Pupekeohe is the eighteenth most populated urban area in New Zealand with a population of 23,630 people (2013 Census, will be updated to 2018 figure, when available).

Pupekeohe serves a wide rural catchment that contains some of New Zealand’s best soils and prime agricultural land. Horticultural production and dairy farming are long-established activities in the area, and Pupekeohe’s economy remains firmly centred on farming-related activities. The unique combination of fertile soils, climate and proximity to market have entrenched this role. The area also continues to attract people seeking a rural lifestyle.

Pupekeohe is well connected with transport infrastructure. The town is located on the North Island Main Trunk rail line with the section between Papakura and Pupekeohe planned to be electrified within the next 10 years, as part of the Auckland Transport Alignment Project. When this happens, the travel time to other key destinations in the Ōtāhuhu region, including the Ōtāhuhu city centre, is expected to reduce. In addition, Pupekeohe is connected to the rest of the North Island via the road network, including State Highway 1 (via Pupekeohe East Road) and State Highway 22. The communities of Paerata, Tūkura and Pokere are all located nearby and are well connected by road to Pupekeohe.

A ring road circles the town centre. The ring road was designed to remove through traffic, particularly heavy vehicle traffic, from the town centre for amenity reasons. Heavy vehicle traffic is currently obliged to use this route, due to a limited number of crossings over the railway line. The ring road has served the town centre well and its function will continue. However, the ring road also acts as a boundary between the commercial and residential areas, and providing better integration and connectivity across the road will be further explored.

Pupekeohe town centre is surrounded by low-density residential dwellings and farming-related activities. Larger retail centres in Manukau Road have created competition with the town centre. However, residents enjoy the relaxed setting and easy access to community services and commercial amenities that the centre provides, such as supermarkets, services, boutique clothing stores, specialty shops and locally owned cafes and eateries.
4.2 Working with mana whenua

We are currently co-designing a partnership framework with mana whenua using a wānanga engagement methodology. The wānanga methodology frames issues and problems in the context of participants' own experiences. Early hui and kōrero have begun. However, given the importance of this kaupapa to mana whenua, and the fact that this is the first time Panuku has engaged with mana whenua in this way, a level of flexibility is required, particularly around timeframes.

We will be guided by the phrase ‘Ki tai wāriki tai wawa’, which means that we will remain flexible and willing to move from side to side, able to change direction if we become stuck or are heading the wrong way. We understand that doing things properly may take more time up front, but in the longer term will provide better outcomes.

4.3 A diverse and growing community

Pukekohe’s population was recorded as 23,630 people in the 2013 Census, representing 1.4 per cent of the Tāmaki Makaurau region’s total population. The community is also an aging one. Within Pukekohe, there are more people aged over 65 years, and within the 0 to 14 years age groups (compared to national averages). These demographic trends are likely to influence the nature of the Pukekohe community over time. This is particularly true for the segment of the community aged over 65 years, which is expected to grow at twice the speed of the overall population.
Pukekohe has also been identified in the Auckland Plan as a priority satellite town, with its population expected to double to 60,000 people in the next 20 years. There could be greater growth in the number of family households in Pukekohe, leading to higher population growth rates in the 0 to 14 years and 40 to 64 years age groups than those forecast from demographic statistics.

Once available, data from the 2018 Census data will further inform planning.

Population projections by age, 2018

Population projections by age, 2043

Ethnic distribution, 2013

- European
- Māori
- Pacific Island
- Asian
- Other
4.5 The Unlock programme area

The Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe programme focuses on the historic town centre, alongside a range of largely non-residential assets situated just outside the ring road. These assets include Pukekohe Railway Station, Auckland Council and Franklin Local Board offices, Pukekohe Library and War Memorial Hall, Bledisloe Park, Jubilee Pool, Pukekohe High School and Pukekohe Intermediate School. The boundary itself helps to focus where Panuku led investment priorities and effort will be directed in the future programme. It is important to note that there are several properties that sit outside of the programme area boundary proposed to be part of the programme. These will be progressed as 'Support' sites as described in section 1.3.

Our role within the project area will include enabling and preparing sites for development, this could also include helping site amalgamation and possible acquisition to enhance the value and economic scale of potential development.

Within the Unlock project area there is a good concentration of Auckland Council, Auckland Transport and Crown-owned land. Panuku will work together with our partners and community to lead the urban regeneration of Pukekohe and undertake property redevelopment, public realm projects and placemaking to achieve the vision and outcomes.

The property portfolio for Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe, both within and outside of the bounded area, comprises 27 properties that are made up by eight surface car parks, a range of small open spaces, three commercial properties (with tenants) and the Auckland Council offices at 82 Manukau Road. Combined, they represent approximately 5.5ha of land valued at approximately $27 million excluding the Auckland Council offices (based on 2017 capital valuations).

These properties are geographically spread throughout the town centre and wider suburban area. There are several large sites that are strategically located within the town centre with significant opportunity for redevelopment for integrated mixed use and employment outcomes.

The plan below shows key council assets in yellow. Many may have the potential to be optimised or redeveloped. These properties include some smaller open spaces, car parks, commercial and industrial properties and vacant land outside of the bounded area.

There are also several Crown owned properties – shown in blue on the map below - including two schools, some state housing and a police station. These properties may present opportunities for future collaboration with Crown agencies.
5.0 PRINCIPLES

As the lead council agency involved in Pukekohe’s transformation, Panuku will champion the Unlock programme’s vision and goals and work closely with other council organisations, community groups and the business association.

This HLPP represents the start of the Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe programme and recognises that more detailed planning, analysis and engagement will be needed as we confirm specific projects and investments. The properties outlined in this programme will be discussed with our council whānau to ensure we align and integrate with their work.

The following principles will guide the Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe programme including any property and precinct development, public realm investment, placemaking and partnering projects and initiatives.

<p>| Precinct redevelopment | A. Redevelop surplus council sites to unlock the potential of Pukekohe town centre and accommodate commercial and residential growth. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 8</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Public realm investment** | D. Invest in public realm improvements and prioritise projects that create greatest value towards achieving the vision.  
E. Take inspiration and guidance from local people, needs and themes to catalyse distinctive place-led design and develop strategic projects that are specific to Pukekohe and showcase the unique character and identity of the area.  
F. Focus on enhancing walking and cycling accessibility and ensuring the town centre caters for a wide variety of people including the young and old. Adopt exemplar universal design into projects to ensure people of all ages and abilities can use and enjoy public spaces within the town centre.  
G. Collaborate with mana whenua, who could in turn manaaki (support) local artists and community groups in strategic projects and initiatives through place making, public art, urban and architectural design. |
| **Partnership** | H. Work with mana whenua who have a strong historical footprint in Pukekohe, so we can understand, respect and amplify their association with the whenua. Use a mana whenua-led approach to realise their aspirations for the place and their people. Explore and define any potential commercial, contractual and cultural opportunities through the project. It is through this relationship with mana whenua that we will in turn ensure Kia Puawai a Pukekohe responds to and provides for the enhanced well-being of all Māori in the locale.  
I. Create wider opportunities by partnering with the Council, Franklin Local Board and mana whenua, and collaborating with landowners, key community groups and council organisations such as ATEED. |
| **Placemaking** | J. Apply a ‘Do, learn, do’ philosophy to inform future design. We envisage that the community will play an active role in building their places through placemaking activations, such as pop-up events and workshops. Experiment with new place-led initiatives to provide an opportunity to test ideas through short term improvements for Pukekohe’s public realm. This participation and inclusion will enable better decision making for Pukekohe’s future.  
K. Foster capacity and pride, in order to support long term resilience by empowering key community stakeholders. Engage with and empower local community stakeholders to ensure that the vision can be achieved and sustained into the future. This self-sufficiency is anticipated to include a continual programme of works that are led by community stakeholders well after the Kia Puawai/Unlock Pukekohe project has been completed.  
L. Ngā pou herenga – ensure our approach to placemaking is strengthened and guided by recognising mana whenua values and in particular their role as kaitiaki. Placemaking will honour collective knowledge and understanding, and support wellbeing. |
6. GOALS

The Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe Programme goals are aligned with the outcomes sought by the Pukekohe Local Board Plan 2017 and the Pukekohe Area Plan 2014 - The goals respond to current challenges and aim to leverage opportunities.

6.1 GOAL 1 – Encourage new growth in the town centre

Outcome - A competitive town centre: The town centre benefits from the growth that is projected for southern Tāmaki Makaurau and northern Waikato.

By leveraging our property portfolio to initiate regeneration, we will attract new visitors, residents and quality employment opportunities. This will serve the growing population and protect the town centre from the increased competition that will flow from the new centres in surrounding growth areas.

It is vital that the town centre capitalises on the forecast growth through continued enhancement, regeneration and place shaping. This could include providing new housing choices within the town centre.

Mana whenua speak of multiple generations of whānau living in Pukekohe and the desire to provide opportunities for future generations as well. A strong theme to emerge was the need to invest in Pukekohe, so that whānau can spend more time here.

1. Grow up - attract higher density development to locate in the town centre.

The town centre can offer different living choices. Potential buyers and investors, can capitalise on its attractive main street, historic character and pedestrian friendly streets.

Pukekohe will benefit from increasing public awareness and demand for these attributes. It can attract new and diverse types of development which will increase the density and range of activities within the town centre. It is also important that we create spaces and places that enable multi-cultural enhancement and sharing as we plan for higher density development in the future in Pukekohe.

2. Promote Pukekohe’s distinct offering and position the town centre for success

Highlight Pukekohe’s unique lifestyle offering and showcase its great amenities, services, shopping, dining and fresh produce markets, all located along a highly walkable and attractive main street, where people can interact and enjoy the town centre’s offerings.

6.2. GOAL 2 – Facilitate better access for all

Outcome - A safe, walkable and vibrant town centre

The town centre currently has several challenges that need to be resolved for the vision to be achieved. These challenges include:

- the large scale of its street blocks which impedes walkability
- the potential constraint on pedestrians and cyclists created by the ring road around the town centre – the road is designed to keep through-traffic out of the town centre, but may also restrict access to the community living in the outer area
- planning that has historically given priority to vehicles over pedestrian amenity. This includes parking provision and limited provision of sustainable transport options to and from the town centre in the past. The transport environment has improved in recent years, for example through new bus services and increased rail frequencies, and there are opportunities for more to be done, particularly for active transport modes
- the lack of residential development within the town centre.
We aim to diversify and grow activity within the town centre, by upgrading public spaces, fostering residential and commercial development on council-owned sites, improving walking and cycling connections, and further enhancing the vibrancy, accessibility, safety and character of the area. Acknowledging mana whenua’s quintessential relationship with the place as a means of providing education, establishing common ground and creating independence is also a critical consideration for the future of Pukekohe.

1. **Make walking and cycling in the town centre more attractive**

Work with Auckland Transport to develop a safe, high-quality network for active transport modes within and to the centre, across the ring road and to key destinations such as the train station, library, pool, stadium, cinema and high school. This can be achieved through enhancing streetscapes, providing more outdoor seating and upgrading streetscapes. Working with developers will be important to provide additional connections through development sites can also be achieved.

Establishing new walking and cycling options across open spaces and council-controlled development sites can foster a better-connected town centre that everyone can enjoy. We expect that it will become safer and easier for people to walk to work, schools, shops, supermarkets, parks, public spaces, leisure and services. Prioritising walking and cycling will support increased recreation, economic prosperity and social interaction.

2. **Put fit for purpose parking management in place**

One of the purposes of town centre parking is to support the economic development of the town centre. We will work with Auckland Transport to optimise the supply and management of car parking within the town centre.

Some examples of potential actions are exploring laneway parking options, providing new signs for under-used parking sites, running awareness campaigns about the Farmers building multi-level carpark, improving pedestrian connections to less centrally located sites, and looking at options for additional on-street parking.

3. **Further enhance the town centre experience, using existing public spaces to support new forms of entertainment, events and activities**

To bring new life to the town centre, it should not only be safe and functional but also attractive to residents and visitors. We will support quality landscaping within the public realm and the integration of public art such as murals and sculptures. These opportunities will also be the main way that we can give voice and visibility to the strong cultural and historical association mana whenua have with Pukekohe.

We will scope how to make better use of existing public spaces for outdoor performances, programming and events. We will do this through working with local activators and community groups to explore different ways of bringing these public spaces to life (into the evening and throughout the year), in order to support business vibrancy. Early kōrero with mana whenua revealed a desire to keep rangatahi in the place and, as such, creation of a vibrant town centre with quality entertainment offerings is very important.
6.3. GOAL 3 – Attract new businesses and critical services

Outcome - A thriving local economy that offers increased access to employment, education and healthcare opportunities for local people.

At present, approximately half of the Pukekohe population travels outside of Pukekohe for employment.

To achieve the project vision, we will need to increase opportunities for local employment and tertiary education, especially for young people. This will improve the self-sufficiency and resilience of Pukekohe by attracting new investment, diversifying the range of local businesses, upskilling the community and increasing local spending.

1. Leverage selected council properties to attract quality healthcare, employment or education providers

We will seek ATEED’s support to leverage council properties to attract businesses that have the greatest benefit to the community. This could include the healthcare and education sector, research and development facilities and high skill employers. We will also engage with Crown agencies to explore any opportunities to leverage each other’s landholdings or service and activity needs in the area.

2. Facilitate investor forums and investigate a business incubator shared space project to help grow access to local jobs

We will work with the Franklin Local Board, mana whenua and ATEED, and engage with potential investors, to investigate creating sustainable employment opportunities in Pukekohe. This could include supporting new businesses within the horticultural or agricultural sectors, who would benefit from easy access to the long-established and high-performing local food producers, as well as Pukekohe’s elite soils and micro-climate.

3. Encourage local people and visitors to choose Pukekohe for their service and spending needs

We will support ATEED, the Franklin Local Board, mana whenua and the Pukekohe Business Association to promote and explore new local initiatives and activities within the town centre. This could include aligning shopping hours to benefit from local events and increasing out of town awareness of local service offerings and specialities.

6.4. GOAL 4 – Build local community identity

Outcome - The diversity of Pukekohe’s communities will be celebrated and reflected in the town centre

As the town centre grows up and urbanises it will still carry its rich cultural and rural identity on its sleeve. This will happen through promoting Pukekohe as a food producing destination, and incorporating more Māori, Chinese and Indian community influences into the design, naming, planning and development of public projects, including art murals and placemaking.
1. **Celebrate Māori identity and acknowledge Chinese and Indian influences through projects**

We will deliver and facilitate placemaking interventions that reflect and celebrate Pukekohe’s unique local identity taking inspiration from its diverse community, as well as working to make sure that the built environment reflects the place and its local people.

This could include, for example, changing place names to reflect the diverse cultures or commissioning creative artworks to be located around the centre.

As part of this we will work in good faith with mana whenua to understand, and give effect to:

- customary mana whenua interests in Pukekohe
- mana whenua aspirations for Pukekohe.

2. **Reveal Pukekohe’s high value food offering**

Increasing food security and economic resilience is important to Pukekohe’s ongoing success.

We will support development of a higher value-added food offering that reflects the quality of produce that local producers grow in Pukekohe’s elite soils and unique frost free microclimate close to consumer markets.

We will collaborate with ATEED and the local business association to scope and develop a strategy and a brand for the town centre that supports awareness of the high-value produce of the area. Events and activities could be used to help position the town centre as a sustainable food hub and destination. Sustainable practices for growing and sharing kai was a theme that emerged through early kōrero with mana whenua. Sustainable practices intused with matauranga Māori will be a strong element in the story around kai for Pukekohe.

7. **KEY MOVES TO ACHIEVE THE VISION AND GOALS**

There are a range of potential opportunities throughout Pukekohe where Panuku can support the vision through the redevelopment of council surplus property, public realm investment and placemaking.

However, Panuku’s mandate and resources alone will not be sufficient to achieve all the potential projects outlined in previous planning documents and those raised through stakeholder engagement.

The key moves identified below are designed to focus our energy and efforts on the property opportunities and public realm projects where Panuku can make the biggest contribution towards the vision. There will be opportunities to consider other projects as the Unlock programme progresses and as potential partnering opportunities arise.

7.1 Three precinct redevelopment key moves

The three key precinct redevelopment areas are shown in Figure 3.

Key moves for these areas will aim to enliven the town centre and better connect it to other areas through using and developing our three flagship development sites.

Flagship development sites are properties or clusters of properties in key strategic locations. Panuku will focus more attention on shaping and influencing the strategic land use outcomes.
for these sites, as their future use could strongly improve the local economy by providing better jobs, education or housing outcomes.

**Key move 7.1.1 – Edinburgh Street superblock**

The objective within this area will be to use Auckland Council’s landholdings to bring about intensive transformational development that connects King Street with the library and civic facilities on Massey Avenue.

There will be opportunities to explore multi-level living options and to activate the street in this key location in the heart of Pukekohe. Development options will integrate with the immediately adjacent lanes and intersections to transform this part of the town centre.
A. **Flagship development opportunity** - investigate opportunities to enhance the connection between Franklin: The Centre and King Street. This will be undertaken within the superblock comprising of 29, 29a Edinburgh Street, 1 and 3 Roulston Street, and 17 and 21 Massey Avenue.

B. **Devon Lane** – explore opportunities to enhance and activate this lane with Auckland Transport (see key move 7.2.1).

C. **Edinburgh Street and Massey Avenue area** - work with Auckland Transport to investigate opportunities to enhance active transport modes between Franklin: The Centre and the Edinburgh Street shopping area.

D. **Roulston Street** – explore extending the town square experience and quality through this well-scaled historic street, to enable a potential ‘market street,’ with a larger and enhanced farmers market, including a regular low-scale activation programme to test options (see key move 7.3.1).

**Key move 7.1.2 – the eastern gateway**

The objective for the eastern gateway area is to enhance the eastern end of King Street and onwards to provide an anchor destination and better connect it with the rail station. This might include the creation of distinctively Pukekohe spaces, where festivals and events can be held.

The eastern end of King Street is close to the train station and there are opportunities to provide for a stronger connection between them. This end of King Street lacks an appropriate anchor destination to draw people to its retail offering. Developing the 7 Massey Avenue site will provide such a destination.

There is also an opportunity to upgrade the streetscape in this area. This could include additional speed management methods or changes, which would also add value to Auckland Transport’s work to upgrade the intersection with Manukau Road. In addition, we will look at providing a new direct pedestrian connection to Roulston Park and Pioneer Cottage from King
Street. This could be achieved by relocating and re-using the old pedestrian bridge currently located at the train station.

**Figure 5: The eastern gateway key moves**

**Map legend**

A. **7 Massey Avenue as a flagship development opportunity** – investigate creating an anchor destination to draw people to the eastern end of King Street and develop Massey Avenue. This could take the form of a mixed-use medical facility, with integrated specialist housing and ground-floor retail or offices.

B. **Massey Avenue and Manukau Road intersection** – support the Auckland Transport led intersection upgrade. Investigate options for additional enhancements for active transport modes with Auckland Transport and establish a gateway to the town centre.

C. **Re-connect to Roulston Park** – investigate options for a new connection across the rail corridor to Roulston Park from King Street (including an upgrade of the park), in collaboration with Franklin local Board, Auckland Council Community Facilities and Auckland Transport. This could improve the main street experience and enhance direct pedestrian access to the park, which would in turn attracting new visitors to the park by enhancing its use and attractiveness. This will also benefit the nearby residential area and accessibility to the stadium (see key move 7.2.3).

D. **King Street** – explore the potential for streetscape upgrades and work with Auckland Transport to consider introducing a slower speed environment at the eastern end of King Street.
Key move 7.1.3 – the station precinct

This precinct connects the town centre and business and retail activities along Manukau Road, and provides opportunities to improve connections to the town centre. It includes the train station and bus interchange, which offer excellent links to the city centre and elsewhere. This makes it an ideal candidate for regeneration as anticipated by the Pukekohe Area Plan’s key move 5.

We envisage that regeneration here will be transformational and will integrate the Manukau Road business precincts with the historic town centre. The strategic land use outcome on this site will be important and could be in the form new learning opportunities, medical services, research and development, intensive residential development or high-skilled employment offices.

![Map legend](image)

**Figure 6: The station precinct key move**

- **Concept plan** – develop a precinct concept plan to show how the precinct could be developed over time and to attract investment opportunities.
- **Way finding** – investigate opportunities with Auckland Transport to improve pedestrian and cyclist movement between the area and the town centre.
- **Historic station building** – support the Franklin Local Board, Auckland Transport and key stakeholders to explore opportunities for the future of the historic train station.
- **Council buildings** – seek potential buyers for the council chambers who would enhance the Pukekohe local economy and support the vision. This property has already been earmarked for development through the Corporate Property Office Strategy its programme.
7.2 Three public realm key moves

A key principle in achieving the vision for the town centre is to ensure that we design for people when undertaking regeneration. There are opportunities:

- for a more diverse range of public spaces
- to explore enhancing laneways to improve safety and walking and cycling, while encouraging new activity along them
- for activation along these connections to make them interesting and safe as well as providing a place in which business and mews-type residential development greater than two levels can thrive
- to improve active transport mode connections into the town centre

Key move 7.2.1 – activate the lanes

Activating selected lanes will improve people’s access and unlock the potential to intensify adjoining sites. We will explore ways of doing this with Auckland Transport through putting in pedestrian footpaths, lighting, some parallel parking to service truck and trailer vehicles, trees and local street art.

This will attract new businesses to front these lanes, potentially alongside residential uses, adding vibrancy to the area.

Figure 7: Activate the lanes key move
Figure 8: Artist impression for potential lane improvement

Figure 8 shows an illustrative concept of potential design elements for a lane transformation. This opportunity will be explored in conjunction with Auckland Transports.

**Key move 7.2.2 – improve and beautify pedestrian connections**

We will work with Auckland Transport to investigate and, where feasible, improve access to and within the town centre through projects that prioritise pedestrians and enhance cycling.

Some key intersections could be candidates for improvement, and we will support opportunities to make minor improvements to the western section of King Street and Edinburgh Street. Such improvements will enable better north–south movement using active transport modes through the town centre. This will strengthen links to key amenities, services and schools.

We will also consider the possibility of an urban tree programme to enhance the ‘green look and feel’ of the town centre, including the feasibility of planting new street trees. We will work with Auckland Transport to investigate options such as speed management for vehicle traffic, which could enhance peoples’ ability to use roads for walking and cycling and increase safety when they cross roads into the town centre. As already noted, the ring road has numerous functions, including as a traffic and freight bypass for the town centre, which will need to be considered in any investigations.

And opportunities we consider will also take into account land use, so that in the future multi-level residential or commercial buildings, shops and cafes will potentially front the ring road.
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A. Analysis and monitoring – conduct a public life survey to see how people currently walk and cycle around the town centre and use the open spaces.

- Key streets – review the town centre streets with Auckland Transport, to identify potential improvements to increase safety and amenity for active transport modes.
- Tree programme – investigate opportunities for street tree plantings to enhance the green look and feel of Pukekohe town centre.
- Pedestrian crossings – assess the safety and effectiveness of the existing pedestrian crossing on Massey Avenue outside the Franklin Centre and work with Auckland Transport to see if any additional improvements would be desirable.
- Walking and cycling – investigate with Auckland Transport the needs of users of active transport modes in the town centre and its surrounds, with a priority focus on Edinburgh Street, which connects southern Pukekohe to Pukekohe High School, Pukekohe Intermediate, the town centre and cinema complex.
- Intersection enhancements – investigate options with Auckland Transport to improve the safety of intersections in the town centre, such as at West Street, Queen Street and Edinburgh Street to improve walking and cycling amenity.

Key move 7.2.3 – contribute towards play opportunities
Identify and explore the feasibility of a new child, youth or even age-friendly destination play opportunity, such as at Roulston or Seddon Park.

Alternatively, contribute towards agreed community play opportunities outside the town centre, such as in Belmont (where agreed with the Franklin Local Board and within the council’s reinvestment policy).
7.3 Two placemaking key moves

Placemaking enables the creation of public realm spaces that people value. The key placemaking moves will connect us back to the fundamental importance of people-friendly scale, design and sense of place.

**Figure 10: Placemaking key moves**
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- **Farmers market** – investigate relocating, growing and enhancing Pukekohe Farmers Market by exploring options such as the Town Square, Roulston Street and King Street. An enhanced market will help build and grow the Pukekohe identity and reveal it as a potential food destination.

- **Car parks** – instigate placemaking activations to explore options for future potential uses of car park sites, led by the urban development key moves.

**Key move 7.3.1 – relocate, grow and enhance the farmers market experience**

Achieve a true ‘market street’ by investigating relocating the market to the town square.

Given the market is larger than the town square we will explore options to extend of the market experience southward into Roulston Street to enable larger and better weekly markets and future signature events that reflect the unique identity of Pukekohe, including its food offerings.

This will first be explored through the development of a market strategy that carefully considers the nature and desired outcomes for the refreshed farmers market. Testing will be conducted through temporary ‘do, learn, do’ activities.

This key move would also enable potential redevelopment on the council’s 7 Massey Avenue property where the farmers market is currently located.
Key move 7.3.2 – placemaking trials and activations
As investigations for lane and streetscape enhancements progress (through the public realm key moves), there is an opportunity in the short-term to work with Auckland Transport to use temporary activations to explore longer term ideas. These may include:

- off-street carparks – testing selected off-street carparks for temporary alternative uses, such as events, if they are no longer required by Auckland Transport
- King and Roulston Street – explore having events such as markets on Roulston Street; and explore, through temporary changes, future options for streetscape upgrades on King Street
- outdoor dining – investigate with Auckland Transport any opportunities to remove selected sections of carparks along King Street to temporarily widen footpaths for outdoor dining on the southern side of the street where there is the most sunlight
- short-term lane activations – investigate with Auckland Transport any opportunities to make these lanes more interesting spaces, and explore temporary changes to selected sections of lanes as a way of investigating options for more permanent change.

7.4 A range of partnering key moves

Achieving the vision for the town centre will require a collective effort with our partners. It will be important that all our collective goals are well aligned, and our actions are coordinated. The following key moves will help us achieve this.

Key move 7.4.1
Kia Puāwai a Pukekohe. Explore and define potential commercial, contractual and cultural opportunities throughout the project that support a shared purpose.

Key move 7.4.2
Support ATEED in business attraction initiatives. Work with ATEED in its leadership of local economic development initiatives.

Key move 7.4.3
Collaborate with Auckland Transport on all town centre proposals that affect the transport and parking network. Collaborating with Kiwirail on the station precinct and any proposals which affect the rail corridor.

Key move 7.4.4
Partner with Franklin Local Board and Auckland Council departments on development planning, project funding, community outcomes and placemaking initiatives.

Key move 7.4.5
Collaborate with the Pukekohe Business Association on invigorating King Street even further, preparing for agreed street events and planning for the farmers market.

8. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

8.1 Development strategy

The high-level development strategy for the Unlock Pukekohe project will be used to set commercial priorities, focus resources and ensure all stakeholders are working toward common goals, establishing agreement around intended results.
**Key influences**
Unlock Pukekohe’s development strategy will most likely be influenced by the following issues.

- **Landholdings** – the commercial strategy will explore opportunities to acquire and aggregate sites, undertake land swaps and make disposals to achieve the outcomes of this plan.
- **Community voice** – Pukekohe’s strong community has galvanised over infrastructure plans. People want a coordinated approach to investment.
- **Demographic change** – projected socio-economic changes will likely increase future demand for retirement living and aged care housing, and put more pressure on community facilities and schools. The workforce should align better with local industrial and agriculture needs to provide more local work opportunities.

**Proposed delivery strategy**
Our proposed delivery strategy builds on the town centre’s existing strengths, reflects inputs from stakeholders and market advice, and phases development to preserve future options.

Our role will include enabling and preparing sites for development, and helping site amalgamation and an economic scale of development. Possible acquisition of sites could help improve community facilities and the quality of development.

The Unlock programme area, shown in Figure 2, is centred around the town centre where most of the high-value properties and key community facilities are located. The boundary helps to focus where Panuku-led investment priorities and effort will be directed.

It is important to note that there are several other properties which sit outside of the programme area, that will be developed as ‘Support’ sites as outlined in section 1.3.

We will also ask the Finance and Performance Committee to consider contributing to small agreed projects outside of the boundary if they have clear benefits towards achieving the vision and outcomes.

Given these concerns, the HLPP adopts the following development strategy.

- Focus on the most valuable properties within the portfolio that are located within the town centre.
- Collaborate with Auckland Transport to navigate the necessary process to achieve regeneration of the three development precincts.
- Prioritise effort on the three development precincts as they have the greatest influence on achieving the outcomes.
- Prioritise attracting quality employment opportunities, education providers and healthcare services.
- Catalyse new housing choices in the town centre that are integrated with non-residential uses.
- Leverage the remainder of the portfolio outside of the town centre for housing and optimal financial return.
- Align timing and priority of adjacent public realm projects with the development site sales.

The tables in the following section provide more detail about the key precincts in our development strategy, along with the key moves to which they relate.

It is important to note that the carpark sites listed in the tables are controlled and managed by Auckland Transport, and will need assessment and the approval of the Auckland Transport board to be fully (or partially) released for development. Some specific sites are also subject to a designation for parking purposes, which would need to be uplisted by Auckland Transport.
### 8.2 Key town centre and surrounding sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Location</th>
<th>No. of Sites</th>
<th>Indicative Potential Uses</th>
<th>Land Area (m²)</th>
<th>Estimated Timing (Ready for development)</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Potential Property Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh Super Block – 1, 3 Rouliston Street, 29 &amp; 29a, 33 Edinburgh Street, 17, 21 Massey Ave.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>6750 m²</td>
<td>3 – 5 years</td>
<td>Town Centre</td>
<td>These sites could provide a catalyst for change for the precinct. They would ideally leverage intensive integrated mixed use development activating street frontages on Edinburgh Street, Massey Avenue, Rouliston Street and Devon Lane. Development should also improve connections across these streets to the library, Pukekohe Plaza and King Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Massey Ave.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>5191 m²</td>
<td>2 – 5 years</td>
<td>Town Centre</td>
<td>This site could provide a catalyst for change. It would ideally become a mixed-use anchor destination with active frontages to Massey Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Tobin Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>1460 m²</td>
<td>2 – 5 years</td>
<td>Town Centre</td>
<td>This carpark primarily serves the supermarket. It could provide a catalyst to upgrade and better connect this anchor destination. Its development could support north-facing mixed-use development along Seddon Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Tobin Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mixed use / Commercial</td>
<td>3687 m²</td>
<td>2 – 5 years</td>
<td>Town Centre</td>
<td>This site could provide for change for this precinct and would ideally incorporate a mixed-use development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hall Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>889 m²</td>
<td>1 – 4 years</td>
<td>Town Centre</td>
<td>This site could provide an opportunity to create a modern development near the eastern end of the main street and would ideally incorporate a mixed-use development consisting of retail and residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Hall Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>3148 m²</td>
<td>1 – 4 years</td>
<td>Town Centre</td>
<td>This site could provide for change to this area of town and would ideally incorporate a mixed-use development attracting locals to this part of town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Tobin Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>363m²</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>This site could provide for a residential extension of the neighbouring properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent to 36 Tobin Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>615m²</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>This site could provide for a residential extension of the neighbouring properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Seddon Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>300m²</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>This site could provide for a residential extension of the neighbouring properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Edinburgh Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>1012 m²</td>
<td>1 – 2 years</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>The property has specific planning restrictions, which include a titoki tree onsite, and has been included in a recent plan change to a category B building. However, the interior is not included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Manukau Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>13090 m²</td>
<td>1 – 2 years</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>This site could provide a key opportunity to create a flagship development close to the rail network. The goal is a mixed-use development that is transformational with an anchoring activity, enhancing the availability of local jobs, enabling better access to healthcare and learning opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174, 176, 180, 182 Manukau Road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Commercial/Industrial</td>
<td>5894 m²</td>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>Business - Light Industry</td>
<td>These sites could provide a catalyst for change for the Manukau Road southern corridor and would ideally incorporate a large industrial, bulk retail outlet or other commercial development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172 Manukau Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Commercial/Industrial</td>
<td>512 m²</td>
<td>1 – 2 years</td>
<td>Business - Light Industry</td>
<td>This site could provide a catalyst for change for the Manukau Road southern corridor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Kia Puawai/Unlock Pukekohe properties outside of the town centre and Manukau Road area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Location</th>
<th>No. of Sites</th>
<th>Indicative Potential Uses</th>
<th>Land Area (m²)</th>
<th>Estimated Timing (Ready for development)</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Potential Property Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Golding Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>8204m²</td>
<td>1-3 yrs</td>
<td>Future Urban</td>
<td>Possible residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent to 995 Paera Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1012m²</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Open Space - Informal Recreation</td>
<td>Possible housing use on part of the site, noting overland flow paths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent to 176 Princess St West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1019m²</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Open Space - Informal Recreation</td>
<td>Possible housing use on part of the site, noting overland flow paths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 East Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>815m²</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Open Space - Informal Recreation</td>
<td>Possible housing use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent 693 Buckland Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2977m²</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Future Urban</td>
<td>Possible housing use on part of the site, noting proximity to a watercourse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land adjacent to 1173 Paera Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residential/other</td>
<td>8491m²</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>Future Urban</td>
<td>Possible housing use, noting proximity to a watercourse and rail line.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.3 Funding

Kia Puawai/Unlock Pukekohe will require funding for capital projects and adequate resourcing to progress the project.

The Transform and Unlock project, approved by Auckland Council, is funded in the Long-Term Plan 2018–2028 by the reinvestment of the proceeds of property sales across the wider Panuku portfolio. Panuku is required to strike a balance between strategic outcomes, such as providing improved town centres, more housing choices and better public amenities, while ensuring the council also optimises the commercial return from its property portfolio. A regional approach to reinvestment gives us the ability to target the greatest need and enable credible progress in all locations.

A business case for Kia Puawai/Unlock Pukekohe will be prepared and will confirm the level of funding for the capital programme. It will also estimate the net community benefits of undertaking the project.

Panuku as the lead agency within the project boundary area, will seek to partner with others, combining funding and resourcing with several other council organisations, and community groups to get the best value out of the project’s funding envelope. Examples of this approach will be:

- advocating to the Franklin Local Board to allocate funding to support the Unlock project, where appropriate
• working with Auckland Council departments and council-controlled organisations, such as Auckland Transport, Healthy Waters, Corporate Property, Community Services and Facilities, and ATEED to reprioritise existing budgets and integrate and align funding towards agreed project priorities
• collaborating with Auckland Transport to align agreed projects within the road corridor, such as safety and walking and cycling programmes.

These funding strategies will be developed following the adoption of the HLPP.

9. Pukekohe Snapshot

9.1 Planning

A range of statutory and non-statutory plans and policies have considered the strategic role and structure of Pukekohe. These plans reflect a broad understanding of Pukekohe as a rural satellite town centre with significant potential for growth and intensification.

The following planning documents have informed this HLPP:

• Auckland Unitary Plan (operative in part 2016)
• Auckland Plan 2050 (2016)
• Long Term Plan 2018-2028
• Franklin Local Board Plan (2017)
• Pukekohe Area Plan (2014)
• Pukekohe-Paerata Paths Plan (December 2018)
• Draft Pukekohe-Paerata Structure Plan (2019)
• Regional Land Transport Plan (2018)
• Auckland Transport Alignment Project (2018)
• Community Facilities Network Action Plan (2015)
• Parks and Open Spaces Strategic Action Plan (2013)

Auckland Unitary Plan - Operative in Part:

The Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe project focuses on the historic town centre and extends out to include several key facilities just beyond the ring road.

A Business: Town Centre zoning applies to an area centred on King Street and contained within the bounds of Tobin Street, Stadium Drive, the North Island Main Trunk (Railway) line, Massey Avenue and Washby Street. It also applies to a small area to the south of Massey Avenue that contains the Pukekohe War Memorial Hall, the RSA and Franklin. The Centre. The town centre accommodates two Civic zoned spaces and a few pockets of Informal Recreation zoned parks and community facilities.

Buildings within the town centre are limited to 18m in height (generally four – six storeys), apart from three blocks on the northern side of King Street which are limited to a height of 13m (to allow winter sun onto the southern foreshore of King Street). There are building frontage control provisions that apply throughout the centre. These seek to maximise street activation and building continuity along the street frontage, they enhance pedestrian amenity and safety. Pukekohe’s traditional main street has Auckland Unitary Plan provisions to protect its character.
The Auckland Unitary Plan adopts an approach to parking in Pukekohe that is different to most other centres within Auckland in recognition of the town's role as a satellite centre, which requires a minimum number of spaces to be provided for activities.

Beyond the Town Centre Zone, there is a mix of Business Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) and Residential Terrace Housing and Apartment (THAB) zoned land. Further south is the Pukekohe Intermediate School, Pukekohe High School and Bledisloe Park. The latter has a Sport and Active Recreation zoning and accommodates football, cricket and netball clubs along with the (public) Jubilee swimming pool. Throughout the area there are numerous scheduled notable trees and historic heritage buildings.

![Figure 11: Unitary Plan zones in relation to the project area](image)

**Auckland Plan 2050**

Pukekohe is identified in the development strategy of the Auckland Plan 2050 as a rural node and satellite town within a multi-nodal system of main centres. Pukekohe will service the surrounding rural communities, be connected to urban Auckland through state highways and rail (which is to be electrified) and will support significant business and residential growth (both within the current urban areas and in greenfield locations).

The Auckland Plan 2050 recognises Pukekohe has the potential to function semi-independently from the main urban area of Auckland and this will reduce the need for people to travel out of the area to access facilities, services and employment opportunities.
Long Term Plan 2018-2028

The Long Term Plan 2018-2028 is a budget that sets out the activities, services and investments that the council has planned for the next 10 years. Infrastructure requirements are considered over a long-term timeframe and are included in the 30-year Infrastructure Strategy.

Infrastructure identified in the long-term plan includes a longer-term initiative to increase the capacity of the Pukekohe reservoirs water supply.

Franklin Local Board Plan 2017

The Franklin Local Board Plan is a three-year strategic document that guides local board activity, funding and investment decisions for 2017 to 2020. This plan highlights the following important outcomes:

- dealing with growth effectively;
- caring for the environment;
- improving transport connections;
- supporting a thriving local economy, with local jobs for local people;
- providing a range of community facilities that meet the needs of a growing community.

The plan emphasises that growth will be focussed on Pukekohe’s existing town centre to help protect Franklin’s productive volcanic soils, in recognition of their importance for food production and the unique combination of soils, climate and proximity to market that occur here. The local board recognises how important it is for the community to feel ownership of and a connection with their local area. The plan provides support for a range of community-led placemaking activities and initiatives that reflect Franklin’s diversity and demographics.

Pukekohe-Paerata Paths Plan December 2018

This aspirational non-statutory plan supports a vision for a network of walking, cycling and ecological connections throughout the region. These include several proposed, but as yet unfunded, paths that have the potential to connect Pukekohe and its heart to the wider area.

Pukekohe Area Plan 2014

This non-statutory plan supported the development of Pukekohe as a rural satellite town with future urban growth located in areas such as Paerata. Through key moves and actions, the plan supports local economic and employment opportunities to match population growth, increased local tertiary education opportunities, and the development of land around the upgraded Pukekohe Train Station for greater uses. Other key actions include the development of town centre character guidelines, improved accessibility and connectivity through the town centre, including improved pedestrian access across the ring road, and local improvements to enhance walking and cycling opportunities in the town centre.

Focusing growth on existing centres and protecting fertile soils used for local horticulture and agriculture is a key priority of the Auckland Plan and the Pukekohe Area Plan, and will be achieved through identification of Future Urban zoned land under the Unitary Plan.

The Pukekohe-Paerata Structure Plan, once adopted, will apply to approximately 1,300 hectares of Future Urban zoned land in the wider Pukekohe area. The current draft plan shows the arrangement of various land uses (residential, business, and parks) and infrastructure. It also shows how these areas connect to adjacent urban and rural areas and wider infrastructure networks. Important cultural values and natural features are also addressed.
The structure plan will refine the staging and timing of development of this land, and identify the mix and location of housing, employment, retail, commercial and community facilities, as well as necessary upgrades to water, wastewater, stormwater and transport that will be required to facilitate the growth. It is anticipated that the final Pukekohe–Paerata Structure Plan will be recommended for adoption to the Auckland Council Planning Committee in late 2019.

Regional Land Transport Plan

The Regional Land Transport Plan is a 10-year investment programme prepared by Auckland Transport, together with the New Zealand Transport Agency and KiwiRail. The plan contains the entire transport investment programme for the region, enabled by all funding allocations (i.e. both from the government, and Auckland Council via the Long-Term Plan 2018–2028), and must give effect to the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport. The government policy statement focuses on four strategic priorities: safety, access, environment and value for money.

Projects identified in the Regional Land Transport Plan that are relevant to Pukekohe include:
- State Highway 22 Drury to Paerata safe roads project
- Pukekohe rail electrification
- additional electric trains.

Other projects in the Regional Land Transport Plan that affect the wider area, such as the State Highway 1 Papakura to Bombay project, may also be relevant to Pukekohe.

Auckland Transport Alignment Project

The Auckland Transport Alignment Project is a joint project between Auckland Council, Auckland Transport and the government to determine an aligned strategic approach on transport for Auckland. This includes information and direction on Pukekohe. At present, the project is focusing on investment priorities for 2018 to 2028, based on an assumed funding envelope of $28 billion over the decade.

9.2 Transport and connectivity

Pukekohe Railway Station and train services

The Auckland Plan and Pukekohe Area Plan identify Pukekohe as one of several growth areas that are a priority for planning and investment in the short term. The plans suggest that having a higher frequency train services on the rail network to Pukekohe will positively affect the overall travel time to other key destinations in Tāmaki Makaurau and encourage the local community to use public transport.

The Pukekohe Railway Station (formally known as the Pukekohe Railway Station and Post and Telegraph Office) was established in 1875 at the eastern end of King Street. It was subsequently re-located a short distance south-east of the town centre and was upgraded in 2016 to include a bus interchange, park and ride and pedestrian overbridge. The project increased public transport patronage by connecting ‘feeder’ bus services to the Pukekohe train station, along with providing good pedestrian and cycling connections.

Auckland’s electric rail network currently terminates at Papakura, where travellers transfer to diesel trains which operate to Pukekohe every 20 minutes at peak times.

Bus network

A new public transport network was developed for Pukekohe in 2016. Bus provision is based on a mixture of three local services that serve the urban areas of Pukekohe area and four longer distance services which serve Paerata, Waiuku and Port Waikato. The three local bus
routes run every 30 minutes, seven days a week around Pukekohe, and serve the town centre and shopping areas, and connect with train services at the station.

**Parking**

An Auckland Transport commissioned parking study for the Pukekohe Town Centre (2019) made the following findings.

- Pukekohe Town Centre contains approximately 4,000 car parks. Half are controlled by Auckland Transport and half by the private sector. Of these, 1,000 are in public off-street lots. These lots are controlled by Auckland Transport or are in the Pukekohe Plaza building.
- Car parks such as these support town centre access and some parking will always be required in a satellite town which serves a rural catchment. The car parks use a large amount of town centre land. Parking surveys undertaken in 2018 show that at least 600 car parks are available in Auckland Transport controlled car parks at peak occupancy. The study also found that some spaces are being used for all day parking as a park and ride for train travel, as opposed to short stay (i.e. visitor) parking.

**Existing walking and cycle Network:**

While Pukekohe has an exceptionally good main street (King Street), other Pukekohe streets are similar in their walking and cycling provision (e.g. footpaths and crossing facilities) to other urban areas of Tāmaki Makaurau. Connections for active transport modes also exist in reserves but there are currently few dedicated cycle facilities on Pukekohe’s streets.

### 9.3 Infrastructure capacity

The Auckland Council has made the following assessments of Pukekohe’s physical and social infrastructure capacity.

**Water supply**

Pukekohe’s water supply is sourced from the Waikato River and treated at the Waikato water treatment plant. The existing supply network is reaching capacity to service this growing region. Watercare has a programme of investments in place to address these issues, as part of catering for the wider structure plan growth area.

**Wastewater**

The Wastewater network is predominantly a gravity system, supported by some pump stations. Wastewater is transferred to the Pukekohe wastewater treatment plant via the new pump station at the Pukekohe Raceway. Treated wastewater is discharged back into the Waikato River, and a 35-year discharge consent has recently been granted by the Waikato Regional Council. The existing network has capacity during dry weather but is affected by infiltration during heavy rains.

The Pukekohe transmission pump station has recently been constructed to accommodate future flows from the Draft Pukekohe-Paeraata Structure Plan area, as well as undeveloped land zoned for residential use and forecast intensification within the existing urban area.

**Stormwater**

The Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe project straddles two stormwater catchments, the Whangapourri Creek catchment, and the Pukekohe South - Tuatenui catchment. Areas to the
south, particularly around Pukekohe Intermediate school and Bledisloe Park, are susceptible to flooding.

In the Long Term Plan 2018-2028, the water sensitive design approach to stormwater and flooding management adopted by the council means that most stormwater investments are likely to be relatively small projects responding to where and when growth occurs. The largest investments will be in future urban growth areas subject to significant flooding.

Education

The rolls at both Pukekohe Intermediate and Pukekohe High School are continuing to grow and, with projected demographic change and population growth, may soon reach capacity. There are limited education opportunities at tertiary level within Pukekohe, with only a few private providers located in the town centre.

Community facilities and open space

The heart of Pukekohe has an unusually good range of open spaces, reserves and community facilities – including Bledisloe Park, the Jubilee Pools, the Franklin Pool and Leisure Centre, Roadston Park, the stadium, Seddon Park, the Town Square, the War Memorial Hall and Franklin: The Centre.

Auckland Council’s Parks and Open Spaces Strategic Action Plan and Community Facilities Network Plan provide frameworks for assessing open space and community facilities requirements. A community facilities provision assessment for Pukekohe–Paerata was completed in March 2019 and identified that, in general, new service provision should be directed towards greenfield growth areas, such as Paerata. For the existing urban area, the priority is to enhance existing facilities.

Although the existing open spaces and community facilities can accommodate some growth, with future growth there may be pressures, particularly on the library and Franklin Leisure Centre. The Franklin and Jubilee pools will require particular consideration to ensure they remain fit for purpose, and further indoor court facilities may be needed by 2026.

9.4 Market dynamics and housing demand

Panuku commissioned a market analysis in March 2019 and this was prepared by CBRE. The report found that Pukekohe had a high population growth forecast with strong demand for industrial, residential and retirement land. The report also found a steady demand for retail and office uses in Pukekohe, with demand growing in line with Pukekohe’s increasing population.

Market growth for residential housing

Housing in Pukekohe is not compact. Abundant land supply and modern builds have encouraged the development of large houses and other as choices have been limited. The opportunity for older locals (or young people) to downsize into lock-up-and-leave apartments in the town centre has been constrained by planning rules which make redevelopment of most of the narrow sites financially or physically challenging.

The time it takes to sell housing in Pukekohe has been increasing as the housing market has slowed and remains well below previous peaks. Nevertheless, improved transport and accessibility, relative affordability and population growth have lifted Pukekohe’s residential attractiveness, and are contributing to an increase in demand, predominantly from retiring local farmers but also form a greater variety of households including working professionals.

Market demand for residential housing
Residential dwelling prices in Pukekohe have increased in line with the wider Auckland market over the past ten years. Over the five year period from February 2012 to February 2017, residential prices in Pukekohe increased by 69 per cent. Like the rest of the region, house price growth has stabilised since 2017, and is currently in the high $600,000 ranges.

Pukekohe has experienced limited decline in housing values compared to other markets within Tāmaki Makaurau, and this is likely to be due to comparative housing affordability in the region and continued demand.

![Graph](image)

**Figure 12: Pukekohe median residential sale price- rolling six-month average**

**Retirement housing supply and demand trends**

Pukekohe has 557 retirement units contained within seven retirement village complexes. Pukekohe also has 345 care beds, contained within four aged care complexes. There are 50 dementia beds and 30 other beds most of which are within assisted living suites that bridge the needs gap between serviced apartments and care beds.

There are generally two-five new retirement complexes added per decade. Looking forward there is likely to be a demand for more retirement living options with peak demand expected between 2020 and 2035.

**Haumaru housing**

There are four clusters of council-owned housing for older people within the Pukekohe urban area. Combined, these represent 75 units of the 1452 units within the Auckland-wide portfolio.

**Office supply and demand trends**

There are few office buildings over 1000m2 in Pukekohe, with a total stock of just under 20,000m2 servicing about 100 different office tenants.

Growth in available office space over the next 25 years is estimated to be 32 per cent, with much of the supply coming from smaller-scale mixed-use developments. We anticipate these will have a small square metre footprint, but be higher quality options, predominantly targeted at the local business community.

**Retail supply and demand trends**

Pukekohe’s retail premises are concentrated in four areas: Pukekohe Plaza, The Zone, Megacentre and the historic town centre. Combined, this equates to 88000m2 retail area, with
25,000m² of this entering the market since 2010, and makes up approximately 28 per cent of
Pukekohe’s total retail stock.

Retail vacancies in Pukekohe are low across all categories. The Pukekohe Plaza currently has
only one unit available for lease (as at March 2019), and along King Street and Edinburgh
Street there are only a few smaller shops that are available. This indicates a tight market with
strong demand for retail space in the town centre.

There are no current vacancies in the large-format retail centres, but there are multiple sites
available for design and build developments in the area.

Industrial supply and demand trends

Pukekohe’s industrial stock is made up of 139,395sqm and 151 buildings (these include
Grade A, B and C industrial buildings). Pukekohe’s industrial vacancy rate is just below 1 per
cent, compared to the rest of Tāmaki Makaurau, which is just over 1 per cent.

By 2045, Pukekohe’s industrial sector is expected to grow by 65 per cent. Pukekohe’s
submarket of retail and wholesale trade sectors, as well as the predominantly local
manufacturing business, will dominate demand for industrial space, catering for the projected
population growth in the area.

Business activity

There are 9,370 people employed in 2,586 businesses in Pukekohe. The town’s economy has
been dynamic, growing by 58 per cent since 2000.

Pukekohe’s growth in the number of business has been comparable to broader Tāmaki
Makaurau, but its employment growth has been higher than the Tāmaki Makaurau average
(which was 50 per cent).

Based on population growth it would be expected that Pukekohe’s business economy shows
higher growth than Tāmaki Makaurau as a whole.

10. Community engagement and communication

10.1 Place-led engagement

Based on the belief that effective collaboration will regularly outperform individual or isolated
approaches, Panuku is committed to engaging regularly with key stakeholders to ensure that
urban regeneration in Pukekohe takes place in a cohesive way. This approach has proved to
offer the best chance for understanding and resolving complex issues.

Our approach to place-led engagement works across several disciplines, including:

- placemaking
- communications
- commercial place operations
- marketing
- relationship management
10.2 Listening to the community

To be effective in our work, we need to take a fresh and bold approach to stakeholder engagement and communications. We will be proactive, collaborative and authentic across our key relationships.

A priority for Panuku is our ability to maintain positive momentum and to demonstrate quick wins. Engaging hearts and minds is vital to achieving this. Establishing understanding, trust and credibility with people will help us proactively prevent negative sentiments, which can often delay progress.

Previous community consultations and legacy planning in Pukekohe have informed this regeneration plan for Pukekohe. Through these channels we know that the people of Pukekohe care about their rural communities, and that Pukekohe is a place for locals. It’s a unique blend of country heart and soul, with an urban centre. Through engagement we will deal specifically with this treasured sense of place in our engagement planning.

The rural heart of Pukekohe:

Descriptors such as the ‘Tamaki Makaurau’s food basket,’ ‘Tamaki Makaurau’s market garden’ and ‘thriving rural market town’ are terms we have regularly heard when engaging with the people of Pukekohe. Markets and farming are important elements of what makes Pukekohe a desirable place to live and work. We have heard that Pukekohe wants to retain and grow that point of distinction even while the numbers of residents, jobs and businesses increase.

We will work with the rural community through Federated Farmers, and other community representatives, to weave identity, lifestyle and the farming industry into all levels of planning. We’ll engage with the right people at the right time to ensure that the town centre growth reflects, and contributes to, the rural heart of Pukekohe.

The rural service hub:

We know from early engagement and previous planning that much of the Pukekohe’s workforce have vehicle-based businesses, and that many others use Pukekohe’s services to sustain their businesses and rural lifestyles. This includes people from a much wider catchment, including north Waikato.

Recognising that these are important considerations for the local board, businesses and the community, Panuku will work with our partners, Auckland Transport and key stakeholders to manage parking in town centre locations. To that end, we will engage early and collaboratively with:

- local trades
- town centre businesses through the business association
- rural business organisations
- private business

Local self-sufficiency

Pukekohe is proudly self-sufficient. We’ll work with local business and business partners to ensure that as Pukekohe grows and develops it retains its regional vibe and the ability to provide locals, and the rural community, with new opportunities while retaining its current offerings. We’ll engage with representative key stakeholder groups early and often throughout the life of the project.
10.3 Engagement with Māori

Through early conversations and direct engagement, three mana whenua iwi have self-identified as having strong associations with Pukekohe: Te Āktai Waikoua, Ngāti Tamahoe, Ngāti Te Ata Waihora.

Our early korero has been with these iwi, with a view to wider iwi engagement in the near future. Panuku will work in good faith with these iwi to develop a unique tikanga based approach to help guide Kia Puawai a Pukekohe.

10.4 Communications approach

The key pillar of our communications approach is that it is place led. This approach helps to ensure each development reflects the unique identity of the area, and that the collective aspirations and needs of the local community are achieved.

In Pukekohe, conversations will revolve around what could change and what the future may look like for the community. We will take the community on this journey with us as we explore local desire for growth, community initiatives and services, and parking requirements in the immediate future.

The local board and community will be invited to participate in messaging to our communities. This approach will show that Panuku is delivering on the desires of the community.

11. Next Steps

11.1 Dependencies

Table 3 shows the key dependencies for the Kia Puawai/Unlock Pukekohe programme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Moves</th>
<th>Nature of dependency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three precinct redevelopments</td>
<td>Approval from the Auckland Transport Board to release sites and community support for the future new parking arrangements. Appetite of the market to respond to potential sites for sale and appetite for the education, health and high-value employment sectors to invest in Pukekohe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public realm projects</td>
<td>Investment funding certainty and prioritisation. Agreement on scope and design with future asset owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placemaking initiatives</td>
<td>Processes and approvals to access carpark sites for temporary activations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.2 Timeframes

Panuku is working on the basis that this is a 5 to 10 year project. The estimated timeframes for Panuku-led tasks in Table 4 require further investigation and are indicative only.

Where project delivery sits with another agency, Panuku will take an advisory role.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Estimated timing</th>
<th>Delivery agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate horizon project planning</td>
<td>Approval of the HLPP by Panuku Board</td>
<td>28 May 2019</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval of the HLPP by the Planning Committee</td>
<td>4 June 2019</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval for the disposal of properties by the Finance and Performance Committee</td>
<td>18 June 2019</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kia Puawai/Unlock Pukekohe Programme Business Case</td>
<td>Late 2019</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pukekohe town centre parking strategy</td>
<td>During 2019/2020 Financial Year</td>
<td>Panuku, Auckland Transport, Franklin Local Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pukekohe Town Centre Precinct Development Plan including commercial strategy and phasing of property sales</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 11.3 Resourcing

Kia Puawai/Unlock Pukekohe will be led by a project team of Panuku staff from work areas across our organisation, including strategy, engagement, design, placemaking, development and portfolio management. At various stages of the project, there will be additional input from our partners, the wider council whānau, mana whenua, external reference groups, stakeholders and consultants.

### 11.4 Monitoring

The goals of this HLPP will be monitored and reported on 3 years after the plan’s adoption and every 3 years after that. We will use a range of performance indicators to measure success, based on an outcomes monitoring framework, which will be developed once the project is approved.
APPENDIX 1: Property map of town centre sites (excludes sites outside of the programme area investment boundary)
APPENDIX 2: Property map of all sites and the full extent of the programme area investment boundary
## APPENDIX 3: Property schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Property address</th>
<th>High level category</th>
<th>Current use</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Rating $CV</th>
<th>Current management portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27 Tobin Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dispose</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>0.0363</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Land adjacent to 35 Tobin Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dispose</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>0.0615</td>
<td>530,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>172 Manukau Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Leased Used for self-service carwash site.</td>
<td>0.0512</td>
<td>730,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>174 Manukau Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>0.1569</td>
<td>820,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>176 Manukau Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>0.0606</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>180 Manukau Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Industrial use, Existing lease in place.</td>
<td>0.2153</td>
<td>1,080,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>182 Manukau Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>0.2172</td>
<td>920,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 Roulston Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Edinburgh Superblock</td>
<td>Carpark</td>
<td>0.0544</td>
<td>565,000</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 Roulston Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Edinburgh Superblock</td>
<td>Carpark</td>
<td>0.1037</td>
<td>1,125,000</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>29 and 29a Edinburgh Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Edinburgh Superblock</td>
<td>Carpark</td>
<td>0.1695</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4 Tobin Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Carpark</td>
<td>0.2674</td>
<td>1,425,000</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9 Tobin Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Carpark</td>
<td>0.3687</td>
<td>2,025,000</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7 Massey Avenue, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Eastern Gateway</td>
<td>Carpark</td>
<td>0.5191</td>
<td>4,925,000</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>24 Hall Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Carpark</td>
<td>0.3148</td>
<td>1,825,000</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9 Hall Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Carpark</td>
<td>0.0889</td>
<td>520,000</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2 Golding Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dispose</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>0.8204</td>
<td>1,155,000</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment A - Item 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Value (NZD)</th>
<th>Responsible Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Land adjacent to 995 Paarata Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dispose</td>
<td>0.1012</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Land adjacent to 176 Princess St, West, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dispose</td>
<td>0.1019</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67 East Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dispose</td>
<td>0.0815</td>
<td>305,000</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Land adjacent to 603 Buckland Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dispose</td>
<td>0.2977</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>42 Seddon Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dispose</td>
<td>0.0300</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22 Edinburgh Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>0.1012</td>
<td>1,775,000</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>82 Manukau Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Station Precinct</td>
<td>1.3090</td>
<td>7,200,000</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17 Massey Avenue, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Edinburgh Superblock</td>
<td>0.0452</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21 Massey Avenue, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Edinburgh Superblock</td>
<td>0.2370</td>
<td>2,325,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>33 Edinburgh Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Edinburgh Superblock</td>
<td>0.1014</td>
<td>2,525,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Land adjacent to 1173 Paarata Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dispose</td>
<td>0.8491</td>
<td>131,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total (Exclude 82 Manukau Rd)**

Approx. 5.45ha

Approx. 27,000,000

---

**Key**

- Panuku managed properties
- Auckland Transport managed properties
- Auckland Council managed properties
- Previously approved Corporate Property, delegated to Panuku for disposal
- Previously approved for disposal properties managed by Panuku
## Attachment D: Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe Property schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Property address</th>
<th>High level category</th>
<th>Current use</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Rating $CV</th>
<th>Current management portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27 Tobin Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dispose</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>0.0303</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Land adjacent to 35 Tobin Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dispose</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>0.0615</td>
<td>530,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>172 Manukau Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Leased. Used for self-service carwash site</td>
<td>0.0512</td>
<td>730,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>174 Manukau Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>0.1589</td>
<td>820,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>176 Manukau Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>0.0606</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>180 Manukau Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Industrial use Existing base in place</td>
<td>0.2153</td>
<td>1,080,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>182 Manukau Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>0.2172</td>
<td>920,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 Rouiston Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Edinburgh Superblock</td>
<td>Carpark</td>
<td>0.0544</td>
<td>565,000</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 Rouiston Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Edinburgh Superblock</td>
<td>Carpark</td>
<td>0.1037</td>
<td>1,125,000</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 and 20a Edinburgh Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Edinburgh Superblock</td>
<td>Carpark</td>
<td>0.1605</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 Tobin Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Carpark</td>
<td>0.2674</td>
<td>1,425,000</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 Tobin Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Carpark</td>
<td>0.3687</td>
<td>2,025,000</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 Massey Avenue, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Eastern Gateway</td>
<td>Carpark</td>
<td>0.3191</td>
<td>4,925,000</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24 Hall Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Carpark</td>
<td>0.3148</td>
<td>1,825,000</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9 Hall Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Carpark</td>
<td>0.0889</td>
<td>520,000</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 Golding Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dispose</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>0.8204</td>
<td>1,155,000</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment D: Kia Puāwai/Unlock Pukekohe Property Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Land Description</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Value (NZD)</th>
<th>Responsible Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Land adjacent to 995 Paerata Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dispose</td>
<td>Open space with no on site amenities</td>
<td>0.1012</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Land adjacent to 176 Princess St West, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dispose</td>
<td>Open space with no on site public amenities</td>
<td>0.1019</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67 East Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dispose</td>
<td>Open space with no on site public amenities</td>
<td>0.0815</td>
<td>305,000</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Land adjacent to 603 Auckland Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dispose</td>
<td>Stock pound</td>
<td>0.2987</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>42 Seddon Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dispose</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>0.0300</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22 Edinburgh Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Plunket</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>1,775,000</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>82 Manukau Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Station Precinct</td>
<td>Corporate property accommodation</td>
<td>1.3090</td>
<td>7,200,000</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17 Messay Avenue, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Edinburgh Supertblock</td>
<td>Commercial use, Leased</td>
<td>0.0452</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21 Messay Avenue, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Edinburgh Supertblock</td>
<td>Commercial use, Leased</td>
<td>0.2370</td>
<td>2,325,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>33 Edinburgh Street, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Edinburgh Supertblock</td>
<td>Commercial use, Leased</td>
<td>0.1014</td>
<td>2,525,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Land adjacent to 1173 Paerata Road, Pukekohe</td>
<td>Dispose</td>
<td>Vacant land</td>
<td>0.8491</td>
<td>131,000</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total (Exclude 82 Manukau Rd)**

| Approx 5.45ha | Approx 27,000,000 |

**Key**

- Panuku managed properties
- Auckland Transport managed properties
- Auckland Council managed properties
- Previously approved Corporate Property, delegated to Panuku for disposal
- Previously approved for disposal properties managed by Panuku
Adoption of Warkworth Structure Plan
File No.: CP2019/07446

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek the adoption of the Warkworth Structure Plan.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. Auckland is growing rapidly and to accommodate a portion of the region’s growth Warkworth has been identified as a satellite town and earmarked to support significant future business and residential development. Around 1,000ha of land immediately surrounding Warkworth has been zoned Future Urban. Before any urban development of the Future Urban zone can occur, the land must be structure planned. The Warkworth Structure Plan sets out the pattern of land uses and the supporting infrastructure network for the Future Urban zoned land around Warkworth.

3. The structure plan has been prepared in the context of the existing town of Warkworth and seeks to weave the new development areas back into the fabric of the existing urban area. The structure plan builds on the opportunities and constraints in and around the Future Urban zone. It also has taken on board feedback from a number of public engagement phases, including community workshops in June 2018 to generate ideas on how Warkworth’s Future Urban zone could be laid out, and public feedback on a draft version of the plan in February/March 2019. It also responds to feedback from two hui with the relevant iwi.

4. The structure plan map is shown in Figure 1 below and some of the key high-level features of the draft Warkworth Structure Plan include:
   - ecological and stormwater areas are set aside from any built urban development
   - the new residential areas across the Future Urban zone enable around 7,500 dwellings and offer a range of living types from spacious sections around the fringe to more intensive dwellings such as town houses and apartments around the new small centres and along public transport routes
   - Warkworth’s local and rural character is protected through various measures including provisions to protect the bush-clad town centre backdrop by the Mahurangi River and retaining the Morrisons orchard as a rural feature of the town
   - new employment areas are identified, comprising land for new industry (e.g. warehousing, manufacturing, wholesalers, repair services) and land for small centres (e.g. convenience retail, local offices, restaurants/cafés). The existing Warkworth town centre by the Mahurangi River will remain as the focal point of the town.

5. The land uses are supported by infrastructure including:
   - prioritising active transport in Warkworth through a separated walking and cycling network providing connectivity to new and existing centres, employment areas, schools and public transport stations
   - a roading network including a potential southern interchange on Ara Tūhono – Pūhoi to Warkworth (south facing ramps only)
   - a public transport network built upon the recently introduced ‘New Network for Warkworth’ which in the long term has a bus station/interchange in Warkworth’s southern local centre and a Park and Ride near the potential Ara Tūhono – Pūhoi to Warkworth southern interchange
• other infrastructure providers for utilities such as wastewater, water, power supply, telephone, broadband, community facilities, schools, and healthcare have plans underway to service the planned growth of Warkworth.

6. The development of Warkworth’s Future Urban zone will occur over the long-term and is sequenced in stages over the next 20 years as bulk infrastructure capacity allows.

Figure 1: Warkworth Structure Plan
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:
a) adopt the Warkworth Structure Plan as shown in Attachment A of the agenda report.
b) authorise the Manager North, West and Islands to make any minor amendments to the Warkworth Structure Plan in order to improve its legibility and correct any errors.

Horopaki
Context
7. Around 1,000ha of land immediately surrounding Warkworth has been zoned Future Urban as shown on Figure 2 below. Before any urban development of the Future Urban zone can occur, the Auckland Unitary Plan operative in part 2016 ('Unitary Plan') requires that land must be structure planned. The Warkworth Structure Plan is the response to that requirement and sets out the pattern of land uses and the supporting infrastructure network for the Future Urban zoned land around Warkworth.

Figure 2: Future Urban zoned land around Warkworth (the structure plan study area)
The Warkworth Structure Plan process began in December 2017 and contained seven phases. Detail on each phase can be found in section 2.5 of the Warkworth Structure Plan document in Attachment A and each phase is briefly described below:

- **Phase 1:** A series of technical ‘Topic Reports’ were prepared to understand the existing environment within the study area and the opportunities and constraints for development.
- **Phase 2:** The initial public consultation for the project in April 2018. The purpose of this consultation was to promote awareness of the project, receive comments on the topic reports, and gain a local perspective on what is valued in Warkworth and potential opportunities and constraints associated with its growth.
- **Phase 3:** The community structure plan workshops in June 2018. The purpose of the workshops was to involve the public in ‘hands-on’ sessions to generate ideas on how the Warkworth Structure Plan could look in terms of a land use layout and supporting infrastructure.
- **Phase 4:** The structure plan team then reported back to the community in August 2018 through two open days to summarise the outcomes of the workshops.
- **Phase 5:** Developing the draft plan for consultation. The draft plan was shaped using inputs from the topic reports (opportunities and constraints), consultation feedback (from April 2018), iwi feedback, the community workshops ideas, and internal specialist workshops.
- **Phase 6:** Consultation with the community to receive feedback on the draft Warkworth Structure Plan during February and March 2019. A copy of the draft Warkworth Structure Plan map is shown on Figure 3 below.
- **Phase 7:** Reviewing the public feedback in April/May 2019 and making any required changes to the draft plan.
Figure 3: DRAFT Warkworth Structure Plan
9. Mana whenua engagement and discussions have been ongoing throughout the structure plan project and four hui were held. The feedback from the hui was generally supportive of the process and the overall structure plan direction, particularly the Green Network concept.

10. At key phases of the process, the Structure Plan Political Reference Group set up by the Planning Committee provided guidance on the plan and authorised the release of the draft plan for feedback. The plan is now ready for adoption by the Planning Committee.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**  
**Analysis and advice**

11. A draft version of the Warkworth Structure Plan was put out for public feedback during February and March 2019. The consultation on the draft plan included drop in days at the Warkworth Town Hall, an event stand and sausage sizzle outside Warkworth New World supermarket, and a number of community group meetings. A total of 219 pieces of feedback on the draft plan were received.

12. Overall, there was an even level of support and opposition on the draft Warkworth Structure Plan. The general comments on the plan were mainly around transport, the scope of the plan, open space provision, new facilities sought, business land, and generally ensuring infrastructure is provided before growth is enabled.

13. There was strong feedback on some specific elements of the plan including opposition to the industrial land. There was a desire that it be reduced and be more clustered. There were also concerns about the interface between industry and residential areas and/or streams. There was support for the indicative parks shown in the draft plan and two-thirds support for the retention of the Morrison’s Orchard.

14. There were 83 site specific requests covering zonings, overlays/controls and staging. Of these, 34 supported the indicative zonings, mainly around the proposed Single House zoning for the Viv Davie-Martin Drive area and Warkworth North East. A total of 49 requests opposed the indicative zonings shown in the draft structure plan and requested changes. The most common areas where changes were requested were the Viv Davie-Martin Drive area (to lower density zones) and 89ha of the 90ha of industrial land (to residential, mixed use or general business).

15. There were 31 requests on site or area specific matters around the Green Network and these mostly commented that the mapping was incorrect. There were 22 requests seeking to add, remove, amend or support various overlays/controls shown in the plan.

16. There were 25 requests that related to site or area specific staging matters. The majority of these were supporting the Viv Davie-Martin Drive area being sequenced for development in 2022 as shown in the draft structure plan. There were also requests seeking that the Warkworth North East area be brought forward to the first stage (2022).

17. Further details on the feedback on the draft structure plan are included in the Engagement Summary on the draft plan in Attachment B.

18. Based on the feedback, a number of changes have been made to the draft structure plan. Generally, rezoning requests were accepted where a compelling case was made to show that the rezoning was suitable in light of any site specific issues while also being consistent with the zoning principles in the plan and the overall land use layout sought for the of the wider town. Other rezonings were not supported because they did not demonstrate adherence to the above matters.

19. The key areas where zone changes have occurred between the draft structure plan and the final structure plan are explained below and identified on the map in Figure 4.
Figure 4: Key areas of change between the draft and final structure plans

- **Area 1**: Various changes including a change from Large Lot to Single House (with an overlay to increase the minimum site size from 600m$^2$ to around 1,000m$^2$, landscape controls and planting) around the northern edge of Warkworth and increased residential density enabled around the Warkworth Showgrounds.

- **Area 2**: A new small Neighbourhood Centre enabled in the northwest to service the needs of a relatively constrained catchment, being the northern part of the residential area to the west, and the industrial zones to the east.

- **Area 3**: Increased residential density enabled around the new small centre.

- **Area 4**: Retention of the Single House zone but the addition of an overlay to increase the minimum site size from 600m$^2$ to somewhere around 1,500m$^2$ – 2,500m$^2$ (to be determined at the plan change stage). This is to reflect the compromised nature of this area to achieve standard urban development and also acknowledges the current spacious residential amenity of the area.

- **Area 5**: Shifting the western Neighbourhood Centre further south to the other side of Woodcocks Road, in light of the additional centre in the north west.
• **Area 6:** Changing from Orchard to Large Lot as this steep land is not required for the orchard operation and it is part of the knoll feature in the south of Warkworth that has the Large Lot zone and landscape overlay on it.

• **Area 7:** Change from Light Industry to Mixed Housing Suburban reflecting the general opposition to the amount of industrial land proposed in the draft plan, the visual impacts of industrial development in this area, the topography of the land making feasible industrial development difficult, the ability to use the ridgeline to demarcate an industrial/residential boundary, and the still high overall future local employment anticipated for Warkworth. The land adjoins other Mixed Housing Suburban zoned land.

• **Area 8:** Change from Single House to Mixed Housing Suburban to be consistent with a granted resource consent that allows for a type of development (lot sizes) more in keeping with the Mixed Housing Suburban zone.

• **Area 9:** Change from Single House to Large Lot to reduce the number of urban neighbours along this rural/urban interface to mitigate the possibility of reverse sensitivity issues arising. A landscape screening area along this boundary is also indicated on the structure plan.

20. The final structure plan has shown the zone boundaries in a more general way than in the draft plan. This is because the structure plan zonings are high-level and indicative only and are likely to be refined through a later (more detailed) plan change process.

21. There was also feedback requesting changes to the staging of the development areas in the draft Warkworth Structure Plan. This was mostly seeking that areas sequenced for later on (2028 onwards) be brought forward to be part of the first stage in 2022.

22. The final Warkworth Structure Plan does not propose to change the sequencing to bring forward any areas as requested through feedback. This is due to the significant infrastructure funding issue combined with the council’s quality, compact city approach set out in the Auckland Unitary Plan and Auckland Plan 2050 Development Strategy. The staging in the Warkworth Structure Plan remains the same as that identified in the council’s Future Urban Land Supply Strategy.

23. Various text changes have been made to the structure plan document to update it in light of the zone changes above and in response to other feedback.

24. A separate report has been prepared that outlines a number of the main themes/requests from the feedback and explains why the final structure plan incorporates some changes from feedback and not others. This ‘Response to feedback on the draft plan’ report is included in Attachment C.

25. The final structure plan map for adoption is shown in Figure 1 and some of the key high-level features of the draft Warkworth Structure Plan include:

• ecological and stormwater areas are set aside from any built urban development

• the new residential areas across the Future Urban zone enable around 7,500 dwellings and offer a range of living types from spacious sections around the fringe to more intensive dwellings such as town houses and apartments around the new small centres and along public transport routes

• Warkworth’s local and rural character is protected through various measures including provisions to protect the bush-clad town centre backdrop by the Mahurangi River and retaining the Morrisons orchard as a rural feature of the town

• new employment areas are identified, comprising land for new industry (e.g. warehousing, manufacturing, wholesalers, repair services) and land for small centres (e.g. convenience retail, local offices, restaurants/cafés). The existing Warkworth town centre by the Mahurangi River will remain as the focal point of the town.
26. The land uses are supported by infrastructure including:
   - prioritising active transport in Warkworth through a separated walking and cycling network providing connectivity to new and existing centres, employment areas, schools and public transport stations
   - a roading network including a potential southern interchange on Ara Tūhono – Pūhoi to Warkworth (south facing ramps only)
   - a public transport network built upon the recently introduced ‘New Network for Warkworth’ which in the long term has a bus station/interchange in Warkworth’s southern local centre and a Park and Ride near the potential Ara Tūhono – Pūhoi to Warkworth southern interchange
   - other infrastructure providers for utilities such as wastewater, water, power supply, telephone, broadband, community facilities, schools, and healthcare have plans underway to service the planned growth of Warkworth.

27. The development of Warkworth’s Future Urban zone will occur over the long-term and is sequenced in stages over the next 20 years as bulk infrastructure capacity allows.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera Council group impacts and views

28. Watercare and Auckland Transport have representatives on the Warkworth Structure Plan project team and on the Structure Plan Steering Group.

29. The council’s structure plan team have worked closely with the Supporting Growth Alliance. This is a collaboration between the New Zealand Transport Agency, Auckland Transport, and Auckland Council. The purpose of the Supporting Growth Programme is to identify and protect the transport networks to support Auckland’s planned greenfield growth over the next 30 years.

30. The council’s Warkworth Structure Plan team has also been working with various internal council teams including parks, healthy waters, and community facilities, as well as external infrastructure providers such as the Ministry of Education, Transpower, Vector, Waitemata District Health Board, and Chorus.

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

31. Rodney Local Board has been briefed a number of times during the project (22 February 2018, 24 May 2018, 7 March 2019 and 4 April 2019). The last briefing outlined the main feedback themes on the draft plan. The Rodney Local Board is supportive of the structure plan project and has not raised any significant concerns around the plan or process.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori Māori impact statement

32. The Warkworth Structure Plan team sought an ongoing dialogue with mana whenua to meet the needs and aspirations of iwi authorities and strengthen the structure plan. Warkworth sits within the area of interest of approximately 13 mana whenua groups.

33. In July 2017, the structure planning programme was introduced by the Plans and Places senior leadership team at a meeting with the Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum of mana whenua governance to socialise the structure planning programme and seek guidance on engagement.
34. In January/February 2018, letters were sent to the 13 mana whenua groups to further introduce the structure plan process and to gauge their interest in participating. Of these, the following five mana whenua groups indicated that they would like to be involved in the Warkworth Structure Plan project:
- Ngāti Manuhiri
- Te Kawerau ā Maki
- Ngaati Whanaunga
- Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whatua
- Ngāti Whatua o Kaipara

35. Mana whenua engagement and discussions have been ongoing throughout the structure plan project and four hui have been undertaken. Ngāti Manuhiri and Ngāti Whatua o Kaipara attended all the hui while the other iwi groups listed above attended the initial hui.

36. The first of these was held in April 2018 in Warkworth. The purpose of this initial hui was to introduce the project, establish an ongoing relationship with mana whenua, and understand how they wanted to be involved in the project.

37. Following this hui, iwi were invited to provide a cultural assessment of the area prior to drafting of the plan. Two cultural values assessments were received from Ngāti Manuhiri and Ngāti Whatua o Kaipara.

38. A second hui was held in July 2018 to discuss responses to the two cultural values assessments, Treaty settlement information, and to undertake a planning exercise akin to the community workshops. The iwi represented at the hui preferred not to undertake the mapping exercise but rather outline key principles that they wanted the structure plan to consider.

39. A third hui was held in September 2018 where the council presented some of the key ideas being developed for the preliminary draft structure plan and demonstrated how the principles outlined at the July hui had influenced this early version of the plan.

40. A fourth hui was held in March 2019 where the council presented the draft structure plan and sought feedback on it. Overall, the feedback was generally supportive of the draft structure plan.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

41. The adoption of the Warkworth Structure Plan has no direct significant implications for the council. However, the next stages of developing the Future Urban zone around Warkworth will include, in due course, a plan change to the Auckland Unitary Plan and the provision of various forms of infrastructure. The costs of a plan change will be met from the operating budget of the Plans and Places Department. The infrastructure identified in the structure plan will have implications for the budgets and long term planning of various council departments that provide infrastructure (e.g. parks, community facilities) as well as Watercare and Auckland Transport.

42. Subsequent reports will be presented to the relevant committee(s) in relation to the provision of infrastructure within Warkworth and other structure plan areas.
Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

43. There are not considered to be any significant risks in adopting the Warkworth Structure Plan. The structure plan is a non-statutory document and therefore cannot be appealed. The next stage of notifying a plan change to implement parts of the structure plan will enable the structure plan to be challenged through a hearing and possible appeals.

44. The plan does create public expectations that rezoning will occur soon, but that risk is an unavoidable consequence and can be mitigated with key messaging around staging/the provision of bulk infrastructure.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

45. Following the adoption of the Warkworth Structure Plan, its implementation starts with the preparation of a plan change to the Auckland Unitary Plan to change the current Future Urban zone to appropriate urban zones. This will be done in stages as guided by the Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (2017) and therefore the Warkworth North area will be the subject of the first Plan Change. This work could commence when it is clear that the appropriate funding for infrastructure is confirmed.

46. The plan changes will be prepared in accordance with the first schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). During the plan change process more detailed matters will be determined and there will be opportunity for residents, key stakeholders and mana whenua to be involved.

47. The implementation of the structure plan will also occur through various parts of council, Auckland Transport, Watercare and other organisations including the identified infrastructure projects in their long-term budgets.

Ngā tāpirihanga

Attachments

Due to the size and complexity of Attachments A to C they have been published separately at the following link: http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz > Planning Committee > 4 June 2019 > Attachments
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Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. This report seeks retrospective approval of Auckland Council’s submission on the New Zealand Infrastructure Commission/Te Waihanga Bill.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
2. In February 2019, Treasury released a Cabinet paper outlining the government’s final proposal to establish a new independent infrastructure body, the New Zealand Infrastructure Commission/Te Waihanga.

3. The Cabinet paper noted that legislation would be needed to establish the commission. This legislation, the New Zealand Infrastructure Commission/Te Waihanga Bill (the bill), was introduced into Parliament on 8 April 2019 and referred to the Select Committee.


5. Auckland Council’s submission (Attachment A) supports the establishment of the new infrastructure advisory body, but requests changes to the bill to clarify the role of the commission in relation to infrastructure owned and/or managed by local government.

6. As there was insufficient time to take a submission to the Planning Committee prior to the closing date, the draft submission was circulated to all elected members and key council and CCO staff on 2 May 2019 with a request for feedback.

7. The feedback received informed Council’s final submission, which was subsequently endorsed by the Mayor, Deputy Mayor, Planning Committee Chair and Deputy Chair prior to the submission closing date.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) approve Auckland Council’s submission dated 17 May 2019 to the Finance and Expenditure Select Committee on the New Zealand Infrastructure Commission/Te Waihanga Bill.
Horopaki Context

8. In August 2018, Cabinet agreed in principle to establish a new independent infrastructure body.

9. A discussion document on the proposal was released for consultation in October 2018. Treasury received nearly 130 submissions. No submissions opposed the proposal to establish an infrastructure body.

10. Auckland Council’s submission supported the proposal but sought clarification on how infrastructure prioritisation would be undertaken and expressed views around how the new body could best support project delivery (Resolution number GB/2018/176). A copy of the council’s submission on the proposal can be accessed here: https://treasury.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2019-02/niib-subm-4037521-auckland-council.pdf


Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

13. The bill seeks to establish the commission as an autonomous Crown entity governed by a board of directors. The intended purpose of the commission is to co-ordinate, develop and promote an approach to infrastructure that encourages infrastructure, and services that result from the infrastructure, that improves the well-being of New Zealanders.

14. The commission is proposed to serve an advisory function only. It would not fund infrastructure.

15. The bill proposes that the commission has powers to require information from central government agencies, but it does not propose this power extends to local government.

16. A key output of the commission would be the development of a 30-year long-term infrastructure strategy.

17. Council staff worked with Watercare Services Limited, Auckland Transport and Pānuku Development Auckland in developing the council’s submission, which is attached to this report (Attachment A).

18. Auckland Council’s submission:
   - seeks greater recognition and clarification of the role of local government in relation to the commission
   - supports extending the commission’s information-gathering powers to local government
   - expresses views around the governance of the commission.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera
Council group impacts and views

19. Feedback on the draft submission was received from a range of Auckland Council staff with roles in infrastructure planning and delivery. Pānuku Development Auckland and Auckland Transport broadly supported Council’s final submission.

20. Watercare Services Limited made its own submission on the bill. Its policy position is consistent with that of Auckland Council, but seeks that the commission’s strategy report has a view out to 50 years, rather than 30 years. Council’s submission is silent on this issue.

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

21. The draft submission was circulated to all elected members, including local board members on 2 May 2019, along with a supporting memo inviting feedback on the draft submission. No feedback was received.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

22. The commission will be advising on future infrastructure needs and building consensus around a longer-term pipeline of infrastructure projects. This is an opportunity to build a better platform for partnership, as this long-term view is more aligned with a Te Ao Māori intergenerational worldview.

23. The purpose of the commission, as set out in the bill, has an emphasis on well-being. This aligns well with the Māori Plan for Tāmaki Makaurau, which also uses a well-being lens (the four pou). Council’s submission seeks to strengthen the well-being focus in the bill and link it more explicitly with the Local Government Act.

24. The establishment of the commission as a Crown entity governed by a board of directors would have an impact on the relationship between the Crown and iwi, and local government and Māori.

25. The draft submission was circulated to all Independent Māori Statutory Board members on 2 May 2019, along with a supporting memo inviting feedback on the draft submission. No feedback was received.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications

26. The commission would have an advisory role only. There would not be any change to the decision-making responsibilities of local or central government, as such, there are no direct financial implications on council from supporting this bill.

27. However, the commission would provide potential opportunities to identify and deliver better value for money from both council and central government infrastructure work programmes.

28. The commission would have the ability to embed its staff into agencies to provide support for infrastructure projects where appropriate.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations

29. If Council’s submission is withdrawn the Select Committee will not be informed of or take into consideration Auckland Council’s position on this bill.
Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

30. The government intends to have the commission operational by 1 October 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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Submission to the Finance and Expenditure Committee

Overview

This is Auckland Council’s submission in response to the New Zealand Infrastructure Commission/Te Waihanga Bill. This submission has been endorsed by the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Planning Committee, the Deputy Mayor and the Mayor of Auckland. The Planning Committee is a committee of the whole governing body, including members of the Independent Māori Statutory Board.

About Auckland

Auckland is New Zealand’s most populous city. Auckland’s current population of 1.66 million people is estimated to grow to around 2.4 million by 2050. Auckland is one of the world’s most diverse cities and has the highest Polynesian population in the world.

Auckland’s regional economy is the largest in New Zealand and makes the greatest contribution to national gross domestic product (GDP). In the year to March 2018, the Auckland region contributed just over 37 per cent of New Zealand’s GDP.

About Auckland Council

Auckland Council is a unitary authority, and the largest local government organisation in Australasia. The council has a governing body, which consists of the Mayor and 20 councillors, and 21 local boards. Auckland Council also has several council-controlled organisations, which it gives direction to through its statement of intent.

Delivering services effectively and efficiently and providing value for money for ratepayers requires prudent financial governance. To achieve this, the council’s financial strategy is one of balance; all operating costs are met out of revenue, and borrowing is only used to fund long-term infrastructure. This helps to spread the costs of those assets across the generations of Aucklanders that will benefit from them. To
ensure we are borrowing wisely, we monitor our borrowing levels relative to our income and the value of our assets.

About the Auckland Plan 2050

The Auckland Plan 2050 is Auckland’s long-term spatial plan. It looks ahead to 2050 and considers how we will address our key challenges of:

(i) high population growth
(ii) shared prosperity, and
(iii) environmental degradation.

The plan has been prepared in response to the requirements under section 79 of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 which is that the council must prepare and adopt a spatial plan for Auckland, and that the spatial plan’s purpose is to contribute to Auckland’s social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing. It is important that the commission have regard for the Auckland Plan 2050 when undertaking initiatives aimed at having a positive influence on Auckland. This submission has been guided by the Auckland Plan 2050.

The plan has six outcomes and a development strategy. The plan can be accessed here.
Introduction

Auckland Council welcomes the opportunity to submit on the New Zealand Infrastructure Commission/Te Waihanga Bill. The Council supports the establishment of a new infrastructure body with the purpose of coordinating, developing and promoting an approach to infrastructure that improves the well-being of New Zealanders.

Auckland Council has multiple roles in the planning and delivery of infrastructure and is a major investor across a range of infrastructure types. Responsibilities for infrastructure are spread across the council group. Decisions on infrastructure investments are important to achieving the outcomes identified in the overarching strategy for the region, the Auckland Plan 2050.

Continued population growth in the Auckland Region is putting pressure on the council group to expand infrastructure and services. Currently, the way infrastructure is funded and delivered means those who benefit most from new investment often do not pay a commensurate share of the cost. This can promote reactive and short-term investment decisions, which come at the expense of providing the greater certainty needed to proactively invest and plan for long-term infrastructure needs. The commission will seek to address some of these existing challenges.

The proposed role and functions of the commission align well with the three key challenges in Auckland’s 30-year infrastructure strategy: coordinating investment and planning to enable growth; enhancing the performance of Auckland’s infrastructure; and creating resilient infrastructure networks. An independent assessment of the state of New Zealand’s infrastructure assets and advice on the nation’s long-term infrastructure needs are important aspects of creating a long-term pipeline of infrastructure investment.

Auckland Council looks forward to working collaboratively with the commission in carrying out its proposed functions. Council is particularly keen to work with Government on the development of a prioritisation framework and criteria for identifying priority infrastructure needs.
Key issues

Auckland Council has a general concern that the bill in its current form concentrates on the role of the Crown and does not sufficiently recognise the significant role of local government as a provider of infrastructure. The role and function of the commission clearly covers infrastructure owned and managed by local government. Given Auckland’s unique size, scale and governance arrangements, we request that the commission seek Council’s knowledge and guidance in carrying out its functions, particularly as they relate to Auckland. Council also asks that the following issues be addressed:

1. Increase the membership of the commission and ensure representation from local government
2. Extend the information-gathering powers to include local government
3. Ensure alignment between the commission and local government
4. Clarify the interpretation of key terms
5. Provide a trigger for infrastructure projects.
6. Have greater focus on existing infrastructure
7. Strengthen the independence of the commission
8. Include performance and review mechanisms.

These are further detailed in sections 1 to 7 of Council’s submission.
1. Increase the membership of the commission and ensure representation from local government

Recommendation: The commission have no fewer than 5 members, and include representation from the local government sector

Clause 8 currently states that the commission must have no fewer than 3, and not more than 7, members. Council is of the view that to ensure well balanced representation, and considering the scope of the commission’s functions, there should be no fewer than 5 members, and the membership should include representation from local government. We suggest that this representation comprise a minimum of two member(s) from the Local Government New Zealand National Council or their nominee.

Recommendation: Specify the composition of; and appointment process for; the commission’s board of directors

This bill should specify the composition of the commission’s board of directors, both in terms of expertise (for example engineering, finance and governance) and sectoral representation of the owners/managers of New Zealand’s largest infrastructure assets (central and local government and any other significant ownership interest). Where it is not already provided for in the Crown Entities Act, this bill should also specify the appointment process for these roles, so that it is clear and transparent what the role of the Minister and other arms of government is (if any), and where advice around appointments is to be received from.

2. Extend information-gathering powers to include local government

Recommendation: Include local government agencies in the list of agencies the commission can request information from

Clause 23 sets out powers to obtain information from central government agencies, but not local government. Local government is a large provider of New Zealand’s infrastructure. Council is therefore of the view that the same powers to obtain information should extend to local government agencies also. This will assist the commission in developing a full picture of the country’s infrastructure needs.

3. Ensure alignment between the commission and local government

Recommendation: That the main function of the Commission be amended to fit with the well-being bill amendments

Council considers that the main function of the commission in clause 9 should be amended to ensure its purpose is aligned with the Local Government (Community
Well-being) Amendment Bill. That is, to have appropriate regard to the resulting outcomes that infrastructure has for the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of New Zealanders. This will assist in ensuring strong alignment between the work of the commission and that of local government.

**Recommendation: Ensure alignment with s101B of the Local Government Act 2002 and require the infrastructure strategy have appropriate regard to resilience**

Clause 11 does not require the commission to provide for or have regard to the financial and non-financial resilience of network infrastructure. Given the need to work with local government on these issues, the role of the commission in identifying infrastructure needs and priorities should be better aligned with the role of local authority infrastructure strategies. We suggest the addition of the same or similar words from section 101B para. 3(e) of the Local Government Act, be added to clause 11(b) to provide for the resilience of infrastructure assets by identifying and managing risks relating to natural hazards and by making appropriate financial provision for those risks. Section 101B para. 3(e) of the Local Government Act takes the following abbreviated form:

(3) The infrastructure strategy must outline how the local authority intends to manage its infrastructure assets, taking into account the need to-

(e) provide for the resilience of infrastructure assets by identifying and managing risks relating to natural hazards and by making appropriate financial provision for those risks.

4. Clarify the interpretation of key terms

a. Definition of Infrastructure

Currently, the bill defines infrastructure as meaning “physical infrastructure in New Zealand or that results in services in New Zealand”. Council supports this definition of infrastructure, as the explanatory note in the bill provides some direction on the commission’s priority infrastructure types; “transport, water, energy, social assets (such as schools and hospitals), and digital networks (such as mobile and broadband networks)”. We seek confirmation that the scope of the commission’s work on transport infrastructure will include all modes of transport (by land, air and sea), including key transport nodes (such as ports and airports) that facilitate the movement of people, goods and services. Council considers waste should also be included, for reasons outlined below.
b. Include waste in the commission’s remit

As highlighted in our previous submission, Council considers that the role and responsibilities of the commission should explicitly include waste and recycling infrastructure. The lack of a coordinated, nationwide approach to planning and delivering waste infrastructure has created a fragmented response to waste management that misses out on economies of scale and means that many communities have poor access to recycling services. By including waste and recycling infrastructure as part of the commission’s scope of works, New Zealand will be better equipped to develop the infrastructure it needs to enable a more circular economy that allows waste to be turned into commodities and resources.

c. Definition of community expectations

Recommendation: That the bill’s use of the term community expectations be changed to community needs

In addition to clarifying the definition of infrastructure, Council suggests that the bill’s definition and use of the term community expectations be changed to community needs. In Council’s experience, there may be substantial differences between a community’s expectations of infrastructure and their actual infrastructure needs. Council considers that to use community needs in the bill would establish a far more robust and evidential basis for monitoring and advising on planning and delivery.

5. Provide a trigger for infrastructure projects

Recommendation: Include a trigger relating to strategic impact and/or significance of projects to determine the commission’s involvement

It is not possible or appropriate for the commission to be involved in all infrastructure provided by local government. A trigger should be added to the bill that relates to the significance of projects in terms of strategic impact and/or investment to determine the commission’s involvement. Council’s interpretation is that clause 13 implies such a trigger. We note that this is the approach used in the Infrastructure New South Wales Act 2011, where a trigger is included in the definition of major infrastructure project.¹

¹ See section 4 (page 2) of the Infrastructure NSW Act 2011 No 23.  
6. Have greater focus on existing infrastructure

*Recommendation: Clause 10 to acknowledge the management of infrastructure assets including maintenance, renewal and demand management and the funding and pricing of infrastructure assets.*

While Council does not want the commission forming and lobbying a position on Council’s operational funding decisions, we would like to see greater provision in this bill for advice on how to better manage existing infrastructure networks. Given the commission’s role in improving the quality of information on our existing infrastructure networks, we consider this a natural fit for the commission, and an important ‘value add’ for local government.

Delivering new infrastructure is becoming more expensive, and local government is struggling to adapt its existing infrastructure networks to be more resilient to a changing climate. Many infrastructure assets provide services that span several decades. These have a long-lasting impact on urban form. It is important for the commission’s role and responsibilities to appropriately recognise that most of our *future infrastructure*, even in 30 or 50 years’ time, already exists today.

The commission could play a significant strategic role through advising on how to better manage existing infrastructure to meet future needs. For instance, through innovative thinking and leadership on topics such as; providing for growth (renewing and upgrading assets at the same time), better managing demand, applying new technology and changing the way we operate our networks.

7. Strengthen the independence of the commission

*Recommendation: Amendments to clauses 15 and 18 to strengthen the independence of the commission and clarification on the intent of clause 22*

Feedback from earlier consultation on this proposal revealed a widely-held view that for the commission to be credible and successful, it must be sufficiently independent of government and able to critique the sitting government’s infrastructure priorities. However, there are several provisions in this bill that risk compromising the commission’s independence.

Clause 15(3), requires the commission have regard to the Minister’s comments on the draft strategy report. This specific requirement, in the absence of a requirement to have the same regard to any other parties’ views on the draft report, could lead to...
undue influence by the Minister. We suggest that the report also be provided to local
government for comment prior to publication.

Clause 18 requires the Minister to present a statement of the government’s response
to the strategy report to the House. However, the bill does not specify what this
response needs to include. Council’s interpretation is that there is no provision in the
bill that requires the Minister do anything more than acknowledge receipt of the
report in his/her response. Ideally the Minister’s response should outline, with
reasoning, key differences in the government’s infrastructure priorities from those of
the commission.

Council asks for clarification/confirmation on the timing of the requirement under
clause 22 for the commission to publish all strategy reports provided to the Minister.
That is, whether the draft strategy report provided to the minister under clause 14 can
be published prior to the Minister providing comments on the draft (and clause 15
being satisfied), and whether the final report can be published on a website once
provided to the Minister (and clause 16 being satisfied), but before it is presented to
the House under clause 17.

8. Include performance and review mechanisms

Recommendation: Ensure appropriate provision is made for performance and
review mechanisms

The Cabinet Paper Establishing a New Independent Infrastructure Body (February
2019) outlined two performance and review mechanisms². The first was an annual
performance monitoring process whereby the Minister could set annual performance
expectations through a Statement of Intent and Statement of Performance
Expectations, on which the commission would report. Council supports this and
understands requirement for this is set out in the Crown Entities Act 2004. However,
the recommendation that Treasury would review the form and functions of the
infrastructure body five years after establishment has not been included in this bill.
Council strongly recommends that this review is provided for in the bill.

Auckland Council does not wish to speak to its submission.

² See para. 55-57 and recommendation 16 (pgs. 13 & 16) of the Feb 2019 Cabinet Paper. Available
online here.
Te take mō te pūrongo

Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval of the grant recommendations for the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme 2018/2019 funding round.

Whakarāpopototanga matua

Executive summary
2. The Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme aims to incentivise best practice, increase understanding and encourage community involvement in the care of regionally significant heritage sites and places. It is focused on funding projects that benefit historic heritage places and outcomes that are relevant to all of Auckland.

3. The Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme was established through the Community Grants Policy adopted in December 2014. In March 2016, the Auckland Development Committee adopted the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme framework which outlined the regional significance criteria and assessment criteria for the grant applications. This framework has been included as Attachment A.

4. The Regional Historic Heritage Grant fund has a total of $83,640 available for allocation in the 2018/2019 financial year, as approved through the Long-term Plan 2015-2025. In total, 25 applications were received for the 2018/2019 funding round, requesting a total of $428,171.90. One application did not meet grant programme eligibility criteria.

5. Following the assessment of applications, it is recommended that six applications are supported with grants totalling $83,640, ranging in value from $5,900 to $18,640 with an average grant of $13,940. It is also recommended that a further 15 applications are declined for the reasons outlined in Attachment B of this report.

6. Applicants will be notified of funding decisions as soon as practical, following confirmed allocation. Successful grant recipients will then have 12 months to complete the project work. At the end of this grant term recipients will be required to meet project accountability requirements detailing how funding has been used and what has been achieved through their project.

Ngā tūtohunga

Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) approve the grant allocations for the 2018/2019 Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme funding round, as listed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation/Individual</th>
<th>Amount recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Point Chevalier Social Enterprise Trust</td>
<td>$12,420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick and Elizabeth Gailer</td>
<td>$13,118.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Bulbulia</td>
<td>$18,562.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warkworth Lions Charitable Trust</td>
<td>$18,640.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) decline the other 15 applications for the reasons identified in Attachment B of the agenda report

**Horopaki Context**

7. The Community Grants Policy, adopted by Auckland Council in December 2014, recognises regional grant funding programmes as a key tool by which council can support communities to implement the regional visions and aspirations, as set out in the Auckland Plan and other regional strategic documents.

8. The Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme, established through the Community Grants Policy, supports the following outcomes:
   - regulations in the Auckland Unitary Plan are supported by incentives to protect and conserve significant historic heritage places
   - Auckland Council, mana whenua, community organisations, and property owners work together to support kaitiakitanga and stewardship of historic heritage
   - Aucklanders see Council investment in historic heritage
   - historic heritage grants unlock private and community investment in heritage conservation.

9. To be eligible for funding through the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme, projects need to meet one of the following eligibility criteria for regional significance:
   - historic heritage places that are included in one of the schedules of the Auckland Unitary Plan, including the Historic Heritage Schedule, Sites of Significance to Mana Whenua, contributing sites within a Historic Heritage Area and contributing buildings within a Special Character Area.
   - historic heritage places that are unscheduled but demonstrated to be of regional significance, subject to evidence that the site has interim protection through heritage covenants as well as a letter from the applicant confirming support for scheduling the site under the relevant heritage overlay.

10. For the 2018/2019 funding round, the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme welcomed grant applications that aligned with the following programme priorities:
    - conservation of regionally significant historic heritage places
    - repairing and maintaining at-risk historic heritage places
    - supporting kaitiakitanga of Māori cultural heritage
    - preserving heritage and character in town centres.

11. We also consider applications for other services, projects, events and activities. However, these may be considered a lower priority. The following activities are identified as lower priorities for 2018/2019:
    - heritage interpretation
    - conservation of moveable heritage (i.e. objects in museums)
      - movable heritage items subject to evidence that the object would be stored and exhibited within the Auckland region in a manner that will ensure its long-term protection.
12. The Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme was promoted through a number of existing processes and networks including Auckland Council’s website and social media sites, publications, hui, local board networks and emails to historic heritage stakeholders and partners. Workshop presentations were held where applicants could be supported through the application process and request advice from council staff.

13. Applications for the 2018/2019 funding round were assessed by staff with subject matter expertise using the weighted assessment criteria as set out in Table One below.

Table One – Regional Historic Heritage Grants Assessment Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with strategic priorities for 2018/2019</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project significance</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding necessity</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public access and education</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Each application had an assessment score out of 100 which was used to rank applications from highest to lowest. Grant recommendations were developed and moderated by council staff considering the application assessment score, project budget, items that the funding was requested for and the level of funding that would maximise outcomes and value for money.

15. The Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme provides individual grants between $5,000 to $20,000 per annum, but there is provision to award smaller grants for projects that meet the criteria for regional significance but only require moderate support.

16. As a funding principle, grants through the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme are provided to leverage the community’s ‘match’ of an equal value in volunteer labour, cash, or donated goods and services. While there is no set match requirement for this fund, council will generally consider a 50 per cent match desirable.

17. This is the fourth annual funding round of the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme. Funding round metrics from the 2015/2016, 2016/2017, 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 rounds are provided in Table Two below. Compared with the 2017/2018 round, the 2018/2019 funding round received the same number of applications, but the amount of funding requested increased. The number of grants allocated and grant sizes are similar.

18. Since its establishment, the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme has been oversubscribed. Heritage Unit staff have investigated options for a budget increase.

19. Applicants that have not received a grant through the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme in the previous three rounds were given priority over those that have.

20. The applications recommended for funding in the 2018/2019 financial year align strongly with the outcomes and priorities established for the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme. The applications recommended for funding represent a variety of project types related to scheduled historic heritage places across the region, ranging from conservation plans to physical works which will contribute to their long-term survival.

21. Two applications recommended for funding are for projects at privately-owned residences. Both properties are scheduled historic heritage places and are visible from a public place. The nature of the projects strictly pertains to the heritage fabric of the building and both projects have significant applicant contributions to the total project costs (over 50 per cent). Both places have well-known and documented interest from the public.
22. Grant recommendation amounts are only less than the requested amount in cases where applicants have stated that a smaller Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme contribution would still be helpful for their project. The recommended amount is based on the amount the applicant has specified in their application as being a helpful contribution.

23. In most instances, applications that are recommended for decline have merit. Because the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme is oversubscribed, lower scoring applications were not recommended for funding. In other instances, applications are recommended for decline due to issues with best practice identified during the assessment process.

Table Two – Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>$80,743</td>
<td>$80,744</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
<td>$83,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of applications</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total value of grants requested</td>
<td>$336,914</td>
<td>$573,559</td>
<td>$383,833</td>
<td>$428,171.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of applications recommended for funding</td>
<td>Seven applications supported, 19 declined and one ineligible</td>
<td>Seven applications supported, 33 declined and two ineligible</td>
<td>Eight applications supported, 15 declined, one withdrawn and one ineligible</td>
<td>Six applications supported, 18 declined, one ineligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of grant allocations</td>
<td>Range: $3,375 to $20,000, Average: $11,998</td>
<td>Range: $2,248 to $20,000, Average: $11,534</td>
<td>Range: $4,000 to $20,000, Average: $10,250</td>
<td>Range: $5,900 to $18,640, Average: 13,940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera Council group impacts and views

24. There are no council group impacts or views identified for the allocation of the 2018/2019 Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme funding round.

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

25. The Community Grants Policy provides for local boards to operate their own local grants programmes. Local boards may choose to fund local heritage projects and activities, some of which may complement the grants provided at regional level, or vice versa. Information on the successful grant applicants will be provided to all relevant local boards, following the approval of the Planning Committee.
26. The Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme was promoted through local board networks via internal memo. The memo addressed the key role local boards play in promoting funding available to their constituents, community networks and contacts. The grant round was also promoted via the local boards’ social media page.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

27. All grant programmes aim to respond to Auckland Council’s commitment to improving Māori wellbeing by providing grants to organisations which deliver positive outcomes for Māori. Auckland Council’s Te Waka Angamua department provided input and practical support towards the development of the Regional Historic Heritage Grant Programme.

28. Promotion of the 2018/2019 funding round included provision of information to heritage stakeholders which included mana whenua, Māori community groups and individuals.

29. Supporting kaitiakitanga of Māori cultural heritage is an identified priority for this grant programme and all applications were assessed as to their alignment with this priority.

30. Applicants were asked to demonstrate how Māori outcomes will be evident in the results of their project. Of the 24 applications received, seven applications were submitted in which the applicant identified the project as contributing to Māori outcomes.

31. The application from Point Chevalier Social Enterprise Trust which is recommended for funding has been identified as contributing to Māori outcomes. The Māori Hall has a history of supporting Māori and their well-being and its owners have made a commitment to continue supporting Māori in the future.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

32. The funding recommendations presented in this report fully allocate the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme budget for the 2018/2019 financial year, as approved through the Long-term Plan 2015-2025.

33. The Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme has a total budget of $83,640 for the 2018/2019 financial year.

34. In this Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme 2018/2019 round a total of 25 applications were received with a total requested amount of $428,171.90. Given the four year pattern of significant oversubscription, options to increase the total funding pool are being explored by council staff.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

35. The assessment process undertaken identifies any risks involved with funding each application. The risks are mitigated by:

- special clauses in the funding agreement which allows the grant to be uplifted only when conditions are satisfied
- accountability requirements oblige grantees to submit a project report at the end of their grant period. The project report details how funding has been used and what has been achieved through their project.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

36. Following the Planning Committee resolution allocating funding for the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme, council staff will notify the applicants of the committee’s decision.
37. Successful grant recipients will receive an agreement detailing the terms and conditions of the grant. The recipients will be required to meet project accountability requirements. Should these projects either not proceed or not fully utilise allocated funding all unspent funds will be returned to council.

Ngā tāpirihanga
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Regional Historic Heritage Grant Programme Guidelines 2018/2019

This fund aims to preserve and enhance heritage as a legacy to pass on to future generations. Heritage reinforces our sense of history and place, is central to our wellbeing, and helps define what is unique and distinctive about Auckland.

About the fund

The purpose of the Regional Historic Heritage Grant Programme (RHH) is to incentivise best practice, increase understanding and encourage community involvement in the care of our regionally significant heritage sites and places. It is dedicated to funding projects that benefit regionally significant historic heritage places and outcomes that are relevant to all of Auckland.

The fund is open to individuals, community groups, businesses, iwi/Māori organisations, educational institutions and other community-based organisations operating in the Auckland region. The fund has one funding round per year where applicants can request up to $20,000.

Funding Outcomes

The RHH will be targeted towards projects which meet at least one of the following outcome areas:

- Regulations in the Unitary Plan are supported by incentives to protect and conserve significant historic heritage places
- Auckland Council, Mana Whenua, community organisations, and property owners work together to support kaitiakitanga and stewardship of historic heritage
- Aucklanders see Council investment in historic heritage
- Historic heritage grants unlock private and community investment in heritage conservation

Priorities for 2018/2019

- Conservation of regionally significant Historic Heritage places
- Conservation of at-risk historic heritage places
- Supporting Kaitiakitanga of Māori cultural heritage
- Heritage and Character in Town Centres

We will also consider applications for other services, projects, events and activities. However, these may be considered a lower priority. The following activities are identified as lower priorities for the 2018/2019 round:

- Heritage interpretation
- Conservation of moveable heritage (i.e. objects in museums)
  - Movable heritage items subject to evidence that the object would be stored and exhibited within the Auckland region in a manner that will ensure its long-term protection.

What does regionally significant heritage mean?

To be eligible for funding, a project must meet at least one criterion for regional significance, as below:

- Historic Heritage places that are included in one of the schedules of the Auckland Unitary Plan including the Historic Heritage Schedule, Sites of Significance to Mana Whenua, contributing sites within a Historic Heritage Area and contributing buildings within a Special Character Area.
- Historic Heritage places that are unscheduled but demonstrated to be of regional significance, subject to evidence that the site has interim protection through heritage covenants as well as a letter from the applicants confirming support for scheduling the site under the relevant heritage overlay.
Who can apply?

Applications will be open to individual private owners, iwi or Māori groups, community groups, trusts and other organisations that contribute to the protection and improvement of regionally significant historic heritage places, sites or areas. Projects can be undertaken on public, private or Māori land.

Places which are owned by Council are not eligible for funding, even if a community group are responsible for the place’s maintenance.

Examples of projects the RHH will fund

- Maintenance and repair of historic heritage places
- Restoration of historic heritage places, including seismic strengthening works
- Kaitiakitanga of Māori cultural heritage
- Restoration projects that contribute to the cultural values of sites scheduled in the Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua Schedule in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Schedule 12).
- Repairs/restoration to historic graves.
- Reinstating heritage features, such as window frames.

The RHH will not fund:

- Debt servicing or repayment
- Legal expenses
- Activities that promote religious ministry or political purposes
- Medical expenses
- Public services that are the responsibility of central government (e.g. core education, primary health care)
- Physical works – e.g. improvements to community buildings – that require consents or permits, prior to the necessary consents or permits being obtained (grants may be awarded in principle, but funds will not be released until all conditions are satisfied)
- Purchase of alcohol
- Salaries
- Projects which are incompatible with the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) NZ Charter (2010) and/or tikanga Māori

Funding process

You can apply for a RHH grant by going through our funding portal at https://aucklandcouncil smartygrants.com.au/RHHGP2019. When you submit an application you will get a confirmation email, this will have the date when funding decisions are made.

We will contact you by email if we need any further information within a few days of you submitting your application. If we need any further information, we will unlock your application so that you can log in and add any further information before re-submitting.

Application are assessed initially by the Environmental Grants team for eligibility and then by members of our Heritage team. This assessment will consider;

- Alignment with stated funding outcomes and funding priorities for 2018/2019
- Regional significance of this project
- Funding necessity (including urgency of work and long-term benefits)
- Compliance with good practice
- Level of public access and public education
Once all assessments are completed recommendations will be made to the members of the Auckland Planning Committee, who make final funding decisions. Members of this committee will have access to all of the information provided in the application.

Shortly after the meeting you will be sent a notification by email regarding the outcome of your grant application. For approved applications, we will also send a funding agreement with the terms and conditions of the grant.

**Application dates**

Applications for project grants will be considered once per year. Each application will be evaluated by heritage staff, who will determine whether the application is complete and the proposed project is eligible. The final grant allocations will be confirmed by the Auckland Council Planning Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applications open</th>
<th>Applications close</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 March 2019</td>
<td>12 April 2019</td>
<td>4 June 2019</td>
<td>5 June 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Things to think about when preparing your application**

- All applications must be submitted using the SmartyGrants online system
- Complete all the mandatory sections of the application form. Incomplete applications will not be accepted
- You will be asked to explain how your project or activity contributes towards regional funding priorities
- You will be asked to attach quotes in your project budget to substantiate costs you are requesting funding to support
- You will be asked to attach project information as appropriate to your application; this can include site details, photos, maps, and restoration plans
- You will be asked to attach bank account details if you have not received a grant payment from Auckland Council in the last 12 months
- Please be aware that Council funding should not be regarded as a sole funding source for your activity
- If your project requires resource consent and you have not yet obtained it, you are still eligible to apply to the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme. However, if your application is successful, the grant will not be paid out until you have obtained resource consent.
- Applicants can also apply for grants from more than one grants programme for different projects and activities. For example, applicants can apply to both the RHH grants programme and relevant Local Board grants programme. Applicants will need to identify any other council grant programmes they have applied to.

**Match Funding (Applicant Contribution)**

- As a funding principle, grants through the RHH are provided to leverage the community’s ‘match’ of an equal value in volunteer labour, cash or donated goods and services. While there is no set match requirement for this fund, Council will generally consider a 50% match desirable. The value of in-kind contributions that are part of a match should be quantified to the extent that it is possible.
- Applicants can submit more than one application to the RHH grants programme, however applications will need to be for different projects or activities.
Accountability requirements & acknowledgement of Council support

All successful applicants to the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme will be required to provide a report to Council detailing how the grant was used and heritage outcomes. Accountability reporting required would be proportional to the grant awarded and tailored to the nature of the project, and include:

- Photographs of the work during construction and at completion.
- Statement from professional engaged confirming that the work was done in accordance with the ICOMOS NZ Charter. If the project involves Māori Cultural Heritage, a representative will be identified at the start of the project to monitor its adherence to tikanga Māori.

Evidence that the:

- Place has interim protection through heritage covenants, as well as a letter
- The landowner confirming support for scheduling the place under the relevant heritage overlay (for unscheduled historic heritage).
- Evidence that the object will be stored and exhibited within the Auckland region in a manner that will ensure its long-term protection (for moveable heritage).

By making an application, the applicant and authorising landowner agree to allow Council access to all relevant areas of the subject property for the purposes of evaluating the proposal and monitoring its outcome. Access requests would be made with reasonable advance notice during normal working hours.

Auckland Council will assess accountability reports to ensure they meet requirements. This may include a site visit by council staff.

Grant recipients should give fair and proper acknowledgement of Council’s support. This acknowledgement would be proportional to the grant awarded and tailored to the nature of the project.

Disclosure of Interest

All applicants must disclose if an Auckland Council councillor, local board member, a council employee or their immediate family has any interest or involvement in the activity they are seeking a grant for. You will be asked this question in the application form.

A councillor or local board member involved in a community organisation can be present at a meeting where the activity is considered, however, they may not take part in the decision process.

How contestable funding works

The RHH grants programme operates as a contestable process, this means:

- Applications are invited to apply for a grant during scheduled funding rounds, with publicly advertised opening and closing dates
- Any eligible organisation has an equal opportunity to be considered for a grant
- Clearly defined processes will be applied to all applications
- Final allocation decisions are made in a public forum

Contact Us

Contact the environmental grants team on 09 301 0101 or via email environmentalfunding@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
### Item 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application ID</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Local board area</th>
<th>Short project description</th>
<th>Total project cost</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Weighted Score (out of 100)</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JH51-190131</td>
<td>Point Chevalier Social Enterprise Trust</td>
<td>5 Edinburgh St Auckland Central Auckland 1010</td>
<td>Waitakaruru</td>
<td>Funding requested towards cost of a Detailed Seismic Assessment</td>
<td>$12,420.00</td>
<td>$12,400.00</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>$12,420.00</td>
<td>Foresters Hall (former/Maori Hall is scheduled as a Category B historic heritage place and a place of Maori Interest or Significance in the Auckland Unitary Plan (UPID 01645). This project has merit and aligns strongly with the priorities identified for the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme. The project will ensure the survival of a significant historic heritage place. For these reasons, it is recommended that this proposal is supported through the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JH51-190136</td>
<td>Workworth Lions Charitable Trust</td>
<td>36 Sandspit Rd Workworth Auckland 0982</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Funding requested to examine options for providing public access to the Historic Combes and Daddy Lime Kilns in Workworth</td>
<td>$39,943.00</td>
<td>$18,640.00</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>$18,640.00</td>
<td>The Daddy Lime Kilns are scheduled as a Category B Historic heritage place in the Auckland Unitary Plan (UPID 00569). The feasibility study to provide public access to the kilns involves aspects directly aligned with the conservation of the kilns and will help to ensure their long-term survival. The project has merit and aligns strongly with the priorities of the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme. It is recommended that a grant of $18,640 is allocated towards the costs of the feasibility study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JH51-190003</td>
<td>Anglican Parish of Avondale</td>
<td>27 St Jude St Avondale Auckland 1026</td>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>Funding requested towards a conservation plan for the restoration of St Jude's Church Hall</td>
<td>$154,625.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>St. Jude's Church and Hall is scheduled in the Auckland Unitary Plan as a Category B historic heritage place and is Listed with Heritage New Zealand as a Category 2 historic place. The hall is currently at risk of further deterioration if repairs are left unaddressed. Work is required to ensure the short-medium term survival of the place and a conservation plan will help guide the work to ensure it aligns with best practice. The project has merit and aligns strongly with the priorities of the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme. It is recommended that a grant of $15,000 is allocated Funding requested towards the costs of a conservation plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>Funding Requested Towards</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Total Grant Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH18-39032</td>
<td>Michelle Taylor</td>
<td>Glenfield Rd Birkenhead Anglican Parish Cemetery Birkenhead Auckland 0626</td>
<td>Kaitaiki</td>
<td>Restoration of a grave restoration project</td>
<td>$11,975</td>
<td>$5,900</td>
<td>$17,875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH18-39038</td>
<td>Helensville District Health Trust</td>
<td>53 Commercial Rd Helensville Auckland 0800</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Cost of a planning consultant and a heritage architect for Alison McKenzie House project.</td>
<td>$36,455.00</td>
<td>$31,700.00</td>
<td>$68,155.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH18-39024</td>
<td>Joseph Bulluba</td>
<td>1189 Awhitu Rd Papakura Auckland 0684</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Urgent repairs of the Kohikohi Church Building</td>
<td>$44,437.00</td>
<td>$28,000.00</td>
<td>$72,437.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH18-39004</td>
<td>Friends Of Waikumete incorporated</td>
<td>4128 Great North Rd Glen Eden Auckland 0602</td>
<td>Waitakere Ranges</td>
<td>Restoration of the McAdam Memorial at Waikumete Cemetery</td>
<td>$20,279.00</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
<td>$38,279.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Pompallier Cemetery (Birkenhead and Northcote Protestant/Anglican and Roman) is scheduled as a Category A historic heritage place in the Auckland Unitary Plan (UPID 00904).
- The project has merit and aligns strongly with the priorities of the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme.

- While the project has merit and would result in a good heritage outcome, the applicant was awarded a grant in the 2016/2017 Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme round for costs associated with the design stages of the Alison McKenzie House restoration. As the current round is oversubscribed, priority has been given to applicants that have not received recent funding through the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme.

- Kohekohe Church is scheduled in the Auckland Unitary Plan as a Category 6 historic heritage place (UPID 01541). The proposal will help to ensure the long-term survival of a regionally significant historic heritage place.
- The project has merit and aligns strongly with the priorities of the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme. It is recommended that a contribution of $18,562 is allocated towards aspects of the work that will improve the building's structural integrity.
- While the project has merit and would result in a good heritage outcome, the applicant was awarded a grant in the 2016/2017 Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme round for a grave restoration project. As the current round is oversubscribed, priority has been given to applicants that have not received recent funding through the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Funding Requested Description</th>
<th>Budgeted Amount</th>
<th>Allocated Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04 June 2019</td>
<td>Patrick, &amp; Elizabeth Galler</td>
<td>59 Knights Rd Rothesay Bay Auckland 0630</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>Refurbishment of five existing Crittall steel windows in Category A listed Historic House</td>
<td>$36,942.99</td>
<td>$18,244.20</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 June 2019</td>
<td>Anglican Parish of Clevedon</td>
<td>32 Church Street, Ardmore, New Zealand Ardmore Auckland 2582</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Upgrading the drainage system of St James' Church, Ardmore to reduce the risk of erosion.</td>
<td>$7,682.00</td>
<td>$6,682.00</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 June 2019</td>
<td>Espano Building Body Corporate</td>
<td>20 Paynton Ter Auckland Central Auckland 1010</td>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>Funding requested towards the restoration of the public entrance way of the Espano Building and preservation of original historic features.</td>
<td>$7,255.00</td>
<td>$2,745.00</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 June 2019</td>
<td>Teroh Preservation Society Incorporated</td>
<td>2 Seaward Rd Henderson Auckland 0610</td>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>Funding requested towards the steam ferry “Teroh” restoration project.</td>
<td>$24,114.05</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 June 2019</td>
<td>Constant Building Management</td>
<td>The Guardian, 105 Queen Street Auckland Central Auckland Central Auckland 1010</td>
<td>Waitakere</td>
<td>Funding requested towards repairs of the clock on the Guardian building, Queen Street.</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spicer House (former) is scheduled in the Auckland Unitary Plan as a Category A historic heritage place (UPID 00867). The project will improve the weather-tightness of the place, helping to ensure its long-term survival. While the place is a private residence, it has significant educational value. The house has been made available for Earth Building conferences as site visits on numerous occasions. The most recent of which was in June 2018. The EBANZ conference weekend in November 2018 had 100 people visit the home to learn more about how and where the materials came from, how the house was built, the type of materials used and to appreciate its uniqueness in Auckland.

This project has merit and aligns strongly with the priorities of the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme. It is recommended that a grant of $13,118 is allocated Funding requested towards the cost of the steel window reinstatement.

While the proposed project has merit, it does not score as highly as other applications received in the current round. For this reason, it is not recommended that funding is allocated Funding requested towards this project.

While the project has merit and would result in a good heritage outcome, the applicant was awarded a grant in the last Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme round Funding requested towards the costs associated with a conservation plan. As the current round is oversubscribed, priority has been given to applicants that have not received recent funding through the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme.

This project does not align strongly with the priorities of the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme. Movable heritage has been identified in the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme as a low priority. For this reason, it is not recommended that funding is allocated to this project.

While the proposed project has merit, it does not score as highly as other applications received in the current round. For this reason, it is not recommended that funding is allocated Funding requested towards this project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 11</th>
<th>Attachment B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IHH18-19015</strong></td>
<td>Vincent Janssen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IHH18-19022</strong></td>
<td>Courtsville Building Owners 101299 Body Corporate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IHH18-19019</strong></td>
<td>Porirua Ceramics Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IHH18-19030</strong></td>
<td>Louise Broughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IHH18-19021</strong></td>
<td>The Howick &amp; Districts Historical Society Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IHH18-19030</strong></td>
<td>Client 1st Realty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment B</td>
<td>Item 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HH18-39008</strong></td>
<td>Blockhouse Bay Community Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>578 Blockhouse Bay Rd</strong></td>
<td>Blockhouse Bay Auckland 0600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>Funding requested towards replacing front entrance steps and handrails of Armanasco Historic House, Blockhouse Bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,886.20</td>
<td>$5,486.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>While the proposed project has merit, it does not score as highly as other applications received in the current round. For this reason, it is not recommended that funding is allocated Funding requested towards this project.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HH18-39011</strong></td>
<td>New Zealand Rugby League Museum Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 Beasley Ave Penrose Auckland 1001</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Funding requested towards the History of Carlaw Park display.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$38,485.61</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This project does not align strongly with the priorities of the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme. Heritage interpretation has been identified in the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme as a low priority. For this reason, it is not recommended that funding is allocated to this project.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HH18-39027</strong></td>
<td>Hollywood Avondale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18-20 St Georges Rd Avondale Auckland 0600</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>Funding requested towards restoration of the outdoor area behind the Avondale Hollywood Cinema.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$37,500.00</td>
<td>$18,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The project does not align with the priorities identified for the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme. The proposal not pertain to the conservation of the building, nor is it restorative in nature; rather, the proposal is for new amenities (e.g. new pergola and garden). For these reasons, it is not recommended that this application is supported through the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HH18-39017</strong></td>
<td>Philip and Sarah Elworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12 Birchwood Giv Greenhithe Auckland 0632</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>Funding requested towards notable Pecan Nut tree protection and enhancement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,370.00</td>
<td>$4,370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>While the proposed project has merit, it does not score as highly as other applications received in the current round. For this reason, it is not recommended that funding is allocated Funding requested towards this project.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HH18-39001</strong></td>
<td>Torpedo Bay Productions Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4/12 Buchanan St Devonport Auckland 0624</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Funding requested towards the book publication of an illustrated History of Devonport 1880s to 1920s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$23,322.00</td>
<td>$11,520.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This project does not align strongly with the priorities of the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme. Heritage interpretation has been identified in the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme as a low priority. For this reason, it is not recommended that funding is allocated to this project.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HH18-39005</strong></td>
<td>Caroline Taku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>46 King Edward St Sandringham Auckland 1025</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>Funding requested towards villa restoration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$233,579.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Some aspects of this project align with the priorities identified for the Regional Historic Heritage Grants Programme and have merit. However, the overall project is related more to renovation and modernisation than to conservation (e.g. new addition, construction of pool, etc.).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HH18-39020</strong></td>
<td>The Remuera Railway Station Preservation Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remuera Railway Station Railway Land adjacent to 130 Market Road Remuera Auckland 1051</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtākāi</td>
<td>Funding requested towards restoration of the interior of the Remuera Railway Station building and the signal box.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$241,356.00</td>
<td>$28,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Remuera Train Station is owned by Auckland Transport. It is not eligible for a grant through Auckland Council.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2015/2016 Regional Historic Heritage Grants allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant name</th>
<th>Mr. Piers Kay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project title and description</strong></td>
<td><strong>Skelton Studio House, Group Architects: reinstatement of original flat membrane roof</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This application seeks funding to support the reinstatement of original flat membrane roof which had been covered by a tin roof by earlier owners. The original flat membrane roof is in keeping with the heritage values of the place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total project cost</strong></td>
<td>$24,513.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant allocation</strong></td>
<td>$6,750 as a contribution towards the costs of reinstating the original roof.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project accountability report (wording is taken from applicant’s response in accountability report)

| **What did this project achieve** | “The financial support provided by the E & H Regional Historic Heritage Grant programme enabled the project to be undertaken. Without the support of the Regional Historic Heritage Grant programme it was unlikely the re-roof would have been undertaken solely through private funding. The project went over budget so the funding played an important role in the financial viability of the project.

The moment the old tin roof was removed, exposing the existing profile and massing of the house was a highlight as it presented the house as the architects had originally intended - without a bulky, pitched tin roof. The flat roof was an import design feature of the house and seeing it realised (only previously through photos) was very exciting.” |
| **How was this grant acknowledged** | A sign erected on the exterior of the property as had been done during the North Shore Heritage Trust works. The project also received a heritage award from the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board in 2018 and Auckland Council was thanked for their contribution. An article was published on Our Auckland. |

**Photos**

![Photo 1](image1.png) ![Photo 2](image2.png)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant name</th>
<th>Mr. Rob Mouncey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project title and description</td>
<td>Development of Pakuranga School as Collections Exhibition Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pakuranga School (Howick Historical Village) requires the following essential works:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.) Improved drainage – As with all buildings of its age, there is some rot in the original timber. The part of the land that the building is sited has a relatively high water table and the moisture content of the soil is advancing the rotting of the timber. The higher moisture content also presents a greater risk of damage to the artefacts that the Howick Historical Village wants to display.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.) Door replacement – The current rear door of the building needs replacing as it has significant rot and is not weatherproof. This is an urgent priority for security and weatherproofing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.) Hanging the waka on the wall – currently this valuable taonga which was used by local Māori is displayed at floor level. The purpose of this project is to give the waka more prominence and to free up more display space at floor level for other artefacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project cost</td>
<td>$45,981.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant allocation</td>
<td>$9,200.00 as a contribution towards drainage and a new door.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project accountability report (wording is taken from applicant’s response in accountability report)**

| What did this project achieve | “By completing the drainage we have helped keep the moisture levels around and under the building lower than previously. This will assist in preserving the timber from rotting. A new door and frame was also installed which has stopped the water ingress into the structure of the building thereby helping preserve it. The waka was hung on the wall and this cleared space for use by schools and allowed greater use of the space for exhibitions. |

It enabled us to complete two parts of the overall project which the Society did not have the financial resources to complete. Maintenance, restoration and conservation of over 30 historic buildings requires substantial funding and it is only possible by obtaining funding from external funding bodies such as the AC Historic Heritage Grant Programme that the buildings can be preserved for current and future generations. |

By removing the water under and around the building through effective drainage is a simple but necessary step in helping reduce the rate of deterioration of the foundations, bearers and structure of the building. Replacing the external door and frame has stopped water ingress into the structure of the building from this source which faced the prevailing south west winds.” |
<p>| How was this grant acknowledged | Auckland Council support is recognised by signage at the entrance of Howick Historical Village. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image-url" alt="Church Image" /></td>
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<td>Applicant name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Project title and description** | **Carnegie Free Library – continuation of seismic upgrading works and other minor heritage-related works**  
1) Continuation of seismic upgrading from 67% to 100% including consultant fees for undertaking the work.  
2) Minor heritage works to include:  
   - Exterior - replacement of rotten timber to window frames on western wall. Uplighting to building frontage. Mending and patching of exterior steps and paved areas. Work to the pohutukawa trees on the western face which obstruct and cause loss of amenity to the landscaped areas below. Rework of lean-to structures on the rear of the building and formation of a boundary wall which would be enabled by the removal of structures owned by the bowling club.  
   - Interior - Complete internal repaint including sanding and staining or treatment of window trims. Cornices in the main dining area have cracks and water tracks that require remediation. Entry doors to be retrofitted with kickplates and to be refurbished.  
3) Site works as noted 2) above to include the refurbishment of lean-to roofs at the rear of the building and tidying of the grounds in respect of the same. |
<p>| Total project cost | $30,000 |
| Grant allocation | $10,000 as a contribution towards costs associated with seismic strengthening |
| <strong>Project accountability report (wording is taken from applicant’s response in accountability report)</strong> | “Ensured safe earthquake rating for the Carnegie Heritage Building and Occupants. This was done with qualified persons meeting with Auckland Council to determine scope and any existing information. An additional qualified person was engaged to uncover and inspect the property, perform calculations and submit report.” |
| How was this grant acknowledged | The project and grant was promoted through media releases. |
| Photos | N/A |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant name</th>
<th>Warren Durling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Project title and description** | Restoration of upstairs section of building  
Restoration, maintenance and improvements to the upstairs room. Work proposed is to protect the heritage fabric of the building while making it habitable. |
| **Total project cost** | $60,609.99 |
| **Grant allocation** | $19,417 as a contribution towards costs associated with aspects that improve the weather tightness of the place (windows, roof repair and wall linings). |
| **Project accountability report (wording is taken from applicant’s response in accountability report)** |
| What did this project achieve | "We feel confident we have delivered a successful result with regards to the priorities for this project, as established when planning and applying for funding. Foresters Hall is an important building to the community and is recognised as such by the council and Heritage NZ. It is unique in its history and location - being in central Auckland where it is accessible to all and can be admired by many. When we started the project, it was at-risk due to very little of the necessary maintenance work having been carried out on it over the last century. We have used the funding we gratefully received, as well as a significant number of our own funds, to undertake the work needed immediately in order to stop further decay. We have addressed many key areas that were high-priority, however given the sheer scale of the project we still have significant work ahead to ensure it remains in fantastic condition for decades to come. We would greatly appreciate the support of the council moving forward.

Receiving the grant funding had a profound effect on the amount of work we could undertake immediately (with the goal of stopping further damage) and in turn on the future of the building. We are very lucky to have the opportunity to restore the hall, but it is an enormous responsibility since the building is a well admired and loved landmark in the community. We are dedicated to completing the project to the highest standard, however, being a young couple this can sometimes be financially challenging. Receiving a grant from the council meant a lot both financially and also the encouragement and kindness we received from the fantastic team at the council. We truly appreciate it and are very grateful." |
| How was this grant acknowledged | The grant was acknowledged in an OurAuckland story and various media publications. |
| Photos |
Attachment C

Item 11
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant name</th>
<th>Mr. Stephen Thomas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project title and</td>
<td>Maintenance/Repairs of Henderson Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>description</td>
<td>Master’s Railway Cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This application seeks funding towards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>repairs associated with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>weathertightness of the place (roof and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rot in weatherboards).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project cost</td>
<td>$5,575.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant allocation</td>
<td>$3,375.19 as a contribution towards roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and weatherboard repairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report (wording is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taken from applicant’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>response in accountability report)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did this project</td>
<td>&quot;We engaged contractor James Greenwood,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieve</td>
<td>director of Smurf Village (SV) Ltd, who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>repaired and replaced numerous sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of weatherboards around the cottage that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>had rot in them with new custom-made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pine weatherboards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We engaged Troy Thomson of TAPS Ltd to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>remediate sections of our lean-to roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which had rusted by applying anti-rust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>compounds, securing the joins between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>roofing sheets and fitting new roofing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>screws. The scope of our lean-to roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project changed somewhat, as our initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contractor could no longer do it and Troy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gave us a remedial option of spot-fixing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the roof, which we went with, rather than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completely re-roofing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The grant enabled us to do important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maintenance work to our cottage as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>described above. In particular, it helped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>us fix areas of our lean-to roof that had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rust in them and helped us repair and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>replace sections of weatherboards that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>had rot in them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Due to the particular profile of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>weatherboards, the grant helped us get</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was this grant</td>
<td>custom milled pine weatherboards that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acknowledged</td>
<td>suited our cottage well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2016/2017 Regional Historic Heritage Grants allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant name</th>
<th>Friends of Onehunga Community House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project title and description</td>
<td>Painting and maintenance of the roof and building. This application seeks funding to support the painting and maintenance of the roof and exterior of the Friends of Onehunga Community House. The building was first painted in 2004 as part of Stage 1 of our total project. Since we have continued with the restoration of the whole, but concentrated on the interior of the house as the exterior was then in good shape. The painting was excellent, and has lasted really well, but now needs attention to stop further deterioration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project cost</td>
<td>$187,258.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant allocation</td>
<td>$20,000 as a contribution towards stage 2 restoration costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project accountability report (wording is taken from applicant’s response in accountability report)**

**What did this project achieve**

“Because we were able to proceed with this project, a regionally significant heritage building, Category A in the Unitary Plan, that needed weather protection, was able to receive this protection because the painting project was able to proceed. Because the building had not been painted for over ten years, closer to fourteen years, some patches of bare wood were appearing, and if left longer these would have increased, thus exposing the building to further deterioration. An at risk historic heritage asset has been conserved. Strong links have existed between Maori and European students in this building, as a significant proportion of students were of Maori descent.

This building occupies a prominent place in Onehunga. Situated higher than the township itself, it is visible from many vantage points, especially when on the Onehunga harbour bridge approaching Onehunga from the south, which is the way most tourists approach Auckland. The township is proud of its heritage and has two Special Character Overlays, one Business and one Residential.

This significant building is easily the biggest building identified in the Unitary Plan in the area, and with its imposing site contributes greatly to the heritage nature of the township.”

**How was this grant acknowledged**

A notice was put on both our noticeboards advising House users that the Auckland Council Regional Historic Heritage fund had supported Stage 2 of the major work. This information was put onto our Facebook page. We will shortly have a list of sponsors on our website. We have been interviewed by the editor of the Onehunga Community News on the project and there is now an article on the project in the June edition of the Onehunga Community News.

**Photos**

![Project Image 1]

![Project Image 2]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant name</th>
<th>St. Patrick’s Cathedral Heritage Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project title and description</td>
<td>St Patrick’s Presbytery Conservation and Restoration Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This application seeks funding to support the conservation and restoration of the St. Patrick’s Cathedral Presbytery (Te Kāinga ō ngā Pirihī  ē Hato Pateriki rāua ko Hato Hohepa). Conservation and restoration work will include restoring the roof to its original slate cladding and seismic strengthening of the building. It will also include an upgrade of the electrical, plumbing and security services; gas, water and drainage services; upgrade of the heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems; repairs to the brickwork and masonry, window joinery and stained glass windows. All work will be done in accordance with the conservation policies set out in the St Patrick’s Cathedral Presbytery Conservation Plan 2015 and the Conservation Principles contained in the International Council on Monuments and Sites New Zealand (ICOMOS NZ) Charter 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project cost</td>
<td>$4,025,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant allocation</td>
<td>$20,000 as a contribution towards roofing costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project accountability report</td>
<td>Accountability reporting for this application is outstanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did this project achieve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was this grant acknowledged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant name</td>
<td>Rawinia Iraihi Rangi Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project title and description</td>
<td>Te Muri Cemetery Headstone Restoration Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This application seeks funding towards the restoration of William Sullivan (Sullivans Bay) and Rawinia Roa's headstones located in Te Muri Cemetery. Both headstones are very important historical artefacts depicting the lives of two astute members of the Mahurangi community. Many bays, rivers and roads are named after them and their descendants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project cost</td>
<td>$11,680.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant allocation</td>
<td>$2,248 as a contribution towards restoration costs of the Rawinia Roa grave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project accountability report (wording is taken from applicant's response in accountability report)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did this project achieve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We have ensured the preservation of our town's local historical urupa. Bringing the iwi back for the opening was indeed a rewarding part of the process. Many were under the assumption that the tribal lines were from one particular iwi when in fact this was incorrect. We are in the process of redefining the lines for future reference. This will take a great deal of time and research. Whanau and distinguished guests travelled from all across Aotearoa to celebrate this grand occasion, marking the significance and importance of ensuring our people will be taken care of in both life and in death. Over 100 people including our Kaumataua braved the wind, rain and tides to walk across the estuary that would take them to this secluded urupa to pay homage and respect. Karanga greeted them whilst our Kaumataua (Tom Roa) opened the way for our people come and see the end result. The headstones were unveiled and our tupuna were at peace once again. Both restoration projects were done using most of the original materials to preserve its history or made to replicate what was originally there and see the end result. The headstones were unveiled and our tupuna were at peace once again.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How was this grant acknowledged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A ceremony was held after the grave restoration and an Our Auckland article was published.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Photos**

Photos have not been included for sensitivity reasons. The graves and surrounds were restored using best-practice principles in conservation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant name</th>
<th>Helensville District Health Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project title and description</td>
<td>Alison McKenzie House: Helensville, Heritage Project Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This application seeks funding towards the concept design, preliminary design and documentation stages of the Alison McKenzie house heritage project to address issues with building foundations and structural stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project cost</td>
<td>$19,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant allocation</td>
<td>$12,420 as a contribution towards the design stages of the Alison McKenzie house restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project accountability report (wording is taken from applicant’s response in accountability report)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did this project achieve</td>
<td>“This funding has enabled us to take a measured approach to the development of Alison McKenzie House, a heritage building situated on the main road of Helensville. This building makes a significant contribution to the townscape of Helensville and particularly the streetscape of Commercial Road. It exhibits a distinctive aesthetic and is a local landmark. The expert reports that we have been able to have done show that the foundations of the building are significantly compromised. The Helensville District Health Trust has been working with a specialist heritage architect on designs and plans to develop the Alison McKenzie House into a facility that enables positive social health and wellbeing outcomes while maintaining the significance (heritage) and value (emotional) to the Helensville community. An unintended outcome has been a wider look at what our community needs now and in the future in terms of health services. The South Kaipara Health Needs Analysis which has been done with the support of ProCare and the Waitemata DHB will help inform the development of this site including Alison McKenzie House, and ultimately, will positively impact the development of improved health services.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was this grant acknowledged</td>
<td>Support has been acknowledged on the district health trust website <a href="http://www.helensvilledistricthealthtrust.co.nz">www.helensvilledistricthealthtrust.co.nz</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant name</td>
<td>Friends of Waikumete Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project title and description</strong></td>
<td>Chapman Monument Restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This application seeks funding towards the restoration of the Chapman Monument which is located at Waikumete Cemetery - Anglican E Section Row 7 Plot 3. Several headstones in the heritage area of New Zealand's largest cemetery, Waikumete Cemetery in West Auckland, have been declared unsafe with some on the brink of falling over. The Chapman Monument being of the several. Restoration is required due to foundation subsidence and the combined weight of the monument and bases being too excessive for the original foundation constructed. The monument appears to be securely attached to the three large bases, it is not feasible to lay it down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total project cost</strong></td>
<td>$4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant allocation</strong></td>
<td>$3,450 as a contribution towards the restoration of the Chapman Monument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project accountability report (wording is taken from applicant’s response in accountability report)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did this project achieve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Waikumete Cemetery is a natural heritage area and is widely used by walkers, genealogies and general public. Retaining the history of the older part of the cemetery for once lost can never be regained. This grant assisted us in being able to cover the cost of the restoration of the Chapman Monument. This needed to be done urgently as the monument was very close to being in a state of disrepair. This restoration was able to be completed before it became more damaged and toppled and lost for ever from our community and historical records.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How was this grant acknowledged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project was promoted through Social media, local newspapers, local agencies and through word of mouth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Photos**

Chapman Monument prior to restoration

Chapman Monument after restoration
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant name</th>
<th>Pitt St Methodist Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project title and description</td>
<td>Pitt Street Buildings Parapet Strengthening and Gutter Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This application seeks funding towards strengthening of building parapets to current code requirements, checks and maintenance on canopies over public footpaths and gutter replacement work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project cost</td>
<td>$71,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant allocation</td>
<td>$6,337 as a contribution towards guttering costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project accountability report (wording is taken from applicant’s response in accountability report)</strong></td>
<td>“The worn-out gutters of the historic Pitt St Buildings have been replaced with stainless steel gutters, preventing water ingress and damage to the interior. Our priority is the structural upgrade of the building for the safety of the public, and being able to carry out expensive maintenance at the same time was a sensible addition to the parapet strengthening and canopy maintenance for the building. The grant contributed to the very expensive cost of the project and enabled our own funds to stretch a little further in other areas of the structural upgrade of the building.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was this grant acknowledged</td>
<td>Street corflute public information boards and continuous communication with tenants and neighbours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Gutter prior to restoration work" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Replacement gutters" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant name</td>
<td>Stonemason’s House Falcon Street Parnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project title and description</td>
<td>Stonemason’s House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This application seeks funding towards the restoration and maintenance of Stonemason’s House, Falcon Street Parnell. The conservation required is too large to complete in one project and we have chosen two sections of the house to begin with which require urgent work. The house was built in 1863 by Benjamin Strange using stone from Rangitoto Island. The house is three storied with 12 sash windows, ornate barge boards and a plaster exterior finish. This project is to repair and maintain windows, barge boards, the plaster finish and remove lichen from the slate roof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project cost</td>
<td>$43,085.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant allocation</td>
<td>$16,289 as a contribution towards painting costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Project accountability report (wording is taken from applicant’s response in accountability report) | “We have begun conservation of a significant heritage site in Parnell (listed on the Auckland Council Unitary Plan)- the Stonemason’s House built in 1863. This project has added to the heritage and character in the Parnell Village centre, in restoring the building to a high quality visual attraction for local residents and visitors to the area. The Stonemason’s House was at risk of becoming dilapidated and an unattractive sight in the local area.

Our aim is to restore and maintain the Stonemason’s House as a unique and significant heritage place. The grant from Auckland Council has certainly helped us on the way to achieving this. With the heritage fund assistance we were able to ensure that the work carried out was of a high standard and in keeping with the style of the building. Rotting timber was replaced with timber, rather than filler.” |
| How was this grant acknowledged |
| Photos | ![Stonemason’s cottage during restoration](image1.jpg) ![Stonemason’s cottage after restoration](image2.jpg) |
Converting Road Reserve, Unformed Legal Roads and Pedestrian Accessways to Open Space

File No.: CP2019/04897

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To identify options for using road reserve and unformed legal roads (paper roads) as open space and to highlight some of the potential issues that could be involved.
2. To recommend the most appropriate mechanism(s) for investigating potential conversions of road reserve and unformed legal road to open space.

Whakarāpopototangatanga matua
Executive summary

3. At its 7 August 2018 meeting, the Planning Committee:
   (c) requested staff report back to the Planning Committee before the end of the year on the issues and options associated with reclassifying and rezoning pieces of road reserve and public owned paper roads as recreation reserves and open space. The report should also assess whether pedestrian only accessways should be zoned as open space.
   (Resolution number PLA 2018/72)

4. In responding to the Planning Committee’s request, staff have investigated whether additional open space could be secured for the public by converting portions of unutilised road reserve and unformed legal roads (paper roads) to open space. This could be undertaken either with or without “stopping” the road. The process for “stopping a road” is specified in the Local Government Act 1974. Formed and sealed roads are shown as “road” in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP). Unformed legal roads are shown in a variety of ways, depending on the approach that was used in the legacy district plans.

5. In some cases, portions of road reserve and unformed legal roads are already used informally as open space, for example, walkways to reserves or formal and informal recreation areas within the road reserve. Many existing parks and reserves include unformed paper roads. Some “road ends” abutting the coastal marine area do not have a formed carriageway and appear to be open space. Road stopping procedures would be required to “stop” these roads. These areas appear to operate successfully under their current land classification and zoning arrangements.

6. Pedestrian accessways linking roads are shown as “road” under the AUP. This approach was supported by Auckland Transport (AT), Parks and Plans and Places departments when developing the plan, and endorsed by the relevant council committees. They are managed and maintained by AT. Many of these are vested as local purpose reserve – walkway.

7. The advantages of securing additional open space via road reserve or unformed legal road are that the overall amount of land classified as open space is increased in a cost-effective manner and there is a positive public perception associated with this. The disadvantages include the costs of “stopping” roads, including potential Environment Court costs, the need for a stopped road to be offered back to the former owners, the need in some cases to maintain access to private property and the more enabling provisions of an open space zone (in comparison to “road”).
8. Auckland Council currently uses a number of tools to identify additional open space and recreational opportunities. These include greenway plans (now part of the Auckland Paths project), open space network plans, area plans, centre plans, structure plans and "regeneration" plans. The greenway plans, open space network plans and structure plans, in particular, are already used to identify opportunities to utilise road reserve and unformed legal road and/or pedestrian accessways as open space, and if there are advantages to do so, change their land classification and zoning.

9. Adopting a “global” approach to converting road reserve or unformed legal road to open space would run a high risk of overlooking local and site-specific issues. Following the non-statutory and statutory processes available to the council and assessing each location on a case by case basis, enables the advantages and disadvantages to be clearly identified before determining the most appropriate approach.

10. The most significant opportunities to utilise road reserve and unformed legal road for open space/recreation purposes are as part of the Auckland Paths project. This project represents a $900 million capital investment in Auckland’s walking and cycling network over the next 10 years.

11. Innovative ways of providing open space and/or opportunities for recreation activities in urban areas are not limited to road reserves or unformed paper roads. The wider issue therefore, is what innovative approaches could be used to provide additional areas of open space and/or recreational opportunities? In addition to the information requested in the 7 August 2018 Planning Committee resolution, this paper also provides some examples of innovative approaches used in Auckland and elsewhere in New Zealand and around the world.

**Ngā tūtohunga**

**Recommendation/s**

That the Planning Committee:

a) note that unutilised road reserve and unformed legal roads (paper roads) are already an open space resource.

b) note that unutilised road reserve and unformed legal roads (paper roads) do not necessarily need to be “stopped” and/or rezoned to open space to be used as open space, and that the road stopping process is complex, expensive and can be a protracted process.

c) note that the most significant opportunities to utilise road reserve and unformed legal roads (paper roads) for open space/recreation purposes are as part of the Auckland Paths project which represents the largest ever capital investment in active travel in Auckland.

d) endorse the approach that where unutilised road reserve and unformed legal roads (paper roads) are utilised for open space / recreation purposes, this is in addition to the open space provision standards for a local board area.

e) request that when the parks and open space acquisition policies are next reviewed, consideration is given to specifically referencing the opportunity that unutilised road reserve and unformed legal roads (paper roads) provide in adding to open space outcomes.

f) endorse the use of existing mechanisms such as the preparation, implementation and review of the Auckland Paths project, existing greenway plans, open space network plans and structure plans as the primary tools for identifying future open space opportunities.

g) request staff when undertaking the preparation, implementation or review of the Auckland Paths project, existing greenway plans and open space network plans, and the preparation of structure plans in conjunction with local boards, give further consideration to:
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i) where appropriate, using unutilised road reserve and/or unformed legal roads (paper roads) as open space; and

ii) investigating innovative ways of providing additional open space and recreational facilities such as the Lightpath (in accordance with the Auckland Council’s Parks and Open Space Acquisition Policy 2013, the Open Space Provision Policy 2016 and the Auckland Plan 2050).

h) endorse the existing Auckland Unitary Plan approach for pedestrian accessways, which is that pedestrian accessways linking roads are shown as “road”, and those linking roads to open space are shown as “open space”.

Horopaki
Context

Previous Resolution
12. At its 7 August 2018 meeting, the Planning Committee:

(c) requested staff report back to the Planning Committee before the end of the year on the issues and options associated with reclassifying and rezoning pieces of road reserve and public owned paper roads as recreation reserves and open space. The report should also assess whether pedestrian only accessways should be zoned as open space.

(Resolution number PLA 2018/72)

13. The above resolution of the Planning Committee arose out of its consideration of the Open Space Plan Change (PC13), where land that had been vested or purchased over the preceding year, was to be rezoned to one of the five AUP open space zones.

Problem or Opportunity Definition
14. In established urban areas, it is difficult and hugely expensive to acquire additional public open space. As parts of Auckland become more intensively developed, existing open spaces will need to be used more efficiently and innovative ways of increasing access to open space or providing recreation opportunities may be required.

15. There are portions of road reserve and unformed legal road that are currently, or potentially could be, used as open space. Additional open space could be secured by converting or utilising road reserve as open space. This could be undertaken either with or without “stopping” the road and changing its notation in the AUP.

16. Many existing open spaces/reserves include unformed legal (paper) roads. Some of these are shown as road in the AUP while others are zoned the same as the surrounding open space. The public are generally not aware of these paper roads. Road stopping procedures would be required to “stop” these roads. There is little to be gained and potentially significant costs involved if these unformed legal (paper) roads are “stopped”. In addition, if land is no longer required for a public work, it must be offered back to the former owners under the Public Works Act 1981.

17. Pedestrian walkways linking roads are shown as “road” under the AUP. They are owned and maintained by Auckland Transport. Many of these are vested as local purpose reserve – walkway.
Unformed Legal Roads (or Paper Roads)

18. An unformed road is as much a legal road as the formed roads that make up Auckland’s public road network. Unformed legal roads may only be recorded on survey plans and not always readily identifiable on the ground (which is why they are often referred to as “paper roads”). Most have never been developed due to there being no access requirements, impractical topography, lack of funding priority or unsuitable environmental conditions. Ownership lies with either a territorial authority or the crown. Road Controlling Authority powers are exercisable over them in the same way as other roads. This means that in Auckland, unformed legal roads are under the control of Auckland Transport. Unformed legal roads are an important component of the transport and recreation network envisaged in the Auckland Council Parks and Open Space Strategic Action Plan 2013.

19. Most unformed legal roads were established during the early days of settlement, particularly in the period of provincial government (1854 – 1876). Before crown land was sold, land was set aside as roads to ensure public access would be available once the land was developed. Roads were shown on survey plans, but not frequently built or used.

20. The functions and powers of Auckland Transport are set out in the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 – particularly sections 45 and 46. These provisions provide that Auckland Transport manages and controls the Auckland transport system (including unformed legal roads).

21. Public users have rights of free passage on unformed legal roads as they do with public formed roads. However, unlike formed roads, unformed roads may in places not be traversable due to the condition of the surface, unsuitable terrain, dense vegetation and other natural hazards.

22. Rights of free passage must also be balanced against potential damage to the environment, and Auckland Transport has the right to restrict vehicle movements on unformed legal roads for the purpose of protecting the environment or the public.

23. Some of the unformed legal roads throughout the Auckland region are already used by recreational users for such activities as walking, mountain biking, horse riding, hunting and to reach outdoor destinations such as rivers, lakes and beaches.

The Use of Roads (Including Unformed Roads)

24. Section 22AB of the Land Transport Act 1998 enables road controlling authorities to make certain bylaws. Auckland Transport has a Traffic Bylaw (2012) which sets the requirements for vehicle and road use, parking and enforcement powers on roads under the care, or management of Auckland Transport.

Methods for Removing the Status of Legal Road

25. There are two methods for removing the status of a legal road:
   i) By a process referred to as “road stopping” under the Local Government Act 1974 – see Attachment A (as opposed to temporary road closures where the underlying status of being a road returns after the closure), or
   ii) By the Minister for Land Information who may stop a road under section 116 of the Public Works Act 1981.

26. Auckland Transport can stop roads by following the procedure set out in Schedule 10 of the Local Government Act 1974, which involves public notification. If the road is in a rural area, the consent of the Minister for Land Information must be obtained for the road to be stopped. If there are objections to the road stopping these will need to be determined by the Environment Court.

27. Assessment of whether a road should be stopped is based on a number of factors (including current and possible future use) to determine whether the need for the road for public use is outweighed by the need for the stopping.
28. Once a road has been stopped, it must be offered back to the former land owners under the Public Works Act 1981. If they (or their successors) are not interested in acquiring the land, Auckland Council is responsible for determining how the land will be used or disposed of. In practice, the purpose of the road stopping often determines how the land will be used.

29. Stopped roads bordering waterways must become esplanade reserves. Under the AUP, stopped roads are to be zoned the same as the adjacent zone and do not need to go through a plan change process.

30. Network utilities also have rights to access roads. If there are any utilities in the roads to be stopped, negotiations with these parties will be required to either relocate those assets or provide a legal mechanism for them to remain in the open space.

31. If road is stopped or proposed to be stopped, issues and or past interests in the underlying land can resurface and need to be addressed. For example, issues such as past confiscation and/or alienation of the land are not uncommon.

32. The general public along with community and sporting or recreational groups utilise many unformed roads as recreational trails for walking, mountain biking and coastal access to beaches. Changing the status of the road could potentially raise objections from those groups, although this could be mitigated by an open space zoning.

33. Auckland Transport also has no obligation to form any unformed legal roads, and currently has no forward capital works programme to form or improve unformed roads. However, Auckland Transport will consider applications from adjacent property owners, developers and interest groups to construct carriageways, cycle tracks, bridle paths and footpaths within unformed legal roads at the applicant’s expense where this is vital for development or where significant public access benefits are clearly demonstrated.

### Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

### Analysis and advice

#### The Auckland Unitary Plan Approach

34. The different ways roads, including unformed legal roads are shown in the AUP are listed in the table below. Apart from pedestrian walkways where a consistent approach was adopted throughout the region, these largely reflect the legacy District Plan approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Status</th>
<th>Unitary Plan Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road – formed and sealed</td>
<td>All shown as road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unformed legal (paper) road</td>
<td>Some shown as road, some have the same zoning as adjacent land, some are zoned open space (e.g. if they lie within a park/reserve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian walkway linking road to road</td>
<td>All shown as road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian walkway linking road to open space</td>
<td>All zoned as the same open space zone as the reserve it provides access to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of the Different Unformed Legal Roads

35. Attachment B provides examples of the different ways unformed legal roads and pedestrian accessways are dealt with in the AUP. These include:

a) Road reserve "ends" that are shown as road (e.g. Brett Ave, Takapuna, Ellett Road and Kidd Road, Karaka) but are effectively used as open space;

b) Unformed legal road shown as road (e.g. Kauri Point Domain, unnamed road off Piha Road);

c) Unformed legal road shown as open space (e.g. Omana Reserve, Maraetai);

d) Unformed legal road shown as the same zoning as the adjacent land (e.g. Krippner Road, Puhoi);

e) Pedestrian accessway from road to road (View Road and The Esplanade, Campbells Bay);

f) Pedestrian accessway from road to reserve (Whitby Crescent, Mairangi Bay);

Number of Road Ends, Unformed Legal Roads & Pedestrian Accessways

36. The Plans and Places GIS team undertook an analysis of the number of instances unformed legal roads occur adjacent to the Coastal Marine Area (CMA) and the number of pedestrian accessways shown as road.

37. The table below contains the results of that analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unformed Legal Roads &amp; Pedestrian Accessways</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Approximate Area (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instances of unformed legal roads adjacent to the Coastal Marine Area</td>
<td>512 (Total)</td>
<td>638 (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Instances of unformed legal road zoned as road adjacent to the CMA and not in Parks asset database</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Instances of unformed legal road adjacent to the CMA which are in the parks asset database but are not zoned as open space</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instances of legal road zoned as open space</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian accessways shown as road</td>
<td>465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Potentially there are 512 unformed legal roads adjacent to the CMA that could be rezoned to increase the area of open space zoned land. Of these, 271 are not currently in the Parks asset database and 241 are in the database. This information is portrayed on a map in Attachment C.

39. In addition, there are 465 pedestrian accessways in the Auckland region that are shown in the Unitary Plan as "road". These are located between roads. Pedestrian accessways that provide access from a road to a park (or open space) typically have the same zoning as the adjacent open space.
Relevant Auckland Council Plans and Strategies Relating to Open Space Acquisition

i. The Auckland Plan 2050

40. The outcomes, focus areas and directions from the Auckland Plan 2050 that are relevant to open space are contained in Attachment D.

41. The Auckland Plan 2050, Homes and Places outcome recognises that “As Auckland’s population increases and becomes more urbanised, our public places and spaces will become even more important to our wellbeing. This is particularly the case in areas of high growth, increased density and socio-economic need. This has implications for the number, size and location of our public places. It is also an important reason why we need to think differently about what we consider to be a public place and how we conceive its use. We also need to think differently about how we design and deliver them”.

ii. Parks Acquisition Strategies and Policies

42. The acquisition of parks is guided by the Parks and Open Space Strategic Action Plan 2013, the Parks and Open Space Acquisitions Policy 2013 and the Open Space Provision Policy 2016. The role and function of these documents is outlined in Attachment E.

Tools Available to Identify and Deliver Open Space and Recreation Opportunities

Open Space Network Plans

43. The Open Space Acquisitions Policy identifies tools for identifying future open space and parks. These include two key tools - open space network plans and greenway plans.

44. Open Space Network Plans set out the actions needed to deliver a sustainable quality open space network for a local board area that will respond to the anticipated growth and provide the community with access to a range of recreational, social, cultural and environmental experiences. They sit under the Open Space Strategy, providing high level direction for improvements to the open space network, specific to each Local Board area.

45. The current status of Open Space Network Plans for Auckland Council’s local boards is outlined in Attachment J.

46. The plans assist Auckland Council to prioritise its spending for parks and open space development by identifying projects for prioritisation through the local board plan, long term plan and annual plan processes.

Greenway Plans

47. Auckland’s Greenway Plans are a series of linked, visionary plans being developed from the “ground up” by local boards and their communities with the long-term aim of improving walking, cycling and ecological connections across the region.

48. Greenway Plans aim to provide cycling and walking connections which are safe and pleasant while also improving local ecology and access to recreational opportunities. To achieve this, greenways may cross existing areas of parkland and follow street connections between parks. The network typically follows natural landforms such as streams and coastlines as well as man-made features such as streets and motorways.

49. The status of Greenway Plans for each local board area is outlined in Attachment K. Greenway Plans have recently been superseded by the Auckland Paths project.

Structure Plans

50. Appendix 1 – Structure Plan Guidelines, of the AUP identifies the provision of open space, the integration of green networks with open space and pedestrian and cycle networks and the layout of the transport network and facilities as matters that a structure plan must identify, investigate and address.
51. Open space network plans, greenway plans and structure plans are/can be an effective tool in identifying future open space opportunities associated with road reserves and unformed legal road.

**Examples from Other Cities of Road Reserve/Closed Roads Being Converted to (or Considered as) Open Space**

52. Like Auckland, other cities in Australasia are recognising the open space benefits of roads or road reserves. Attachment F highlights examples from Sydney, Melbourne and Christchurch which illustrate this point.

**Other Innovative Approaches**

53. Innovative ways of providing open space and/or opportunities for recreation activities in urban areas are not limited to road reserves or unformed paper roads.

54. The Auckland Plan 2050 Homes and Places outcome (in Direction 4) states “we need to think differently about what we consider to be a public place and how we conceive its use. We also need to think differently about how we design and deliver them”.

55. There are a number of examples of innovative ways of providing open space and recreational opportunities in Auckland, other parts of New Zealand and overseas. Attachment G provides some examples of these. Existing mechanisms such as the Auckland Paths project, existing greenway plans, open space network plans, area plans, centre plans, structure plans and “regeneration plans” can be used to explore innovative responses to the need for additional open space/recreation facilities, particularly in established urban areas.

**Advantages and Disadvantages of Different Options**

56. Attachment H identifies possible options associated with converting road reserve, unformed legal roads and pedestrian accessways to open space and assesses the advantages and disadvantages. The three scenarios discussed at the Planning Committee meeting of 7 August 2018 are assessed. These are:

- road ends (which are effectively the end portions of road reserve or unformed legal roads)
- paper roads (or unformed legal roads)
- pedestrian accessways.

57. Attachment H also provides an initial scoping of likely costs and benefits. If a plan change was to be pursued, a more detailed section 32 report of the costs and benefits would need to be prepared.

58. In summary, the key advantages of zoning unformed legal roads to open space potentially are:

- increases the amount of land zoned open space
- there is a positive public perception.

59. The key disadvantages are:

- the costs of the process of stopping roads (if they are to be stopped)
- the possibility of Environment Court costs and delays if road stopping is appealed
- in some cases, unformed legal roads provide access to adjacent private land, so access would need to be maintained
- stopped roads may need to be offered back to the former land owner under the Public Works Act 1981
- issue of maintenance responsibility (e.g. Auckland Transport or Parks)
- an open space zoning is generally more enabling than road reserve (in terms of allowing buildings and structures) so there could be opposition to any rezoning from potentially affected persons.
Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera Council group impacts and views

Views of Auckland Transport

60. All roads, including unformed roads are 'owned' by Auckland Council. Auckland Transport, as the road controlling authority, manages the road network for Auckland Council. If the function of a road, including unformed roads, is to change, Auckland Transport would need to support this change in function. If an unformed road was to be used for a public access purpose, like a pedestrian way/cycleway – this would not be a change of function – but there would be funding needed to develop unformed roads for this type of public access.

61. Auckland Transport staff agree that there are opportunities to convert some road reserves and unformed legal roads (paper roads) into open space, particularly in coastal areas. However, they consider that these situations need to be considered on a case by case basis. They also advise that road stopping is a difficult and expensive process and are of the view that a joined-up cross-Council management approach, without the “stopping of roads”, may be able to achieve the same outcomes.

Views of Auckland Council Parks and Recreation Policy Unit

62. The Council’s Parks and Recreation Policy Unit also agree that there are opportunities via road reserve and unformed legal road to expand and enhance the open space network. These are being identified through the Auckland Paths project and the development of open space network plans. In addition, an evaluation of the network plans in the future will be able to identify further opportunities. Parks and Recreation Policy staff are of the view there is not a great deal of value in closing unformed legal roads where they are located in existing parks and already have an open space zoning, as there is no impact in terms of additional open space. They also advise that the New Zealand Walking Access Commission frequently utilises unformed legal roads to develop walking and cycling trails.

63. Parks and Recreation Policy staff also advise that converting all unutilised or unformed legal roads to open space may not accord with council policy and could have significant resource and financial implications. The Council’s Open Space Provision Policy identifies six specific open space typologies:

- Pocket parks
- Neighbourhood parks
- Suburb parks
- Destination parks
- Civic space
- Connection and linkage open space

64. Some unutilised or unformed legal roads could provide connection and linkage open space, particularly those adjoining existing parks or esplanade reserves. However, each site would need to be assessed against the Parks and Open Space Acquisition Policy (2013). Undertaking these assessments would have resource implications in terms of staff time. Auckland Council would need to acquire any assets from Auckland Transport based on net book value in accordance with the internal asset transfer policy. The governing body would need to consider the trade-offs between this expenditure and the acquisition of new open space.

---

1. These open spaces provide contiguous networks of open space that establish recreational, walking, cycling and ecological connections, integrated with on-street connections. Road and stormwater reserves are not considered open space because they do not provide contiguous or continuous functionality for passive and active recreation. The location of these reserves has no impact on open space provision levels.
65. Parks and Recreation Policy staff support the current approach to pedestrian accessways whereby those that link roads are shown as “road” and those that link to open space/parks have the same zoning as the park/open space. They point out that should pedestrian accessways linking roads be converted to open space this may raise maintenance issues for parks.

**Views of Auckland Council’s Parks, Sport and Recreation Department**

66. The Council’s Parks, Sport and Recreation department staff consider that the most significant opportunities to utilise road reserve and unformed legal road are as part of the Auckland Paths project. This project represents a $900 million capital investment in Auckland’s walking and cycling network over the next 10 years. This is the largest ever capital investment in active travel in Auckland. This project is being delivered by NZTA, Auckland Transport and the Council’s local boards, with the potential for third party investment through corporate sponsorship.

67. In new growth areas, the acquisition of open space is guided by the open space provision guidelines. In existing urban areas, the emphasis is on improving the quality of existing open spaces. In many cases, “road ends” are currently being used for open space/recreation purposes. There is always potential to add more but these need to be considered on a case by case basis. Where existing infrastructure is repurposed (e.g. Te Ara I Whiti – the Lightpath, and the Highline in New York), there is significant potential to add to open space and recreational assets.

**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe**

**Local impacts and local board views**

68. Consultation has not yet occurred with local boards. If the recommendations of this report are supported, consultation would occur with the respective local boards through the Auckland Paths project and the development, implementation and future review of open space network plans and structure plans.

69. Representatives of the Devonport-Takapuna and Hibiscus and Bays Local Boards attended a workshop on the issue of converting road reserve and unformed legal road to open space. Email correspondence was also received from the Albert Eden Local Board. The key point made by all three boards was the need to ensure that where road reserve and unformed legal road is utilised as open space and/or for recreation purposes, this is in addition to the normal open space provision standards for a local board area.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

70. Any proposed road stopping would involve engagement with iwi.

71. Under section 40 of the Public Works Act, where land is no longer required for a public work it must be offered back to the former land owner or their successors. If that owner does not want the land it potentially becomes available for Treaty Settlements with iwi having the first right of refusal.

72. Under section 41 of the Public Works Act 1981, where former Māori land is not required for a public work it must be offered back to the former owner(s).

73. Māori are also potentially impacted through the Auckland Paths project and the development of open space network and structure plans. The development of these plans includes engagement with relevant iwi.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea

Financial implications

74. Costs are associated with any road closure and/or plan change process, including possible appeal costs and opportunity costs (loss of the opportunity for council staff to work on other projects). These costs need to be considered alongside the benefits.

75. In addition, the Finance department advises that the transfer of road reserve to open space would need to be paid for by the council at net book value.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga

Risks and mitigations

76. A number of greenway plans, open space network plans and structure plans have been completed recently. If these planning tools are the primary means by which additional open space opportunities are identified and they did not explore or identify all options, there is a risk that opportunities to secure additional open space by way of road reserve and/or unformed legal roads will not be realised for some time when these plans are next reviewed. This risk is mitigated to some extent by opportunities that will be created through the Auckland Paths project.

77. Any “global approach” to converting road reserve or unformed legal road to open space would overlook local and site-specific issues. Following the non-statutory and statutory processes available and assessing each location on a case by case basis will enable potential advantages and disadvantages to be identified before determining the most appropriate approach.

Ngā koringa ā-muri

Next steps

78. An initial assessment of converting unformed legal road and/or pedestrian accessway to an open space zone indicates there are both advantages and disadvantages. The exact nature and degree of these will depend on the context. They therefore need to be looked at on a case by case basis.

79. Auckland Council already has suitable mechanisms and processes underway – the Auckland Paths project, existing greenway plans, open space network plans and structure plans, for identifying opportunities for additional open space across local board areas (see Attachment I for examples). These planning processes already include the assessment of whether road reserve or unformed legal roads could be appropriately converted to or used as open space. The implementation of these plans is the next step in the process. Other innovative approaches to securing open space could also be explored.

80. The Auckland Paths project represents a significant opportunity to add to Auckland’s open space and recreational resources. This project will utilise both road reserve and unformed legal roads (paper roads).

81. Auckland Transport would need to be closely involved in any proposal to convert unformed legal roads to open space as they are the road controlling authority on behalf of Auckland Council.
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Attachment A - Local Government Act 1974 (Road Stopping)

319 General powers of councils in respect of roads

(1) The council shall have power in respect of roads to do the following things:

(h) to stop or close any road or part thereof in the manner and upon the conditions set out in section 342 and Schedule 10:

342 Stopping and closing of roads

(1) The council may, in the manner provided in Schedule 10,—

(a) stop any road or part thereof in the district:

provided that the council shall not proceed to stop any road or part thereof in a rural area unless the prior consent of the Minister of Lands has been obtained; or

(b) close any road to traffic or any specified type of traffic (including pedestrian traffic) on a temporary basis in accordance with that schedule and impose or permit the imposition of charges as provided for in that schedule.

Schedule 10 Conditions as to stopping of roads and the temporary prohibition of traffic on roads

1 The council shall prepare a plan of the road proposed to be stopped, together with an explanation as to why the road is to be stopped and the purpose or purposes to which the stopped road will be put, and a survey made and a plan prepared of any new road proposed to be made in lieu thereof, showing the lands through which it is proposed to pass, and the owners and occupiers of those lands so far as known, and shall lodge the plan in the office of the Chief Surveyor of the land district in which the road is situated. The plan shall separately show any area of esplanade reserve which will become vested in the council under section 345(3).


2 On receipt of the Chief Surveyor’s notice of approval and plan number the council shall open the plan for public inspection at the office of the council, and the council shall at least twice, at intervals of not less than 7 days, give public notice of the proposals and of the place where the plan may be inspected, and shall in the notice call upon persons objecting to the proposals to lodge their objections in writing at the office of the council on or before a date to be specified in the notice, being not earlier than 40 days after the date of the first publication thereof. The council shall also forthwith after that first publication serve a notice in the same form on the occupiers of all land adjoining the road proposed to be stopped or any new road proposed to be made in lieu thereof, and, in the case of any such land of which the occupier is not also the owner, on the owner of the land also, so far as they can be ascertained.
3 A notice of the proposed stoppage shall, during the period between the first publication of the notice and the expiration of the last day for lodging objections as aforesaid, be kept fixed in a conspicuous place at each end of the road proposed to be stopped:

provided that the council shall not be deemed to have failed to comply with the provisions of this clause in any case where any such notice is removed without the authority of the council, but in any such case the council shall, as soon as conveniently may be after being informed of the unauthorised removal of the notice, cause a new notice complying with the provisions of this clause to be affixed in place of the notice so removed and to be kept so affixed for the period aforesaid.

4 If no objections are received within the time limited as aforesaid, the council may by public notice declare that the road is stopped; and the road shall, subject to the council’s compliance with clause 9, thereafter cease to be a road.

5 If objections are received as aforesaid, the council shall, after the expiration of the period within which an objection must be lodged, unless it decides to allow the objections, send the objections together with the plans aforesaid, and a full description of the proposed alterations to the Environment Court.


6 The Environment Court shall consider the district plan, the plan of the road proposed to be stopped, the council’s explanation under clause 1, and any objection made thereto by any person, and confirm, modify, or reverse the decision of the council which shall be final and conclusive on all questions.


7 If the Environment Court reverses the decision of the council, no proceedings shall be entertained by the Environment Court for stopping the road for 2 years thereafter.


8 If the Environment Court confirms the decision of the council, the council may declare by public notice that the road is stopped; and the road shall, subject to the council’s compliance with clause 9, thereafter cease to be a road.


9 Two copies of that notice and of the plans hereinbefore referred to shall be transmitted by the council for record in the office of the Chief Surveyor of the land district in which the road
is situated, and no notice of the stoppage of the road shall take effect until that record is made.

10 The Chief Surveyor shall allocate a new description of the land comprising the stopped road, and shall forward to the District Land Registrar or the Registrar of Deeds, as the case may require, a copy of that description and a copy of the notice and the plans transmitted to him by the council, and the Registrar shall amend his records accordingly.
Attachment B – Examples of the Different Ways Unformed Legal Roads and Pedestrian Accessways are Dealt With in the Auckland Unitary Plan

Road End’s - Winscombe Street & Westwell Road, Belmont
Paper Roads Shown as Road – Unnamed Road in Kauri Point Domain & Defense Land
Paper Roads Show as Road – Unnamed Road off Piha Road, Piha

Attachment B

Item 12
Item 12

Pedestrian Walkways (Road to Road) – View Road & The Esplanade, Campbells Bay
Pedestrian Walkways (Road to Reserve) – Whitby Crescent, Mairangi Bay

[Diagram of pedestrian walkways]

[Another diagram showing the area]
Attachment D – Auckland Plan 2050 – Outcomes, Focus Areas and Directions Relating to Open Space

Auckland Plan

Outcome: Belonging and Participation

**Direction 1:** Foster an inclusive Auckland where everyone belongs

**Focus area 1:** Create safe opportunities for people to meet, connect, participate in, and enjoy community and civic life

**Focus area 7:** Recognise the value of arts, culture, sports and recreation to quality of life

**Outcome:** Homes and Places

**Direction 4:** Provide sufficient public places and spaces that are inclusive, accessible and contribute to urban living

The Auckland Plan contains the following statement on the need for different thinking on public places/spaces.

"As Auckland’s population increases and becomes more urbanised, our public places and spaces will become even more important to our wellbeing. This is particularly the case in areas of high growth, increased density and socio-economic need.

This has implications for the number, size and location of our public places. It is also an important reason why we need to think differently about what we consider to be a public place and how we conceive its use. We also need to think differently about how we design and deliver them.

They have to:

- support multiple uses
- be able to adapt and change in the future
- reflect who we are as communities, Aucklanders and New Zealanders.

As Auckland grows and intensifies, space will be at an even higher premium.

Acquiring new public space is expensive. Auckland must therefore complement any new public places by getting more out of what we already have. Innovative and thoughtful design will be key ways of meeting this challenge”.

Outcome: Transport and Access

**Direction 1:** Better connect people, places, goods and services

**Direction 2:** Increase genuine travel choices for a healthy, vibrant and equitable Auckland

**Direction 3:** Maximise safety and environmental protection

**Focus area 1:** Make better use of existing transport networks

**Focus area 4:** Make walking, cycling and public transport preferred choices for many more Aucklanders
Focus area 5: Better integrate land-use and transport

Quality open space is a critical component of attractive and liveable high density urban areas. Therefore, high quality open space can facilitate the regeneration and growth of urban centres. The existing urban area of Auckland has an established, well distributed, open space network. The ability to significantly expand the urban network is constrained due to the land supply and budget constraints. Therefore, council’s investment in open space in the existing urban area prioritises improving the existing network.
Attachment E – Parks Acquisition Strategies and Policies

Parks and Open Spaces Strategic Action Plan 2013
1. The Parks and Open Spaces Strategic Action Plan, 2013 focuses on creating a green network across Auckland by physically and visually connecting parks, open spaces and streets. The priorities for the next 10 years are to:
   - Create greenways across Auckland
   - See our streets as places
   - Create a regional trail network
   - Connect our natural areas
   - Link with the transport network
   - Use parks and open space to create attractive urban areas
2. Actions identified in the plan include:
   - (P3) Develop greenway plans for all local board areas that identify and prioritise opportunities to enhance connection between local destinations and provide recreational opportunities through streets, parks and open spaces.
   - (P4) Develop local park network plans for all local board areas based on analysis of the current network and that prioritise actions for improvement.
   - (P5) Develop a regional park network plan based on analysis of the current network and that prioritises actions for improvement.
   - (P6) Develop a regional open space network plan based on analysis of the provision of parks and open spaces across Auckland and outlines investment priorities at a regional scale.
   - (P7) Plan and implement a regional trail network that aims to provide destinations for walking and riding that will attract users from across Auckland and tourists.
   - (P8) Prioritise upgrading and investment in new parks, open spaces and streetscapes in areas identified for growth (intensification and greenfield development) in the Auckland Unitary Plan.
   - (P9) Develop our network of walkways and cycleways through parks and open spaces to implement connections identified in greenway plans.

Parks and Open Space Acquisitions Policy 2013
3. The Parks and Open Space Acquisition Policy sets the framework for acquiring new land for parks and open space.
4. The policy identifies four acquisition criteria and high and medium priorities. It also identifies matters that are “not a priority” within each of those criteria.
5. The high priorities within each of the criteria that are potentially relevant to utilising road reserve and/or unformed legal road as open space are outlined in the table below:
### Attachment E

**Item 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>High Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting community needs, now and in the future</td>
<td>Land to increase the accessibility or capacity of the parks and open space network that serve areas identified as most change and significant change in the Auckland Development Strategy. Land to meet a significant current and future need identified in a council endorsed needs assessment or parks and open space network plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecting our parks and open space</td>
<td>Land that will establish a significant area of contiguous park or open space that enhance recreation, ecological or landscape values. Land required to establish regional or sub-regional recreation connections (walkways, bike trails) identified in an endorsed council plan (e.g. greenways plan, parks and open space network plan). Riparian land (such as esplanade reserves) that provides access to or along the coast or waterways. Land that connects areas of habitat or significant ecological value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting and restoring Auckland’s unique features and meanings</td>
<td>Land containing or protecting rare or threatened indigenous ecological values. Land containing historic heritage or cultural value, including taonga o significance to Mana Whenua, of regional significance or greater and that has public open space values. Land of geological or landscape value of regional significance or greater and that has public open space values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the parks and open space we already have</td>
<td>Land that will improve the accessibility and functionality of an existing park or open space that serves an area of most and significant change identified in the Auckland Development Strategy. Land that provides access to an existing park from an area with poor access to parks and open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Open Space Provision Policy 2016**

6. The Open Space Provision Policy 2016 gives effect to the Parks and Open Spaces Strategic Action Plan. It informs the council’s investment, asset and acquisition...
activities in open space, and guides spatial planning by both the council and the private sector.

7. The focus for investment in open space in the existing urban areas is:
   - investing in the established open space network to offer a wider range of activities for more people;
   - improving linkages between open space, such as establishing greenways;
   - optimising assets through land exchange and reconfiguration;
   - acquiring new open spaces as opportunities allow, particularly in large brownfield developments.

8. The focus for investment in open space in greenfield areas is:
   - investing in new open space when growth occurs;
   - integrating open space with stormwater, transport, schools and community facilities;
   - creating a resilient and multi-functional open space network that can evolve with changing community needs over time;
   - connecting new and existing open space networks.

9. The policy sets out principles to deliver high quality parks and open spaces across the region. The principles align to the four areas of focus of the Parks and Open Spaces Strategic Action Plan – treasure, connect, enjoy and utilise.

10. The principles most relevant to the potential use of unformed legal roads and road reserve include:
    - Provide regular access points to coastal open space networks and the foreshore from adjoining streets;
    - Locate corridors of multifunctional public space along the coast, streams and floodplains that provide for green infrastructure, conservation and recreation outcomes;
    - Form contiguous open space networks along waterways, the coastline and floodplains, particularly where esplanade reserves or green infrastructure corridors are required;
    - Retrofit linkages and improve access to open space in the existing urban area when opportunities arise;
    - Use greenways and ‘green streets’ with generous berms, street trees, wide footpaths and cycleways to connect parks and open spaces and create recreational circuits for walking, running and cycling;
    - Implement connections identified in greenway plans, walking and cycling strategies, or other spatial plans;
    - Ensure esplanade reserves are wide enough to provide for access and environmental outcomes. Expect to provide a 20-metre wide esplanade reserve or strip alongside all qualifying water bodies;
    - Integrate the design of civic space and adjoining streets to create larger spaces, and add interest to the street.

11. The Open Space Provision Policy 2016 also contain metrics for the provision of open space.
Attachment F – Examples From Other Cities of Road Reserve/Closed Roads Being Converted to (or Considered as) Open Space

City of Sydney

1. The City of Sydney’s “Open Space, Sports and Recreation Needs Study 2016” identifies street closures as one of its open space classifications. The classifications are:
   - Park
   - Pocket Park
   - Foreshore Park
   - School
   - Street closure
   - Civic
   - Ancillary link
   - Open space not controlled by the City of Sydney

2. The strategy notes that ‘key to creating open space linkages is the City’s Liveable Green Network and at a wider regional level the State Governments Sydney Green Grid. These projects will make walking and cycling a viable option to access the open space and recreation network as well as being part of a greater recreation/fitness network’.

City of Melbourne

3. The City of Melbourne’s investigations into open space opportunities for North and West Melbourne (Open Space Opportunities In North and West Melbourne – City of Melbourne (undated)) includes a number of road reserves adjacent to existing parks.

4. Although North and West Melbourne possess few large parks, the local street pattern produces two important open space assets. Thoroughfares are wide, and pockets of open space occur where different street grids intersect. Some of these streets and intersections are intensively landscaped. These areas provide green corridors and green spaces within a dense fabric of residential and mixed – use buildings. However, the potential of many other streets and sites remains unrealized. In their current form they are too small, too inaccessible or too sparsely planted to provide valuable recreational amenities.

5. The study focuses on the irregular “left over” spaces that occur between North and West Melbourne’s skewed street grids. It examines how these accidental open spaces can become more significant components of the city’s recreational open space system.

6. The analysis recommends full and partial (narrowing of the road reserve) road closures and the incorporation of land into adjacent reserves.
Christchurch City

7. The Christchurch City Council Public Open Space Strategy covers the following categories:
   - ‘green spaces’ (parks used for recreation and amenity purposes and for the protection of biodiversity and cultural heritage);
   - ‘blue spaces’ (the city’s waterways and wetlands);
   - ‘grey space’ (streets, malls and squares).

8. Grey Spaces primarily refers to the street network. In addition to its transportation function, it also provides for passive recreation, amenity, potential connectivity between parks and other civic features, as well as areas for exercise.

9. Grey spaces also incorporate elements of green, such as grass bays and plantings and make a major contribution to the landscape character of the city. A high proportion of urban Christchurch’s open space consists of street networks.

10. Examples of roads enhanced for pedestrian use include civic squares, pedestrian malls and living streets such as Cathedral Square, City Mall and New Regent Street.

11. Open space issues identified in the strategy include:
   - Provision of adequate parks space is needed to meet the day-to-day requirements of existing and future residents in areas with open space deficiency and urban intensification including the Central City;
   - Improved pedestrian friendly linkages, including streets, are needed within the Central City to link existing open space features;
   - Generally, Christchurch urban parks are not well linked either by pedestrian friendly streets or green or blue open space;
   - Better access through rural areas for walking and cycling using Council-owned unformed legal roads is needed.
Attachment G – Examples of Innovative Ways of Providing Open Space and Recreational Opportunities

1. Use of road reserve e.g. skatepark on Greville Reserve, Forrest Hill Road, Auckland
2. Open Space Over Railway Yards e.g Millennium Park, Chicago
3. Cycle and walking trails around the perimeter of golf courses

Oregon, USA

Chamberlain Park/Northwestern cycleway
4. Roof top parks/open spaces

Gangbuk Gu, South Korea
5. On top of existing infrastructure (Greville Reserve, Forrest Hill water reservoir (learn to ride course)
6. Disused infrastructure e.g. rail lines

The High line, New York City

The 606, Chicago
7. Purpose built bridges, aerial parks (e.g Frank Kitts Park, Wellington)
8. Stairways (e.g. Freyburg Place, Auckland City)

Hurstmore Green (Takapuna)
9. Over water

Westhaven Promenade, Auckland

Santa Monica Pier, Los Angeles
10. Abandoned or converted infrastructure - railway lines, motorways

Central Otago Rail Trail

Light Path, Auckland
11. Disused Quarries (e.g. Bellwood Quarry/Park, Atlanta)
12. Vacant Land

Wellesley Street Temporary Park, Auckland
13. Car parks (e.g. Proposed Takapuna Square, Takapuna central carpark)

*Golden Shoe carpark area, Singapore*
14. Walls (e.g. Millennium Park, Chicago)
### 1. Road Reserve and Unformed Legal (Paper) Roads

#### Option 1a - Road Stopping Option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages/benefits</th>
<th>Disadvantages/costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secures additional public open space</td>
<td>Road stopping costs (e.g. survey, valuation, legal costs - $25-$30,000 for average road stopping)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive public perception (adding/securing additional open space)</td>
<td>Costs of the process (e.g. Committee reports, signage etc., vesting of land as reserve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possibility of Environment Court costs (if any of the changes are appealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stopped road my need to be offered back to original land owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In some cases, road ends provide access to adjacent private land and so would need to be assessed on a case by case basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance responsibility shift to Parks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Option 1b - Non Road Stopping Option but Zoning Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages/benefits</th>
<th>Disadvantages/costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No road stopping costs (as road remains open but a portion of it is “zoned” open space – note GIS are able to create a phantom boundary for the zone boundary)</td>
<td>Plan Change costs – changing the “zoning” from road to open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secures additional public open space</td>
<td>Possibility of Environment Court costs (if any of the changes are appealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive public perception (adding/securing additional open space)</td>
<td>Maintenance responsibility may shift to Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space zoning reflects current use of that portion of the road reserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not need to be offered back to the former owner as status as road is unchanged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Option 1c – Non Road Stopping & No Zoning Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages/benefits</th>
<th>Disadvantages/costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secures additional public open space if paper road is currently shown as road</td>
<td>No net gain in public open space unless paper road is currently shown as road as it is not adding to the open space resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive public perception (adding/securing additional open space)</td>
<td>Maintenance responsibility may shift to Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper road remains available for public access</td>
<td>Less of an opportunity for a positive public message (adding/securing additional open space)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Pedestrian Accessways

Option 2a - Pedestrian Accessways Providing Access Between Roads Rezoned to Open Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages/benefits</th>
<th>Disadvantages/costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secures additional land as public open space (although its use does not change)</td>
<td>Plan Change costs (but could be bundled with other open space changes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possibility of Environment Court costs (if any of the changes are appealed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issues of maintenance responsibility AT v Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing access (some properties utilise walkways to access their property – legally if these are identified as road)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 2b – Pedestrian Accessways Providing Access Between Roads - No Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages/benefits</th>
<th>Disadvantages/costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walkway remains available for pedestrian access</td>
<td>No additional open space secured¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retains existing access to those properties which utilise walkways to access their property – legally if these are identified as road</td>
<td>No costs associated with a plan change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No possibility of Environment Court costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance responsibility remains with Auckland Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

¹ If road reserves/walkways are recognised as part of the open space network (i.e can be used and are recognised in the metrics) then what they are zoned is not really relevant
### Attachment J - The current status of Open Space Network Plans for the Auckland Region’s Local Boards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Open Space Network Plan Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>No date specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>No date specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāmaki portion of Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>No date specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orākei</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pukatāpapa</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>No date specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke</td>
<td>No date specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment K - The Status of Greenway Plans for Each Local Board Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Greenway Plan Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>Aug 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Tekepuna</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin (Pukekohe – Parata Paths Plan)</td>
<td>Dec 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin (Pohutukawa Coast Trails)</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin (Waiuku Te Ara Hiko – Waiuku Trails)</td>
<td>Dec 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>In 2018/19 Board work plan. Referred to as a connections plan rather than a greenway plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>Dec 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick (Walking and Cycling Network)</td>
<td>Nov 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipatiki</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>Aug 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>No plan although the Board intend to develop one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Dec 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>Aug 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oiota-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>Sept 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pukotainuku</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney (Puhoi to Pakiri Greenways Local Paths Plan)</td>
<td>May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney (Wellsford Greenways)</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney (Kumeu, Huapai, Wai maukau &amp; Riverhead)</td>
<td>Dec 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney (Wai Rodney Greenways Local Paths Plan)</td>
<td>Currently being developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>Nov 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiake</td>
<td>Currently being developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>Oct 2018 – draft version only, soon to be adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiwai (Waiwai Neighbourhood Greenways Plan)</td>
<td>Aug 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) - Private Plan Change Request from Counties Racing Club to rezone land at Pukekohe Park

File No.: CP2019/07343

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To consider a private plan change request (the request) from Counties Racing Club to rezone 5.8ha of land at 222-250 Manukau Road, Pukekohe (Pukekohe Park) from Special Purpose – Major Recreation Facility to Business – General Business zone in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) and remove the rezoned land from the Pukekohe Park Precinct.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. The request seeks to rezone 5.8ha of land in Pukekohe Park from Special Purpose – Major Recreation Facility to Business – General Business in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP) and remove the rezoned land from the Pukekohe Park Precinct. The proposed plan change area (the site) is located on the north-western corner of Pukekohe Park fronting Manukau Road, and is surplus to the needs of the club for providing its primary activities being horse racing and motor racing.

3. Under clause 25 of Part 2 of Schedule 1 to the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), the council is required to make a decision that either:
   a) adopts the request as if it were a proposed plan made by the council, which must then be processed in accordance with the provisions of Part 1 of Schedule 1 (clause 25(2)(a)); or
   b) accepts the private plan change request, in whole or in part, which then triggers a requirement to notify the request, or part of the request, under clause 25 (clause 25(2)(b)); or
   c) rejects the private plan change request in whole or in part, in reliance on one of the limited grounds set out in clause 25(4); or
   d) decides to deal with the request as if it were an application for a resource consent (clause 25(3)).

4. It is recommended that the private plan change request is accepted under clause 25(2)(b) and notified for submissions.

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s

That the Planning Committee:

a) accept the private plan change request by Counties Racing Club for Pukekohe Park, included as Attachment A to the agenda report, pursuant to clause 25(2)(b) of Part 2 of Schedule 1 to the Resource Management Act 1991 for the following reasons:
   i) having regard to relevant case law the request does not meet the limited grounds for rejection under clause 25(4);
ii) it is more appropriate to accept the request than ‘adopt’ it or treat it as a resource consent application.

b) delegate authority to the Manager Central and South Planning to undertake the required notification and other statutory processes associated with processing the private plan change request by Counties Racing Club for Pukekohe Park pursuant to Schedule 1 to the Resource Management Act 1991.

Horopaki
Context
Site and surrounding area
5. The site is 5.8ha and forms the north-western corner of Pukekohe Park, a 73ha horse racing, motor racing and events facility owned by Counties Racing Club (CRC) (refer to Figure 1). It is approximately 2km south of Pukekohe Town Centre. The site is zoned Special Purpose - Major Recreation Facility and is subject to the Pukekohe Park Precinct.

6. The site is largely an open grassed area, which is occasionally used for overflow event parking. Two businesses, Kia and Versatile Pukekohe occupy a relatively small area at the north-western corner of the site, facing Manukau Road.

7. The site is adjoined by the environs of Pukekohe Park to the east and south. To the north are businesses which include a car yard, commercial vehicle servicing and a large storage facility. The Pukekohe Mega Centre is located at the north-eastern corner of the site. Manukau Road adjoins the site to the west.

8. The wider surrounding environment is comprised of a variety of land uses and zones. To the north along both sides of Manukau Road are light industrial and commercial activities zoned either Business – General Business or Business – Light Industry. Large areas to the east and west are zoned Future Urban and are dominated by large grassed areas and farmland. Horticultural activity on Rural – Rural Production zoned land occurs beyond the Future Urban zone to the west. The southern train line runs along the full length of Pukekohe Park’s eastern boundary, with the Franklin Trotting club being located on the opposite side. The Buckland township is an established low-density residential area located to the south.

9. Much of the surrounds are currently part of council’s Pukekohe Structure Plan process. The application of business zoning is currently being anticipated for the surrounding Future Urban zoned area.
Private plan change request

10. The request was lodged on 29 March 2019 (see Attachment A) and seeks to rezone 5.8ha of Pukekohe Park from Special Purpose – Major Recreation Facility to Business – General Business and to remove the rezoned land from the Pukekohe Park Precinct. No further amendments to the AUP are sought.

11. The purpose of the plan change is to allow commercial development. CRC have for some time been considering the financial sustainability of their operation, especially considering the broad challenges facing the racing industry. They have concluded that the proposed rezoning will enable them to make the best use of surplus land and ensure the longer-term sustainable operation of Pukekohe Park for horse racing and motor racing. CRC intends to maintain ownership of the land, and following the plan change, the club would be able to lease the land for commercial tenants. This will provide the club with an additional revenue stream for the long term without affecting their existing activities.

12. The existing zoning of the site is shown in Figure 2 while the proposed zoning is shown in Figure 3.
Figure 2: Existing zones under the AUP – plan change area in red

Figure 3: Rezoning proposed by the private plan change – plan change area in red
Planning Committee  
04 June 2019

13. The applicant has provided documentation relating to the following in support of the request:
   - Private plan change request
   - Certificates of Title
   - Section 32 (S32) evaluation report
   - Integrated transport assessment
   - Economic impact assessment
   - Urban design statement
   - Acoustic assessment
   - Infrastructure and stormwater report
   - Ecology report.

14. Further information has been requested from the applicant. None of the information requested is material to this stage of the plan change process. The information being sought is primarily to determine whether the proposed zone is the most appropriate and to provide a reasonable degree of certainty for how effects can be managed. Once received, this information will inform the merits assessment to follow.

15. It is considered that the information lodged is sufficient for the council to consider the request under clause 23(6).

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu
Analysis and advice

Resource Management Act 1991

16. The process for considering private plan change requests is set out in Part 2 of Schedule 1 to the RMA. A request can be made to the appropriate local authority by any person under clause 21 of Schedule 1. After a request has been lodged, a local authority can request further information under clause 23, and modify a request under clause 24, but only with the applicant's agreement.

17. Under clause 23(6), if an applicant refuses to provide any requested further or additional information, a local authority that considers it has insufficient information to enable it to consider or approve the request, may reject the request or decide not to approve the plan change requested.

18. Under clause 25, after receiving the request, receiving all required information and modifying the request (where relevant), the local authority is required to make a decision to either:
   - adopt the request as if it were a proposed plan made by the council, which must then be processed in accordance with the provisions of Part 1 of Schedule 1 (clause 25(2)(a)); or
   - accept the private plan change request, in whole or in part, which then triggers a requirement to notify the request, or part of the request, under clause 25 (clause 25(2)(b)); or
   - reject the private plan change request in whole or in part, in reliance on one of the limited grounds set out in clause 25(4); or
   - decide to deal with the request as if it were an application for a resource consent (clause 25(3)).

19. See Attachment B for the full wording of the clauses that make up Part 2 of Schedule 1 to the RMA.
Options available to the council

20. Council staff consider that the applicant has provided sufficient information to enable the request to be considered, and do not consider the ground of rejection in clause 23(6) (insufficient information) to be available. The next sections of this report assess the various options available to the council under clause 25.

Option 1 – Reject the request, in whole or in part

21. The council has the power to reject a private plan change request, in whole or in part, in reliance on one of the limited grounds set out in clause 25(4). If the private plan change request is rejected by the council, the applicant has the ability to appeal that decision to the Environment Court under clause 27 of Schedule 1.

22. The grounds for rejection under clause 25(4) are as follows:
   a) the request or part of the request is frivolous or vexatious; or
   b) within the last two years, the substance of the request or part of the request:
      i) has been considered and given effect to, or rejected by, the local authority or the Environment Court; or
      ii) has been given effect to by regulations made under section 360A; or
   c) the request or part of the request is not in accordance with sound resource management practice; or
   d) the request or part of the request would make the policy statement or plan inconsistent with Part 5; or
   e) in the case of a proposed change to a policy statement or plan, the policy statement or plan has been operative for less than two years.

Is the request frivolous or vexatious?

23. The plan change aims to establish a Business – General Business zone to provide for commercial development in an area which is now surplus to Pukekohe Park’s needs. The plan change includes a S32 evaluation report which is supported by specialist assessments for key matters such as transport, flooding and ecology, acoustics, economics and urban design. Following the plan change, the CRC will likely lease the land for commercial tenants. This substance of the plan change and its aim of enabling commercial development are not considered frivolous or vexatious.

24. It is therefore recommended that the council not reject the private plan change request on the basis that it is frivolous or vexatious.

Has the substance of the request been considered and given effect to or rejected by the council within the last two years?

25. These provisions largely seek to discourage repetitive private plan change requests that are substantially the same, with the associated costs to the council and the community.

26. A similar rezoning request was considered during the Auckland Unitary Plan hearings process. At the time, the applicant had not provided sufficiently detailed information for the rezoning to be adequately considered. In any case, it has been more than two years since the council made its decisions in response to the recommendations made by the Auckland Unitary Plan Independent Hearings Panel.

27. It is recommended that the council not reject the request on the basis of this ground of rejection.
Has the substance of the request been given effect to by regulations made under section 360A?

28. Section 360A of the RMA relates to regulations amending regional coastal plans pertaining to aquaculture activities. The substance of this private plan change request does not relate to section 360A of the RMA.

29. It is recommended that the council not reject the request on the basis of this ground of rejection.

Is the request in accordance with sound resource management practice?

30. The term “sound resource management practice” is an often used planning term but is not defined in the RMA. The High Court in Malory Corporation Limited v Rodney District Council (CIV-2009-404-005572), where the issue on appeal was determining the correct interpretation of clause 25(4), considered this term in light of clause 25(4)(c) of Schedule 1 and stated:

“... the words “sound resource management practice” should, if they are to be given any coherent meaning, be tied to the Act’s purpose and principles. I agree too with the Court’s observation that the words should be limited to only a coarse scale merits assessment, and that a private plan change which does not accord with the Act’s purposes and principles will not cross the threshold for acceptance or adoption.”

31. The request includes a number of specialist reports, which all support the proposed plan change. Council has consulted Auckland Transport (AT) and Watercare and engaged experts to consider the plan change. While there are aspects of the private plan change request that need to be tested through the submission and hearings process, the scope and extent of the changes sought do not, in themselves, threaten the purpose and principles of the RMA when considered at this stage.

32. It is therefore recommended that the council not reject the private plan change on the basis that it is contrary to sound resource management practice.

Would the request or part of the request make the policy statement or plan inconsistent with Part 5 of the RMA?

33. Part 5 sets out the role and purpose of planning documents created under the RMA, including that they must assist a local authority to give effect to the sustainable management purpose of the RMA. The proposal to rezone Special Purpose – Major Recreation Facility to Business – General Business zone will not make the AUP inconsistent with Part 5 of the RMA.

34. It is therefore recommended that the council not reject the private plan change request on the basis that the substance of the request would make the AUP inconsistent with Part 5 of the RMA.

Has the district plan to which the request relates been operative for less than two years?

35. The district plan provisions of the AUP relevant to this request were made operative on 15 November 2016. The provisions have therefore been operative for more than two years.

36. It is therefore recommended that the council not reject the private plan change request on the basis that the relevant parts of the AUP have been operative for more than two years.

Option 2 – Decide to deal with the request as if it were an application for resource consent

37. The council can, in some circumstances, decide to deal with a private plan change request as if it were an application for resource consent. Given the current zoning of the site, it is considered that the most appropriate process to consider whether commercial development is appropriate is through a plan change process.

38. It is therefore recommended that the council not decide to deal with the request as if it were an application for resource consent.
Option 3 – Adopt the request, or part of the request, as if it were a proposed plan made by the council itself

39. The council is able to decide to adopt the request and process it as though it were a council-initiated plan change. If a request is adopted, all costs associated with the plan change would rest with the council.

40. Given that the applicant has not requested that the council adopt the private plan change and the council would accept all costs associated with the plan change if it were adopted, it is not recommended that the council adopts the private plan change request.

Option 4 – Accept the private plan change request, in whole or in part, and proceed to notify the request, or part of the request

41. If the council accepts the request, in whole or in part, it must then proceed to notify the request, or part of the request under clause 26. After the submission period has closed, the council would need to hold a hearing to consider any submissions, and a decision would then be made by the council in relation to the request in accordance with Schedule 1 of the RMA. All costs associated with the request (including notification and any hearing) would rest with the applicant.

42. This is the only remaining option and is supported on the basis that the request does not meet the criteria for rejection under clause 25(4) of Schedule 1 to the RMA, having regard to relevant case law, and it is more appropriate to accept the request than adopt it or treat it as a resource consent application.

43. It is therefore recommended that the council accepts the private plan change request.

Conclusion

44. Having carefully assessed the request against the relevant matters set out in the RMA and associated case law, it is recommended that council decide to accept the request and notify it for submissions.

Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera

Council group impacts and views

45. AT has reviewed the plan change and has not reported any fundamental constraints which would prevent the plan change from being accepted. AT has provided detailed feedback and identified several transport issues where further information will be required. AT will review the response when it is available and will continue to be involved in the plan change process.

46. Healthy Waters has reviewed the plan change and consider that further information is required in relation to stormwater management, flooding and effects on water quality. The issues raised are not considered material to the decision to accept the plan change and can be resolved through further information being provided by the applicant.

47. Watercare has reviewed the plan change and requested that the applicant provide a capacity assessment for water supply and wastewater. This was provided on 17 May 2019 and stated that no capacity issues are anticipated.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe
Local impacts and local board views

48. The applicant attended the Franklin Local Board’s business meeting on 27 November 2018, to update the board on the work being done to progress the plan change in Pukekohe Park.

49. Following lodgment of the plan change with council, staff provided a copy to the local board and their feedback was requested. The following response was received on 29 April 2019:

“The Franklin Local Board supports this application as it aligns with our local board plan outcome: A thriving local economy. It is also in line with Council’s draft structure plan for Pukekohe-Paerata. The General Business zone is more favoured to provide a wider scope of commercial activity, which would also manage reverse sensitivity.

This will provide the Racing Club the opportunity to be more sustainable and create opportunities to provide needed commercial zoned land in Pukekohe. There is a need to ensure activities that could directly conflict with the imposition of noise contours around the park are not permitted e.g. retirement village or apartments, which would be contrary to the long held desire to avoid residential living within the immediate surrounds of the park.”

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori
Māori impact statement

50. On 17 April 2017, a number of amendments to the RMA came into force which place an increased focus on engagement and consultation with iwi authorities as part of various plan-making processes. This is particularly the case for plan change processes that are initiated or adopted by the Council.

51. The applicant advises that it has engaged the following iwi groups with an interest in the local area (see below). The proposal including plans were sent to the iwi groups via email, providing opportunity for queries before the plan change request was lodged with council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mana Whenua Group</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki</td>
<td>No response received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Maru</td>
<td>No response received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Tamaoho</td>
<td>Ngāti Tamaoho were met onsite and a Cultural Values Assessment has been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Te Ata</td>
<td>Ngāti Te Ata were met onsite and written feedback has been received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Ākitai Waiohua</td>
<td>No response received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato - Tainui</td>
<td>No response received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. A cultural impact statement from Ngāti Tamaoho has been submitted with the plan change. A letter from Ngāti Te Ata has also been provided. Both have made a number of recommendations primarily around water quality and the management of stormwater effects. This feedback will be considered as part of the plan change process. An ecology report has been submitted by the applicant on 26 April 2019 to address water quality concerns.

53. If the council accepts the plan change for notification, all iwi authorities/mana whenua will have the opportunity to make submissions on the private plan change.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea
Financial implications
54. If accepted, the council’s costs associated with processing the private plan change request would be met by the applicant.

Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga
Risks and mitigations
55. The only risk associated with the recommendations made in this report is a judicial review by a third party. This risk is considered to be very low and mitigated by the analysis provided in this report.

Ngā koringa ā-muri
Next steps
56. If the private plan change is accepted for notification, the implementation of this decision will follow the process set out in clause 26 of Schedule 1 of the RMA. This requires that the private plan change is notified within four months of being accepted, unless this time frame is waived in accordance with section 37 of the RMA. A hearing will subsequently be held, after which point the council’s decision will be released. As with all council and private plan changes, submitters are able to appeal the council’s decision to the Environment Court.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments
Due to the size and complexity of Attachment A it has been published separately at the following link: [http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz]> Planning Committee > 4 June 2019 > Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Private Plan Change Request (90 pages) <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Extract from Clause 25 RMA</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

| Author          | Jimmy Zhang - Planner                                                 |
| Authorisers     | John Duguid - General Manager - Plans and Places                      |
|                 | Megan Tyler - Chief of Strategy                                        |
Clause 25, Schedule 2, Resource Management Act 1991

25 Local authority to consider request

(1) A local authority shall, within 30 working days of—

(a) receiving a request under clause 21; or

(b) receiving all required information or any report which was commissioned under clause 23; or

(c) modifying the request under clause 24—

whichever is the latest, decide under which of subclauses (2), (3), and (4), or a combination of subclauses (2) and (4), the request shall be dealt with.

(1A) The local authority must have particular regard to the evaluation report prepared for the proposed plan or change in accordance with clause 22(1)—

(a) when making a decision under subclause (1); and

(b) when dealing with the request under subclause (2), (3), or (4).

(2) The local authority may either—

(a) adopt the request, or part of the request, as if it were a proposed policy statement or plan made by the local authority itself and, if it does so,—

(i) the request must be notified in accordance with clause 5 or 5A within 4 months of the local authority adopting the request; and

(ii) the provisions of Part 1 or 4 must apply; and

(iii) the request has legal effect once publicly notified; or

(b) accept the request, in whole or in part, and proceed to notify the request, or part of the request, under clause 26.

(2AA) However, if a direction is applied for under section 80C, the period between the date of that application and the date when the application is declined under clause 77(1) must not be included in the calculation of the 4-month period specified by subclause (2)(a)(i).

(2A) Subclause (2)(a)(iii) is subject to section 86B.

(3) The local authority may decide to deal with the request as if it were an application for a resource consent and the provisions of Part 6 shall apply accordingly.

(4) The local authority may reject the request in whole or in part, but only on the grounds that—

(a) the request or part of the request is frivolous or vexatious; or

(b) within the last 2 years, the substance of the request or part of the request—

(i) has been considered and given effect to, or rejected by, the local authority or the Environment Court; or

(ii) has been given effect to by regulations made under section 360A; or
(c) the request or part of the request is not in accordance with sound resource management practice; or

(d) the request or part of the request would make the policy statement or plan inconsistent with Part 5; or

(e) in the case of a proposed change to a policy statement or plan, the policy statement or plan has been operative for less than 2 years.

(5) The local authority shall notify the person who made the request, within 10 working days, of its decision under this clause, and the reasons for that decision, including the decision on notification.
Auckland Unitary Plan - Plan Change 3: Stockade Hill Viewshaft (to be made operative)

File No.: CP2019/08055

Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval to make Plan Change 3 to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part): Protection of views from Stockade Hill, Howick, operative.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary
3. A panel of independent commissioners decided on 13 August 2018 to approve Plan Change 3, subject to modifications (the decision).
4. This decision received two appeals, from Housing New Zealand Corporation (HNZC) and Janet Dickson.
5. Following discussions all parties have agreed that these appeals can be settled in their entirety by consent. Subsequently, the Environment Court issued a consent order.
6. The consent order includes a new overlay to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part), D20A Stockade Hill Viewshaft Overlay. The purpose of this overlay is to maintain and enhance the integrity of the view from Stockade Hill to the coastal environment (Hauraki Gulf and Islands). The overlay does this by restricting the height of new development within the overlay area, so that it does not intrude into or obstruct views to the coastal environment.
7. The relevant parts of the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) can now be amended and made operative as set out in the consent order (and included in Attachment A of the agenda report).

Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) approve Plan Change 3 to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) as it relates to the Environment Court consent order dated 18 April 2019, as identified in Attachments A and B of the agenda report.

b) request staff to complete the necessary statutory processes to publicly notify the date on which Plan Change 3 will become operative as soon as practicable.
Horopaki

Context

8. Plan Change 3 is a council-initiated plan change that seeks to protect views of Rangitoto, the Hauraki Gulf and the Islands from a public open space – Stockade Hill, Howick. The plan change proposed to delete an existing contour based local public viewshaft that originated from the base of Stockade Hill. It then proposed to introduce a new viewshaft and a blanket building height restriction area into the Local Public Views Overlay that originates from the top of Stockade Hill.

9. A decision to approve Plan Change 3, with modifications, was made by a panel of independent commissioners on 13 August 2018. This decision included a new viewshaft with an 8-metre blanket height restriction area.

10. The decision was appealed by HNZC and Janet Dickson.

11. HNZC appealed the introduction of the ‘blanket height restriction area’ method into the Local Public Views Overlay (Chapter D16) and its application to part of the Mixed Housing Urban Zone along the seaward side of Stockade Hill.

12. Ms Dickson’s appeal raised a broad range of issues including a perceived failure in the decision to consider the possibility of a wider 360 degree viewshaft to protect broader views from Stockade Hill (i.e. not only coastal views), and to give sufficient weight to the heritage and historical significance of Stockade Hill.

13. Following discussions all parties agreed to settle these appeals in their entirety by consent, and the Environment Court issued a consent order on 18 April 2019.

14. The consent order includes a new overlay in the Auckland Unitary Plan, D20A Stockade Hill Viewshaft Overlay. This overlay has been ‘uplifted’ from Chapter D16 Local Public Views Overlay and inserted as a standalone chapter, with reference to the ‘blanket height restriction area’ deleted.

15. The physical extent of the new overlay and the sites affected by it are the same as that included in the decision on the plan change.

16. The consent order also includes minor consequential changes to Chapter E26 Infrastructure to add references to the new overlay.

17. A map showing the approximate location of the Stockade Hill Viewshaft Overlay in context of the wider location is shown below.
18. Attachments A and B of the agenda report contains the changes that are required to the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) text and maps.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu**

**Analysis and advice**

19. As this report is procedural in nature, no further analysis and advice is required.

**Ngā whakaaweawe me ngā tirohanga a te rōpū Kaunihera**

**Council group impacts and views**

20. The final step in making additional parts of the Auckland Unitary Plan operative is a procedural step and therefore does not have any impact on the council group.

**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe**

**Local impacts and local board views**

21. The Howick Local Board was consulted on Plan Change 3 prior to notification. The Local Board’s views were not sought for this report as it addresses factual and procedural matters. Staff have updated the Howick Local Board on the resolution of the appeals to Plan Change 3.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori**

**Māori impact statement**

22. Relevant iwi authorities were consulted on the draft plan change prior to notification in accordance with Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991. The final step in making additional parts of the Auckland Unitary Plan operative is a procedural step.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea**

**Financial implications**

23. The cost of making the Auckland Unitary Plan operative is covered by the Plans and Places department’s operational budget.

**Ngā raru tūpono me ngā whakamaurutanga**

**Risks and mitigations**

24. There are no risks associated with making the relevant parts of Plan Change 3 operative.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri**

**Next steps**

25. Following a resolution from this Committee, staff will publicly notify the date on which the relevant parts of Plan Change 3 will become operative and update the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part), in accordance with Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
### Ngā tāpirihanga
#### Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Plan Change 3 Consent Order and text changes</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Plan Change 3 Mock up for GIS Viewer</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ngā kaihaina
#### Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Katrina David - Planner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>John Duguid - General Manager - Plans and Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Megan Tyler - Chief of Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENT COURT
I MUA I TE KOITI TAI AO O AOTEAROA

IN THE MATTER

the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act)

AND

of two appeals against the decision of Auckland Council on Plan Change 3 to the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part: Protection of Views from Stockade Hill, Howick

BETWEEN

JANET DICKSON

ENV 2018-AKL-000264

AND

HOUSING NEW ZEALAND CORPORATION

ENV-2018-AKL-000268

Appellants

AND

AUCKLAND COUNCIL

Respondent

Environment Judge D A Kirkpatrick sitting alone under s 279 of the Act
In CHAMBERS at Auckland.

CONSENT ORDER

[A] Under s 279(1)(b) of the Resource Management Act 1991, the Environment Court, by consent, orders that:

(1) the appeal is allowed subject to the amendments set out in this order;

(2) the appeal is otherwise dismissed.

[B] Under s 285 of the Resource Management Act 1991, there is no order as to costs.
REASONS

Introduction


[2] A panel of independent Commissioners decided on 13 August 2018 to approve PC3, subject to modifications (the decision). The key components of PC3, as contained in the decision, are:

(a) deletion of an existing local public viewshaft located at the base of Stockade Hill overlooking Crawford Reserve in a generally easterly direction;

(b) introduction of a new viewshaft within the Local Public Views Overlay from the top of Stockade Hill covering 137 degree views (on the seaward side); and

(c) amendments to Chapter D16 Local Public Views Overlay to introduce a 'Blanket Height Restriction Area' within the new Stockade Hill viewshaft, applying an 8m height control to parts of specific properties in the Mixed Housing Urban zone along the seaward side of Stockade Hill.

[3] The notified PC3 also included amendments to Regional Policy Statement (RPS) policies (Chapter B4.3.2) to provide for the protection of public views of the coastal environment and to recognise the importance of scheduled historic heritage places as a criterion when evaluating the regional or local significance of a view from a public place. The Council withdrew the proposed amendments to the RPS during the course of the Council hearing, in response to questions from the Commissioners and the submission from HNZC.
The Appeals

The Dickson Appeal

[4] The Dickson appeal raises a broad range of issues, but specifically alleges a failure by the Commissioners to consider the possibility of a wider viewshaf protecting broader locally significant views from Stockade Hill (i.e. not only coastal views). The Dickson appeal also alleges a failure in the decision to properly apply the objective and policies in Chapter D18 and the RPS provisions, and failing to give sufficient weight to the heritage and historical significance of Stockade Hill.

[5] The Dickson appeal seeks that the Unitary Plan be amended so that:

(a) a 360 degree local public view protection is imposed from Stockade Hill;

(b) appropriate controls apply to ensure that the protection of locally significant views from Stockade Hill is guaranteed, including but not limited to height, bulk and location, yard, height in relation to boundary controls of identified buildings that would otherwise intrude into the locally significant view sought to be protected.

(c) Any consequential or further relief as necessary or desirable to achieve the outcomes of the appeal; and

(d) costs.

The HNZC Appeal

[6] HNZC appealed the introduction of the 'Blanket Height Restriction Area' method into Chapter D18 (Local Public Views Overlay) and its application to part of the Mixed Housing Urban zone along the seaward side of Stockade Hill.

[7] The HNZC appeal alleges that the Blanket Height Restriction Area is an inappropriate mechanism for protecting a Local Public View. The appeal raises concerns that use of this method for a Local Public View erodes the distinction that exists in the Unitary Plan between the 'Local Public Views Overlay' and Regionally and Locally significant views (managed within Chapter D14) to which a 'Blanket Height Sensitive Area' method applies. The appeal says that this distinction that currently exists in the Unitary Plan recognises the higher-level
values in relation to landscape, heritage and visual amenity values of Locally and Regionally Significant Viewshafts, when compared to Local Public Views.

[8] The HNZC appeal does not take issue with the relocation and redefinition of the Stockade Hill Viewshaft through PC3, but claims that these views should be protected through the existing approach to Local Public Views in the Unitary Plan – where building heights are managed by controlling the intrusion of new development through the viewshaft plane of the Local Public View.

[9] The appeal seeks the following relief:

(a) that the Council’s decision be disallowed;

(b) that the amendments to Chapter D16 be deleted in full;

(c) such orders, relief or other consequential amendments as are considered necessary to address the concerns in the appeal; and

(d) costs.

The agreement reached

[10] Following settlement discussions, the parties have reached an agreement that will settle both appeals in their entirety. In summary it has been agreed that the proceedings can be resolved by ‘uplifting’ the provisions from Chapter D16 and inserting them in a new standalone chapter, and by deleting reference to the height protection method.

[11] The key features of the settlement are as follows:

(a) A new chapter is to be created in the Auckland Unitary Plan: D20A Stockade Hill Viewshaft Overlay. The chapter is to have the following features:

() D20A.1. Overlay description, stating that the "overlay is used to restrict building heights to ensure that new development is of a height that does not intrude into or obstruct views to the coastal environment";
(ii) D20A.2. and D20A.3. which stipulate that Objective D16.2.(1) and Policies D16.3.(1), D16.3.(2) and D16.3.(3) (within the Local Public Views chapter) apply to the overlay;

(iii) D20A.4. Activity table specifying that buildings in the ‘8m height area’ (the same area previously referred to in the decision) have a Restricted Discretionary activity status where they do not comply with specified standards. This activity is identical to D16.4.1(A3) that was added through PC3, with the exception that the reference to the ‘Blanket Height Restriction Area’ in the decision has been removed;

(iv) An additional bullet point is proposed to be added before the Activity table at D20A.4. clarifying, for the avoidance of doubt, that the Stockade Hill Viewshaft Overlay does not apply any height limits to road network activities within the legal road. The parties consider that this clarifying addition is entirely neutral in effect (it reflects the fact that the 8m height area does not extend over the legal road within the viewshaft);

(v) D20A.6. Notification provisions, stating that the normal RMA tests apply to applications for resource consent in this chapter;

(vi) D20A.6. Standards specifying that height in specified areas within the viewshaft (shown in a corresponding figure within Chapter D20A) must not exceed 8m. This standard is identical to D16.6.1 included through PC3, but for the deletion of the reference to a ‘Blanket Height Restriction Area’;

(vii) Figure D20A.6.1.1. showing the ‘8m height area’. This figure (including the properties to which the 8m height control applies) is identical to the decision, save for some consequential amendments to the legend;

(viii) D20A.6.1. Matters of discretion for restricted discretionary activities. These match the provisions applying in the decision (D16.8.1.); and ix. D20A.6.2. Assessment criteria for restricted discretionary activities in the chapter. These match the provisions applying in the decision (D16.8.2.).
(b) As a consequence of this new chapter D20A, the settlement reaches deletes amendments that were made to Chapter D16 Local Public Views in the decision, and also deletes the proposed Stockade Hill Viewshaft from Schedule 11 of the Unitary Plan.

(c) Consequential amendments have been made to the provisions listed below in Chapter E26 Infrastructure. The amendments simply add reference to the Stockade Hill Viewshaft Overlay where similar references are made to other viewshaft chapters in the Unitary Plan:

(i) E26.1.1.1 Structure;

(ii) E26.12.1. Objectives;

(iii) E26.12.2. Policies;

(iv) E26.12.3. Activity table; and

(v) Table E26.12.3.1 Activity table.

Scope

[12] The parties have carefully considered whether the proposed changes to the Unitary Plan are within the scope of PC3. They agree that the amendments are within scope, and can be said to be reasonably foreseeable consequences of PC3 (and the submission and appeal by HNZC in particular) for the following reasons:

(a) The settlement makes no amendment to the breadth of the viewshaft that was introduced through PC3, or the height limits that are imposed on properties within the viewshaft. In this sense, the proposed changes are largely neutral in effect.

(b) While no appeal specifically seeks as relief the creation of a new chapter for the Stockade Hill Viewshaft, this proposed amendment responds to the HNZC appeal (and HNZC’s submission on PC3) raising concern with use of a Blanket Height Restriction Area as a method in Chapter D16 Local Public Views Overlay. As noted above, HNZC had concerns that the distinction that currently exists between Local Public Views and Regionally and Locally Significant Viewshafts is degraded through use of the Blanket Height Restriction Area method.
(c) Uplifting this method from Chapter D16 into a standalone chapter responds to the HNZC appeal and its request that the Blanket Height Restriction Area method not to apply to Local Public Views in Chapter D16.

(d) The settlement also amends the name of the method used for controlling height within the Stockade Hill Viewshaft Overlay from the ‘Blanket Height Restriction Area’ to the ‘8m height area’. This amendment also directly responds to the HNZC appeal (and HNZC’s submission on PC3) that seeks deletion of the Blanket Height Restriction Area as a method for controlling heights at Stockade Hill.

(e) Finally, the parties consider that the amendments proposed to be made to Chapter E26 are a direct and logical consequence of the amendments described above and are proposed to ensure consistency across the Unitary Plan.

(f) The parties consider that agreement reached is procedurally fair, and that no third party will be prejudiced by the Court adopting the amendments. The changes are foreshadowed in the HNZC appeal and therefore would not come as an unforeseen surprise to a person that has chosen not to become a party to these proceedings.

Consideration

[13] In making this order the Court has read and considered the appeals and the joint memorandum of the parties dated 5 April 2010.

[14] Howick Ratepayers and Residents Association Incorporated and Auckland Transport, Housing New Zealand Corporation and Janet Dickson filed notices to become parties to the appeals under s 274 of the Act and have signed the memorandum of the parties seeking this order.

[15] The Court is making this order under s 278(1)(b) of the Act, such order being by consent, rather than representing a decision or determination on the merits pursuant to s 279. The Court understands for present purposes that:

(a) All parties to the proceedings have executed the memorandum requesting this order;
(b) All parties are satisfied that all matters proposed for the Court’s endorsement fall within the Court’s jurisdiction and conform to relevant requirements and objectives of the Resource Management Act, including in particular Part 2;

(c) The parties have considered whether the amendments sought are within scope of PC3, the appeals and the submissions made; and

(d) This order settles the appeals in their entirety.

Order

[16] The Court orders, by consent, that:

(a) The appeals are allowed to the extent that the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part is to be amended in accordance with Annexure A.

(b) The appeals are otherwise dismissed.

(c) There is no order as to costs.

DATED at Auckland this 18th day of April 2019

D.A Kirkpatrick
Environment Judge
ANNEXURE A
(amendments in underline and strikethrough text)

Insert new chapter in Auckland Unitary Plan Operatio in Part:

D20A Stockade Hill Viewshaft Overlay

D20A.1. Overlay description

This overlay is used to restrict building heights to ensure that the new development is of a height that does not intrude into or obstruct views to the coastal environment.

D20A.2. Objectives [replaced]

(i) Objective D16.2.(1) applies to this overlay.

D20A.3. Policies [replaced]

(i) Policies D16.3.(1), D16.3.(2) and D16.3.(3) apply to this overlay.

D20A.4. Activity table

Table D20A.4.1 Activity table specifies the activity status of development activities in the Stockade Hill Viewshaft Overlay pursuant to section 9(3) of the Resource Management Act 1991.

- The rules that apply to network utilities and electricity generation in the Overlay are located in E56 infrastructure.
- For the avoidance of doubt, it is noted that the Stockade Hill Viewshaft Overlay does not apply any height limits to road network activities within the legal road.

Table D20A.4.2 Activity table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development (where it intrudes into the viewshaft)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A1) Temporary construction and safety structures</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings in the 8m height area depicted in Figure D20A.4.1.1, excluding network utilities, electricity generation facilities, broadcasting facilities and road networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A2) Buildings, structures and external additions and alterations to buildings that do not comply with D20A.6.1</td>
<td>RD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D20A.5. Notification

(1) Any application for resource consent for an activity listed in Table D20A.4.1 Activity table above will be subject to the normal tests for notification under the relevant sections of the Resource Management Act 1991.
(2) 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).

**D20A.6. Standards**

**D20A.6.1 Height**

Purpose: to manage the height of buildings to:

- maintain the visual integrity of the view by minimising the visual intrusion of buildings
- protect views to the coastal environment from public open spaces, including scheduled historic heritage place

(1) In applying these standards, height must be measured using the average ground level method.

(2) Buildings within the Stockade Hill Viewshaft must not exceed a maximum building height of 8m within the areas as shown on Figure D20A.6.1.1

**Figure D20A.6.1.1**
DD20A.7. Assessment – Controlled activities

There are no controlled activities in this section.

DD20A.8. Assessment – Restricted discretionary activities

DD20A.8.1. Matters of discretion

The Council will restrict its discretion to the following matters when assessing a restricted discretionary resource consent application:

(i) buildings and structures that intrude into the viewshaft;
   (a) effects on the visual integrity of the view from the identified viewing point;
   (b) location, nature, form and extent of proposed works;
   (c) the functional need or operational need for the proposal and any alternatives considered to fulfil that need without the intrusion into the view; and
   (d) the relevant objectives and policies in D20A.

DD20A.8.2. Assessment criteria

The Council will consider the relevant assessment criteria for restricted discretionary activities from the list below:

(i) buildings and structures that intrude into the viewshaft:
   (a) whether the nature, form and extent of the building adversely affects the visual integrity of the viewshaft and its view;
   (b) whether the proposed building has a functional or operational requirement to be in the location proposed and the proposed height of the building is consistent with that requirement; and
   (c) whether there are practicable alternatives available that will not intrude into, or will minimise the intrusion into the viewshaft.

DD20A.9. Special information requirements

There are no special information requirements in this section.
Amend Schedule 11 Local Public View Schedule as follows:
Delete Map 11.1 Stockade Hill Reserve from Schedule 11 to the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part.

Amend Chapter E26 as follows:

Table E26.1.1.1 Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overlay or Auckland-wide provisions</th>
<th>E26 sub-section reference</th>
<th>Page number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D15 Ridgeline Protection Overlay</td>
<td>E26.12 Network utilities and electricity generation – Auckland War Memorial Museum Viewshaft, Local Public Views, Ridgelines, Stockade Hill Viewshaft Overlays</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D16 Local Public Views Overlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D19 Auckland War Memorial Museum Viewshaft Overlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D20A Stockade Hill Viewshaft Overlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E26.12.1. Objectives
The objectives for this sub-section are located in D15 Ridgeline Protection Overlay, D16 Local Public Views Overlay, D19 Auckland War Memorial Museum Viewshaft Overlay and D20A Stockade Hill Viewshaft Overlay.

E26.12.2. Policies
The policies for this subsection are located in 15 Ridgeline Protection Overlay, D16 Local Public Views Overlay, D19 Auckland War Memorial Museum Viewshaft Overlay and D20A Stockade Hill Viewshaft Overlay.

E26.12.3. Activity table
Table E26.12.3.1 Activity table specifies the activity status of land use and development activities in the Ridgeline Protection Overlay, Local Public Views Overlay, and Auckland War Memorial Museum Viewshaft Overlay and the Stockade Hill Viewshaft Overlay pursuant to section 9(3) of the Resource Management Act 1991:

- Network utilities include road network activities within the legal road and its formation width, unless otherwise stated in the activity table.
### Table E26.12.3.1 Activity table – Network utilities and electricity generation – Auckland War Memorial Museum Viewshaft, Local Public Views, Ridgelines, Stockade Hill Viewshaft Overlays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network utilities and electricity generation activities</td>
<td>Auckland War Memorial Museum Viewshaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A166) Operation, maintenance, renewal and repair of network utilities and electricity generation facilities</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A167) Minor infrastructure upgrading</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A168) Minor upgrading of road network activities</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A169) Minor utility structure</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A170) Service connections</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A171) Antennas and aerials</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A172) Road network activities comprising road lighting and associated support structures</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A173) Road network activities comprising traffic signs, road name signs</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A174) Road network activities comprising traffic signals and support structures</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A175) Temporary construction and safety structures</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A176) Small and community scale electricity generation facilities</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A177) Network activities and electricity generation facilities that do not comply with permitted activity standards</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RD*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A178) Network utilities and electricity generation facilities not otherwise provided for</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo
Purpose of the report

1. To receive a summary and provide a public record of memos or briefing papers that have been distributed to committee members.

Whakarāpopototanga matua
Executive summary

2. This is a regular information-only report which aims to provide greater visibility of information circulated to committee members via memo/briefing or other means, where no decisions are required.

3. The following information items are attached:
   - Planning Committee workshop schedule June 2019 (Attachment A)
   - Auckland Monthly Housing Update April 2019 (Attachment B)
   - Auckland Monthly Housing Update May 2019 (Attachment C)
   - 27 March 2019 – Albert-Eden Local Board resolution on berm parking (Attachment D)

4. The following memos are attached:
   - 16 May 2019 – Venue Development Strategy, Western Springs Speedway and Colin Dale Park (Attachment E)
   - 24 May 2019 – Wynyard Crossing Permanent Bridge Resource Consent briefing and update (Attachment F)

5. The following letters are attached:

6. The following workshop and briefing information is attached:
   - 2 April 2019 – Transform Manukau Crown-Council collaboration (Attachment H)
   - 18 April 2019 – Tāmaki Regeneration Company Update (Attachment I)
   - 7 May 2019 – Public Transport Fares scenarios and options (Attachment J)
   - 9 May 2019 – Unlock Pukekohe High Level Project Plan draft content (Attachment K)
   - 15 May 2019 – 2021 Briefing (Attachment L)
   - 16 May 2019 – Waterfront and City Centre Masterplan refresh (Attachment M)

7. Note that staff will not be present to answer questions about the items referred to in this summary. Committee members should direct any questions to the authors.

8. The attachments for this report have been published separately at the following link: [http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz](http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz) > Planning Committee > 4 June 2019 > Extra Attachments
Ngā tūtohunga
Recommendation/s
That the Planning Committee:

a) receive the Summary of Planning Committee information memos and briefings – 4 June 2019.

Ngā tāpirihanga
Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Planning Committee workshop schedule June 2019 <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Auckland Monthly Housing Update April 2019 <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Auckland Monthly Housing Update May 2019 <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>27 March 2019 Albert-Eden Local Board resolution on berm parking <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Memo on Venue Development Strategy, Western Springs Speedway and Colin Dale Park <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Memo on Wynyard Crossing Permanent Bridge Resource Consent briefing and update <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>24 April letter to the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority on the Low Emission Vehicles Contestable Fund criteria <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Transform Manukau Crown-Council collaboration workshop minutes <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Tamaki Regeneration Company Update workshop minutes <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Public Transport Fares scenarios and options workshop documents <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Unlock Pukekohe High Level Project Plan draft content workshop minutes <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>2021 briefing minutes <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Waterfront and City Centre Masterplan refresh workshop minutes <em>(Under Separate Cover)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina
Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Kalinda Gopal - Senior Governance Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Megan Tyler - Chief of Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the Planning Committee

a) exclude the public from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C1 Auckland Unitary Plan: Possible Plan Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Situation

- 3 kauri are at risk
- 1 on private land at 40 Patrooa Rd, 2 in road reserve
- Kauri on 40 Patrooa Rd currently only protected by interim injunction of High Court
- Road reserve trees are on public land & need consent to remove
- All these trees were protected by general tree protection and then within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA) until 2015.
PAUP zoning map (2013) with the SBA Overlay on 40-42 Patuaroa Road and the Road Reserve.
What happened?

- In 2014 developers Lenihan & Greensmith obtained non-notified consent to remove trees & develop on #40 & 42 Paturea Rd (consents gained under Waitakere District Plan)
- He started to remove trees but was stopped by public campaign to protect kauri supported by 26,000 people
- Lenihan applied to Unitary Plan Commissioners to have SEA removed from #40, 42 and road reserve in 2015.
- Council’s Ecologist Jane Andrews stated in evidence that the remaining vegetation still qualified as an SEA.
- Council lawyers overruled her because Lenihan held consents to remove trees, so SEA was removed. NOTE: proper consent was never sought to do any work in road reserve
Jane Andrews (Council Ecologist) stated:

"While the majority of the area has been cleared, several large trees remain around the perimeter including a mature kauri (40 Paturoa Rd) and rimu tree (42 Paturoa Rd) as well as a number of nikau and several broadleaf species. These trees are contiguous with the remaining vegetation on site as well as vegetation within the wider area and in my opinion meet the SEA criteria 1a-representativeness (WF11- kauri podocarp-broadleaved forest) and 4b (buffers a protected area- Paturoa Esplanade). Although the submitter has consent to clear this vegetation it had not been completed at the time of my site visit and my assessment is based on the current extent of vegetation."
AUP(OIA) zoning map (2017) with the SEIA Overlay removed from part of 40-42 Paturoa Road and the Road Reserve.
Attachment A

AUP(OR) aerial Photograph with the S6A Overlay removed from part of
40-42 Paturoa Road and the Road Reserve
What happened?

- In 2016 neighbours challenged Lenihan’s consents via judicial review in High Court & he voluntarily surrendered the consents in 2017.
- Currently NO CONSENTS exist to do any work on #40 or 42 Paturoa Rd or in the road reserve.
- But now SEA removed (and general tree protection removed from RMA) so trees have no protection other than interim High Court injunction.
- The tree on #40 can otherwise be cut down without consent.
- If/when new consents are applied for under Unitary Plan they must comply with rules for set-back.
- Kauri tree on #40 is within 10m set-back from front boundary so NO BUILDINGS can be placed where the tree stands.
Matauranga Maori treatment

- The kauri on #40 Paturoa was ringbarked on early hours of 23 Dec 2015 on the day the first protection order was granted by the Environment Court.
- The tree was subsequently treated by tangata whenua with matauranga Maori techniques.
- Over 3 years later the tree is still alive and flourishing despite being in a kauri dieback infected area.
- The landowner agreed in court to the tree being studied and scientists from the University of Auckland (Dr Cate MacInnis Ng and Dr Nick Waipara) are keen to do this & consider the tree’s recovery significant.
- Obviously the tree needs to stay alive if we are to learn from this.
Attachment A

Item 5.2
The Ask

- Include proposal to replace the SEA on 40, 42 Paturoa Rd and road reserve into upcoming plan change re trees.
- PC will be publicly notified. Everyone can make submissions, including Lenihan, Council & the public.
- Decision re SEA will be made by independent commissioners
  - So Council not setting any sort of precedent
  - Not siding with or against developer
  - Just levelling the playing field and recognising that the premise for removing the SEA no longer applies
Why should Council do this?

- Premise on which the SEA was removed no longer applies
  - SEA was removed because landowner held consents to remove trees on 40, 42
  - Landowner voluntarily surrendered all consents
  - No consents now exist for any work on 40, 42 or road reserve
  - Removal of SEA from road reserve was in error
  - Matauranga treatment has subsequently been applied to the ringbarked tree

- Unitary Plan rules different to Waitakere District Plan rules
  - 10m set-back from front boundary now applies
  - Kauri on 40 Pатурoa Rd is within 10m of front boundary
  - No buildings allowed within set-back therefore tree is not preventing development of property

- Any future consents applied for on these properties or the road reserve will then need to take into account the existing vegetation & the Unitary Plan rules re set-backs.
What will happen if Council don’t do this?

- Lenihan will remove kauri on 40 Paturoa Rd as soon as interim protection order is lifted
  - He has already obtained Certificate of Compliance stating he can do this
  - Despite not needing to remove tree in order to build (because it is within 10m set-back)
- High Court appeal on lifting of protection order will fail because no attempt has been made to gain long term protection of trees
  - Environment Court ruling stated that “the remedy is...a plan change in accordance with the legislation” ie Council reinstating the SEA overlay.
- Council devalues SEAs by not protecting vegetation that qualifies
- Very likely that Lenihan will apply for consent to remove road reserve kauri
  - To protect the road he needs to put in significant retaining in the road reserve
  - Without SEA protection the argument to retain them will be more difficult to make
- Auckland loses 3 more kauri in an area losing them from disease every day
Thank you for considering our proposal to:

Include a proposal to replace the Significant Ecological Area on 40, 42 Patoa Rd and the road reserve in the upcoming plan change regarding trees.

And for recognising that the environment matters as well as development rights in getting good outcomes for managing Auckland’s land.
To: His Worship The Mayor Phil Goff  
Councillor Chris Darby, Chair Planning Committee  
Councillor Penny Hulse, Chair Environment & Community Committee  
Councillor Linda Cooper, Chair Regulatory Committee  
CC: Greg Presland, Chair Waitakere Ranges Local Board

30 April 2019

Tāna koutou,

RE: PLAN CHANGE TO PROTECT AUCKLAND TREES

We are writing to you regarding the recent statements made about the plan change process to protect trees and in particular the kauri tree in Tiritiri named Awhi Awhi. We believe that the current situation presents a real opportunity for Auckland Council to better protect trees in the Auckland Region and is about far more than a single tree.

Significant Ecological Areas and the Paturoa Road Kauri

The Unitary Plan Commissioners chose to remove the Significant Ecological Area (SEA) from the public road reserve and #40 and 42 Paturoa Road on request from the developers Lenihan and Greersmith as part of the Unitary Plan hearings in 2015 because they had gained non-notified consent to build a house and remove the trees on the building platforms on the private land (but not on the road reserve). Auckland Council’s own ecologist Jane Andrews argued in the Unitary Plan hearings that the SEA should not be removed and that the site still qualified as an SEA despite the tree removal that had already taken place (see attached...
evidence para 3 of P2). This opinion was overruled by legal counsel because of the then existing consents to remove vegetation on the building platforms (para 4 and 5 of P2).

The resource consents for both #40 and #42 Pataua Rd have subsequently been voluntarily surrendered by the developers during the High Court case. They now have no consent to build on the property and never had consent to do any work in the road reserve. Therefore the basis for the original decision to remove the SEA overlay on the previously consented building platforms is no longer relevant because the permission to remove trees here via consent has been surrendered. Further, the developers need to access the property via the road reserve and have never applied for consent to undertake this essential retaining work that will enable them to develop the property. This will require the removal of the two much larger kauri in the road reserve, but this has never been applied for nor admitted to by the developers, despite plans having been prepared for a 60m long retaining wall in their rootzones. Removal of the SEA overlay from the road reserve was therefore erroneous as the developers never had consent to remove trees or build in the road reserve.

The prior Council decision not to notify the consent applications for the dwelling, the size of which far exceeded the criteria for a permitted activity in the Unitary Plan, resulted in the huge public outcry when removal of numerous kauri on the property began because the public did not feel it had been given the opportunity to advise the consenting process of the ecological values of the site.

It should be noted that the replacement of the SEA over the land at #40, 42 and the road reserve will not in any way prevent the developers from applying for and gaining future consents to build on the property. All it means is that the ecology will need to be taken into consideration when developing those plans. It is not a case of having to choose between keeping the tree or having a house, both are well able to co-exist on this site. In fact under the Unitary Plan (rather than the Waitakere District Plan under which the original consents were obtained) the tree named Awhi Awhi on #40 will fall within the 10m minimum set back from the front boundary and the house therefore cannot occupy this area (see attached Unitary Plan Large Lot Residential Zone Table H1.6.5.1 ‘Yards’).

The reality is however that these developers are determined to fell this tree regardless of whether they need to do so in order to develop the site. In the absence of any resource consents or building consents for the property they applied to the Environment Court to have the protection order lifted to enable them to do just that. This will be lifted on 26 April. An appeal has been lodged that will extend that temporary protection via a High Court injunction, but this is not a solution to enable long term protection for the remaining trees on the site or to require the developer to consider them when applying for consent to develop.

There is an opportunity now for Auckland Council to amend the removal of the SEA by the Unitary Plan Commissioners. This was not a decision taken by Council, in fact Council’s own ecologist argued against it. Since the consents upon which that decision was based now no
longer exist there is even more reason to restore the SEA now so that future consent applications can be considered in the light of the remaining ecologically significant trees on the site, which in the opinion of Council’s ecologist still do constitute a SEA. If this does not take place then this section in the middle of the forest in Titirangi may as well be in the central city because it will be totally stripped as soon as the developer is able to do so. It is an extremely steep clay section and removal of all vegetation will not aid its stability, nor that of its neighbours and the road. We believe this is an opportunity for Auckland Council to show leadership and level the playing field so that this developer has to apply for a consent in the context of the ecological situation that actually exists on the site, not one as they would prefer it to be, ie devoid of all vegetation.

Councillor Linda Cooper made an important statement at the Planning Committee meeting in October 2017 (https://councillive.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/video/101017-planning-committee-items-01-05-part-01) regarding the requirement for public notification of decisions relating to trees that are public assets. She said “these trees are scheduled for the benefit of the public and they shouldn’t be a private issue they should be public”. In this instance she was referring to Notable Trees listed in Schedule 10, but the point applies equally to those trees protected by being in a Significant Ecological Area, which are arguably even more important because they relate to more than just a single tree. We believe that all proposed SEA removals should be publicly notified in future.

Furthermore, Council is well advanced with developing a plan change to correct the errors within Schedule 10 (Notable Trees) that have been uncovered by the audit initiated following The Tree Council’s presentation to the Planning Committee meeting in October 2017. We are delighted that Council has undertaken this important work and is about to implement the results and thank you for pursuing this initiative. However, if Council is genuine in its desire to achieve the outcome as Councillor Penny Hulse has publicly stated “Our feeling is that if we’re going to do a plan change… we would rather schedule a whole lot of trees, than put all of our energy just into one” (https://www.newshub.co.nz/home/new-zealand/2019/04/auckland-council-won-t-try-to-stop-ancient-kauri-s-falling.html?fbclid=IwAR3pvVJU2e7zOyF6EYWz5YM4zZq7L7PI9KqYHGa20cRQ1WAQBE3Dw1Y14Nk) then we believe this plan change can be effectively used to achieve far more than just correcting the errors in Schedule 10. This plan change will be publicly notified and therefore presents an excellent opportunity to undertake consultation on these issues efficiently, cost effectively and urgently before yet more of our urban forest is lost. Council cannot change the RMA but it can use the powers it currently does have within the RMA to better protect trees in the Auckland Region. As Councillor Hulse stated at that same October 2017 Planning meeting Council was aiming to achieve “cleaning up the impacts of the Unitary Plan and [re]loss of blanket tree protection] look at producing an omnibus report to look at what we will try to re-establish should we have the opportunity to revisit some of those RMA changes.”
We believe this represents one of those opportunities and should not be missed. The restoration of the SEA at #40, 42 Paturoa Road and the road reserve is one of those “impacts of the Unitary Plan” that needs “cleaning up”. There are many others, but this is within Council’s gift and there is an opportunity to do something about it right now. If we miss this opportunity it will be too late for this site and possibly many others. If there is time to review any other recent SEA removals prior to the plan change then this should also be done now, as well as adding any newly proposed SEAs or extensions of SEAs into the Unitary Plan. These are frequently agreed via consent conditions (which we are often involved with) and so we know there is likely to be an existing list of those awaiting implementation.

Schedule 10 (Notable Trees)

The other opportunity that this plan change presents relates to scheduled trees. There are many trees that have been nominated for scheduling over recent years that will have been assessed by staff as complying with the criteria but are waiting for a plan change to be incorporated into Schedule 10. This should be done now and not have to wait for yet another plan change. These trees have no interim protection and can be felled while they are waiting to be added to the schedule, in the current climate that is a very unsafe situation for hugely significant individual trees assessed as worthy of protection as significant public assets.

In addition the scheduling criteria are another of those “impacts of the Unitary Plan” that needs “cleaning up”. The Tree Council, Environmental Defence Society & Forest & Bird made representations to the Unitary Plan Commissioners regarding a “second tier” for scheduled trees. This would enable trees to be protected that are currently just under the qualifying criteria but if allowed to continue to grow will develop into heritage trees of huge significance that will ultimately replace the currently scheduled trees as they age and die. If we do not allow for replacement of scheduled trees eventually we will end up with no large heritage trees in our city because the old ones will die and there will be no other large trees left, having been removed piecemeal to enable development as sites are sold and subdivided. Reducing the scheduling criteria “pass mark” would enable more individual trees to qualify to be scheduled, while still requiring a strict and objective assessment of their significance to the Region.

However the change that would make the most difference to enabling more trees to be scheduled is removing the landowner veto from the scheduling criteria. Councillor Cooper’s comment regarding public assets is again relevant here. Why should a landowner who may only occupy a site for a short period of time dictate whether a tree worthy of scheduling as a significant public asset is protected? This should be a public decision (as per the public notification process of a plan change) not a private decision that prevents that proposal ever reaching the stage of a plan change process.

Plan Change Opportunity
Therefore the issues we consider that should be included in this plan change in addition to the corrections to Schedule 10 in order to achieve protection for more of Auckland’s trees are as follows:

1. Replace SEA removed including #40, 42 Paturoa Road and the road reserve.
2. Review any other SEA removals or new proposed additional SEAs or extensions to SEAs.
3. Require future SEA removals to be publicly notified.
4. Add trees already nominated for scheduling by a specific date and qualifying to Schedule 10.
5. Review the scheduling criteria for future inclusion in Schedule 10 to make it easier to protect outstanding individual trees. The criteria we believe that should be changed are as follows:
   a. Remove landowner veto on scheduling. Short term private landowners should not have the right to determine the long term protection of these public assets.
   b. Reduce the pass mark for scheduling to enable special trees that will grow to become (and replace) those currently on the Schedule as they age & die, otherwise we will eventually have no scheduled trees.

The Tree Council, WRPS and Forest & Bird would welcome the opportunity to discuss any or all of these issues about how we can use the current process to better protect Auckland’s urban trees with you and/or your staff. We consider there is considerable progress that can be made and it would be a shame to miss this opportunity.

Thank you for your consideration of our proposals.

Ngā mihi maioha

Dr Mels Barton  
Secretary, The Tree Council  
info@hetreecouncil.org.nz 021 213 7779

John Edgar  
President, Waitakere Ranges Protection Society  
john@johnedgar.co.nz 0272 290169

Nick Beveridge  
Regional Manager Auckland/Northland, Forest & Bird  
n.beveridge@forestandbird.org.nz 021 216 2920
IN THE ENVIRONMENT COURT OF NEW ZEALAND
AUCKLAND REGISTRY

ENV-2017-AKL-000065

UNDER the Resource Management Act 1991

IN THE MATTER of an application for an interim enforcement order under sections 314, 316 and 320 of the Resource Management Act 1991

BETWEEN ANDREW ALEXANDER MAEHL and WINIFRED MARY CHARLESWORTH of 38 Paturoa Road, Tiritiri
Applicants

AND JOHN ROBERT LENIHAN, JANE HELEN GREENSMITH AND ANTHONY GORE as trustees of Lenihan and Greensmith Family Trust

AFFIDAVIT OF EDWARD ASHBY IN SUPPORT OF APPLICATION FOR PERMANENT ENFORCEMENT ORDER
Affirmed 14 September 2018

Solicitor acting:
Christopher Taylor
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Suite 302 Geyser Building
100 Parnell Road
PO Box 37772, Parnell
AUCKLAND 1151
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Barrister acting:
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AFFIDAVIT OF EDWARD ASHBY IN SUPPORT OF APPLICATION FOR
PERMANENT ENFORCEMENT ORDER

I, Edward Ashby, of Auckland, Executive Manager, affirm:

1. I am the Executive Manager of the Te Kawerau Iwi Settlement Trust and Te Kawerau Iwi Tribal Authority which are the entities mandated to represent Te Kawerau a Maki.

2. I am making this affidavit in support of the application for a permanent enforcement order in respect of the kauri that stands at 40 Paturoa Road, Titirangi ("the Kauri") and to provide the Court with information about the cultural value of the Kauri.

3. Te Kawerau a Maki are the mana whenua iwi of the Waitakere Ranges and West Auckland. We have kaitiakitanga obligations to protect and sustainably manage the environment in accordance with our tikanga that are provided for under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the Resource Management Act 1991 s8, 6s and 7a, the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008 s7(j), and the Te Kawerau a Maki Claims Settlement Act 2015. Our role as kaitiaki over Te Waonui a Tiriwa and our taonga kauri are also provided for within the Auckland Unitary Plan (Chapter B6) and in our 1995 Resource Management Statement (Iwi Management Plan).

4. A central concern of Te Kawerau a Maki is the decimation of our taonga kauri in the forest of Te Waonui a Tiriwa from widespread kauri dieback disease, including trees in the Waitakere Ranges Regional Park area. In the 16,000 hectares Waitakere Ranges Regional Park alone, nearly 20% of the kauri in the forest are infected with PTA, nearly double the number that were infected five years ago. Kauri are considered the rangatira (chiefs) of the forest and are a keystone ecological species meaning that the health of the wider forest is connected to the health of kauri. Kauri are also a living tīpuna and connector for Te Kawerau a Maki to the spiritual world. The survival of our kauri, and our forest, is an existential issue for Te Kawerau a Maki – if the forest dies so too does the Iwi.
5. For the past 10 years since kauri dieback was first identified the Council and Governmental response has failed to find solutions to stop or properly manage the spread of the disease and the quickening death of the forest. On 2 December 2017, Te Kawerau a Maki placed a rōhūi (customary prohibition) over Te Waonui a Tiriwa to try to protect the forest while efforts continue to fight the spread of kauri dieback. The Waitakere rōhūi is in place to make sure the forest will still exist for our grandchildren.

6. I am aware of the interim enforcement order that currently protects the Kauri that stands on the land at 40 Paturoa Road. This tree, like all kauri but in particular because of its age and location with Te Waonui a Tiriwa, has significant cultural value to Te Kawerau a Maki. It is also within our rōhūi, meaning Te Kawerau a Maki have placed an absolute ban on the felling of kauri unless they posit an immediate risk to public safety and only with express agreement by the iwi. The environment needs to recuperate and kauri within it are protected by our tikanga and the rōhūi (a kind of tapu).

7. On 22 December 2015, the tree and other trees at 40 and 42 Paturoa Road were damaged in the early hours of the morning by contractors with chainsaws resulting in the tree being ringbarked. I worked for Te Kawerau a Maki at the time, and I recall that we were not notified of any application or intention to remove kauri and neither did we consent to it. The trees, including the Kauri, were tended to that day by the application of a healing pou tus made from beeswax and kawakawa leaves and continued to be nursed over the ensuing months. I understand that the Kauri now seems to be doing well and shows no signs of ill health. Resilient kauri are important to the wider population, now more so than ever.

8. I would conclude by stating that while Te Kawerau a Maki have some sympathy for and appreciate that the situation is difficult for the owners of the land in question, that ultimately our obligation rests with protecting Te Waonui a Tiriwa and our taonga kauri. The Kauri is protected by the rōhūi Te Kawerau a Maki placed on 2 December 2017 and felling it is in breach of our tikanga. The Kauri is protected by the WRHAA requirement for the Crown to protect and enhance the heritage...
values of the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area which the subject properties are within. The Kauri is classified as a threatened species. And the Kauri may have some resilience which is extremely important at a population level with the threat of kauri dieback. For the sake of the forest and the future Te Kewereu a Māki is supportive of efforts to protect the Kauri including the application of a permanent enforcement order.

AFFIRMED at Auckland
by EDWARD ASHBY
this 14th day of September 2018
before me:

Edward Ashby
A Solicitor of the High Court of New Zealand

LEATHER ELIZABETH BRIDGMAN
BARRISTER AND SOLICITOR
AUCKLAND
Unnecessary Delays on the Auckland Suburban Train Network

There are two main categories of unnecessary delay in the day-to-day operation of the Auckland Suburban Rail Network which affect thousands of users every day:

1. Delays at Level Crossings
2. Delays at Stations

Both are ultimately caused by sub-optimal specifications for the signaling and train control systems by Auckland Transport. Their resolution will involve collaboration with KiwiRail and TransDev as the operators and CAF as suppliers of the EMU trains. Rectifying these issues is not particularly urgent but will take considerable time and does need to be sorted before the CRL opens in about five years and allows twice as many trains to run on the system and a halving of headways between them.

1. Delays at Level Crossings

For years there have been frequent complaints about excessive delays at Level Crossings on the rail network, where vehicles and pedestrians can be held up many times each day for over a minute while the “approaching” train is actually stationary at a nearby station. On investigating, I soon found that a train passing over a level crossing before entering a station trips the alarm signals and barriers about half a minute prior to entering the crossing (a prudent safety factor) – but trains which pass over a level crossing after stopping at a nearby station trip the alarms and barriers over an annoyingly long minute prior to entering the crossing.

In other words, the surprising difference in time for in-bound and out-bound trains at the same level crossing typically vary by about 35 seconds, but at Woodward Road it averages 49 seconds.

For those with the patience I have attached my Notice of Motion on this topic which was passed by the Albert-Eden Local Board in May. It includes a detailed analysis of the timing and delays at three level crossings in our ward, level crossings in other wards behave in a very similar fashion.

What is the problem? A pointless and unnecessary 30 second delay is not only frustrating, it can lead to lengthy queues that sometimes stretch back to nearby intersections with arterial roads, causing grid-lock and delaying bus services. It also contributes to risky behavior as motorists try to beat the half-arm barriers, or pedestrians (notably school children) use the emergency gates to bypass the safety gates and cross the tracks in spite of the bells and warning lights being on.

What is the solution? Adjust the tripping point for the alarm signals and barrier arms – for example at present the alarms on the Morningide Drive level crossing start 8 seconds before an in-bound train halts at Morningide Station and 65 seconds before it enters the crossing. If this was advanced by say 30 seconds (i.e. to 22 seconds after the train halts) it would still leave 35 seconds before the train enters the level crossing – exactly the same time as for out-bound trains.

However, it is not as simple as recalibrating the existing system. To be safe, any change needs to allow for trains which do not stop (such as freight trains or re-positioning movements). Changes are required to the existing signals and balise units which drive the train control system following a root-and-branch analysis of the existing set-up. This should be linked to an upgrade of the entire train control system (as discussed below) which is far too conservative in its current configuration.

2. Delays at Stations

The advent of the EMUs in 2014 disappointed many as they failed to deliver the expected increase in service speeds due to the conservative specifications for the trains themselves and for the operating system. The trains themselves may be fast and capable of greater rates of acceleration.
and deceleration, but the excessive delays add to journey times and reduce the effective speed to slightly less than that of the old DMUs. Timetabled journey times are slower than they could be.

My Notice of Motion of a month ago focused on the delays at level crossings as I did not then have sufficient knowledge about the delays at stations. However, in the last few weeks I have received information from train drivers and a signals engineer which fill in many of the gaps in my understanding which was previously based entirely on trackside observations with a stop watch.

The Dwell Time at Stations is extended by delays which arise from 4 distinct phases and collectively add about 30 seconds to every train’s journey time for each station passed through:

i. Slow Station Approach: caused by conservative design and settings of the train control system and trackside signals
ii. Slow Station Departure: caused by conservative design and settings of the on-board train computer system
iii. Delay before Doors Open: caused by conservative design and settings of the on-board train computer system
iv. Delay after Doors Close: caused by Conservative Design and Settings of the on-board Train Computer System

Before discussing these 4 types of delay, a little about the systems which control the operation of the trains and the network. The track network is divided into blocks of varying length (in Auckland blocks range between 25m and over 600m long) monitored by axle counters to ensure that there is only one train in each block. Trackside signal lamps linked to the axle counters inform drivers when the track ahead is clear or not. The EMU drivers also receive data about track conditions and their precise location from the European Train Control System (ETCS) which passes “telegrams” to the driver by radio from balise units positioned between the tracks. Auckland has a slow and cumbersome version of ETCS (Level 1, commissioned in 2014 to serve the new EMUs), whereas parts of Australia have ETCS-Level 2 and in Europe many countries are using ETCS-Level 3.

i. Slow Station Approach:
An approaching train has its speed reduced to under 15kmph (4.2 metres per second) as it enters a station (i.e. passes the start of the platform) by a combination of a red signal at the station entrance and the ETCS which limits speed to a crawl. The ETCS computer on the train doesn’t update and allow the driver to go faster until it passes the next trackside balise located next to the signals at the far end of the platform, by which time the train has stopped. As a consequence it takes about 40 seconds for the train to slowly run the full 160 length of the platform and then halt. This time could be reduced by (say) 10 seconds if the signal and balise arrangement was modified so that trains began slowing a bit later and decelerated at a slightly greater rate.

ii. Slow Station Departure:
Trains start initially at an extremely slow speed for the first 10 metres or so, then accelerate at somewhat less than the 1 metre per second per second they are capable of. After 20 seconds the train speed is about 12 metres per second (43 kmph) and the train finally achieves cruising speed of 80 kmph (22.2 metres per second) after another 10 seconds. If the driver attempts to exceed the 15 kmph limit in the first 10 seconds, the ETCS can shut the system down and cause further delay as it resets. If the driver was allowed to begin accelerating immediately the train would achieve 80 kmph after about 22 seconds and arrive at the next station some 10 seconds quicker than now.

iii. Delay before Doors Open:
The train’s computer has to check that the train has completely come to a stop before it will allow the driver to release the doors. This takes about 4-5 seconds for a 3-car EMU, but for some reason take twice as long for a 6 car unit. Then the driver can open the doors, but sometimes there is an unaccountable delay before the doors actually open, and the plug doors take a while to swing out and slide open - so it can be up to 12 seconds before the doors are fully open. On a well-run
system the doors should start opening almost immediately after the train stops. I am not sure how much time could be saved here but it could be about 5 seconds on average so that the doors are always open about 5 seconds after the train stops – not just occasionally as now.

iv. **Delay after Doors Close:**
The train’s computer has to check that all doors are closed before the Driver can get traction power and start to move. The Train Manager controls his door, which is the last to close, as he checks to ensure that all intending passengers have successfully boarded. But after the last door has closed, the computer is very slow in confirming “doors closed” – perhaps because it uses an outdated operating system. In the words of a frustrated Driver: “if the driver attempts to move off and apply power before the Train Monitoring Screen (TMS) ‘loops screen’ in the drivers cab all goes blue, it will make the loops on the screen go red and there is a delay while the computer resets the loops again to go blue, which will then allow the Driver traction power to move the train.” Not sure how much time could be saved here but it could be at least 5 seconds on average so that the train is free to move off about 5 seconds after the doors are closed. In practice the current delay can be many times longer – I have observed over 30 seconds delay for no apparent reason.

**Conclusions and Future Actions:**
Even though some of the details in this report might not be absolutely correct (and I am happy to be corrected), there are clearly a number of sources of delay on our trains which could and should be addressed and resolved.

Although officials at Auckland Transport I have spoken to claim that these problems are not their responsibility and have referred me to KiwiRail, I argue that they are part of the problem and need to be involved in its resolution. Auckland Transport set the unduly conservative specifications for the control systems on the EMU trains and the Train Control System and need to:

a) acknowledge that they do indeed have a role to play
b) review whether the various control systems are fit for purpose

CAF (Construcciones Y Auxiliar de Ferrocarriles) supplied and maintains the initial order of 57 3-car EMUs for Auckland which went into service 5 years ago and were built to Auckland Transport’s specifications. They will upgrade (retrofit) the EMUs if AT amends those technical specifications – but obviously subject to a negotiated arrangement which could be awkward as one of my informants tell me that “CAF charge a horrendous amount for variances to the original specs.” On the bright side, the same informant has heard that “the next batch of [15] EMUs are apparently going to have CAF’s own ETCS system which I hope will be better, as the current system is really crap”. Hopefully AT can work with CAF to ensure that the whole EMU fleet has a uniform control system specified to the higher standard of the new trains.

KiwiRail operates the track and signalling systems for the Auckland Suburban Network as a subset of the nationwide rail system. So any rules relating to safety standards at our level crossings and stations have to fit within that national context. Nevertheless I am confident that changes can be made to reduce unnecessary delays while still conforming to safety requirements.

The issues I raise have been widely discussed over the last 5 years, but Auckland Transport has yet to grasp the nettle and set about dealing with them. A firm message from the Planning Committee today may be enough to kick start some action.

Thank you for your attention,

Graeme Easte
Transport Lead, Albert-Eden Local Board
Call to Reduce Overly Long Down Time of Barrier Arms at Level Crossings close to Rail Stations

In accordance with Standing Orders, please place the following Notice of Motion on the agenda for the Albert-Eden Local Board meeting being held on Wednesday 1st May, 2019.

Recommendation/s

a) That the report be received.

b) That the Albert-Eden Local Board notes that:

- complaints have been received about long delays and queues at some railway level crossings in our area as detailed in the Background to the report.
- there is a marked discrepancy between the down-time of the barrier arms at level crossings located close to rail stations depending on whether the train that tripped the cycle of warning signals and barriers is arriving at or departing from that station.
- this discrepancy frequently exceeds 30 seconds and can be up to 50 seconds per cycle, during which time the train is stationary and posing no safety risk.
- at peak times when there are six trains per hour in both directions this discrepancy totals at least 4 minutes per hour (6.7% of unnecessary barrier down-time).
- prolonged down time of the level crossing half-arm barriers causes long traffic queues that may involve dozens of vehicles and stretch for hundreds of metres.
- overly long delays at level crossings is clearly an inefficient use of road-users’ time and clearly causes considerable frustration that may impact negatively on driver behaviour and tolerance of other road users.
- although each level crossing is slightly different it appears that the cycle times could be adjusted to be more or less equal for in-coming and out-going trains while retaining an appropriate safety margin.
- although Auckland Transport’s 10-year plan includes $424.3 million for a programme of grade separating level crossings it will be years before construction begins and there is only sufficient allocated funding to deal with a minority of the 45 level crossings so it is likely to take several decades to complete the job.

c) That the Albert-Eden Local Board urges Auckland Transport and KiwiRail to assess any opportunity to reduce the cycle time of the warning signals and barrier arms at level crossings near rail stations while maintaining safety for all affected users.

d) That this resolution be addressed to the Chief Executive and Chair of the Board of Auckland Transport and to the Auckland Operations Manager of KiwiRail.

e) That this resolution be also drawn to the attention of other Local Boards who have one or more railway level crossings in their area and may have similar issues.
Background

Some railway level crossings are located relatively close to a station, and in such situations the delay to traffic caused by the cycle of warning bells/flashing lights and lowered half-arm barriers can be up to twice as long for trains which pass over the level crossing after leaving the station as for trains in the opposite direction which pass over the level crossing before entering the station.

In the discussion below I have used average times for 6-car EMU trains which are 144 metres long. The station platforms are 151-163 metres long. Full data is in an appendix at the end of the report.

In Albert-Eden there are three situations where level crossings and stations are close together:

- **Morningside Drive Level Crossing** is 27 metres from the island platform of Morningside Station for out-bound trains, and 31 metres from the platform for in-bound trains.
- **Woodward Road Level Crossing** is 451 metres from the island platform of Mount Albert Station.
- **Rossgrove Terrace Level Crossing** is 14 metres from the East side platform of Baldwin Avenue Station, and 34 metres from the West side platform, the side platforms are offset by 20 metres. (related to Rossgrove Terrace is the **Asquith Avenue Level Crossing** which is about 90 metres North East of Rossgrove Terrace and has its signals/barrier arms triggered just before or after those of the Rossgrove Terrace level crossing, depending on train direction.)

In each case trains crossing the level crossing before they pull in to the station trigger a cycle of warning signals that last 45-60 seconds – but trains crossing the level crossing after they leave the station trigger a cycle that lasts 95-113 seconds as detailed below. This large discrepancy is caused by overly cautious settings for the signal triggers that add at least 30 unnecessary seconds.

**Morningside Drive Level Crossing Analysis** (see details of events and timing in the Appendix):

**The current situation:**

- Out-bound (West-bound) trains trigger the warning-signal cycle 24 seconds before they first become visible from the platform (rounding a bend some 150 metres East of the level crossing), and 35 seconds before the front of the train enters the level crossing. The cycle ends after 61 seconds with the half-arm barriers returned to the vertical and the bells and flashing lights cease – just before the train halts at Morningside Station with its rear end about 28 metres from the level crossing.

  - The resultant interruption to the flow of traffic on Morningside Drive averages 61 seconds.

- In-bound trains from the West pulling in to the station trigger the warning-signal cycle 8 seconds before they halt with their nose some 34 metres from the nearby level crossing on Morningside Drive. The trains then sit stationary for about 47 seconds (varying from 35 seconds up to a minute depending on numbers of passengers, etc.), before starting to leave, very slowly at first entering the level crossing about 65 seconds after the bells first started. The cycle ends with the half-arm barriers again vertical 95 seconds after the cycle began.

  - The resultant interruption to the flow of traffic on Morningside Drive averages 95 seconds.

- The discrepancy between the in-bound and out-bound trains averages 34 seconds.

- The half-arm barriers begin descending to the horizontal about 4 seconds after the bells and flashing lights start and are horizontal after 12 seconds. For an out-bound train the barriers are fully down 23 seconds before it enters the level-crossing at high speed but an in-bound train enters the level-crossing 53 seconds after the barrier arms are down and at a relatively slow pace as it gradually accelerates from a standing start.
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Possible solution:
- If the trigger point for in-bound trains was adjusted by 30 seconds so that the cycle began 22 seconds after the train halted, there would still be at least 25 seconds before the train started again, and at least 35 seconds before the train entered the crossing (and 23 seconds after the half-arm barriers were fully down) – exactly the same safety margin as for out-bound trains.

Woodward Road Level Crossing Analysis (see details of events and timing in the Appendix):
The current situation:
- Unlike the other crossings discussed here, trains cross the Woodward Road level crossing at the maximum permitted speed in this block of 90 kmph (22.22 metres per second).
- In-bound trains from the South West trigger the warning-signal cycle 27 seconds before they enter the Woodward Road level crossing and enter the crossing 15 seconds after the barrier arms are fully down. The barrier arms are back up in the vertical position and the bells have stopped before the train has stopped at the Mount Albert Platform some 450 metres away. The resultant interruption to the flow of traffic on Woodward Road averages 46 seconds.
- Out-bound trains from the North East trigger the warning-signal cycle at the Woodward Road level crossing about 26 seconds after they have stopped at Mount Albert station some 450 metres away from the level crossing but about 13 seconds before they have left the station. It takes the train another 29 seconds on average to reach and enter the level crossing at high speed. The total cycle time for the alarm signals (bells and flashing lights) is about 95 seconds, approximately twice the time for in-coming trains.
- The resultant interruption to the flow of traffic on Woodward Road averages 95 seconds.
- The discrepancy between the in-bound and out-bound trains averages 49 seconds.
- The barrier half arms begin descending to the horizontal about 4 seconds after the bells start and are horizontal after 12 seconds. For an out-bound train the barriers are fully down 56 seconds before it enters the level-crossing at high speed but an in-bound train enters the level-crossing 27 seconds after the barrier arms are down although the speed is similar to or the same as that of out-going trains at this point — the in-bound trains have not yet begun to decelerate and the outgoing trains have had 450 metres to get up to cruising speed.

Possible solution:
- If the trigger point for out-bound trains was adjusted by 30 seconds so that the cycle began when the train started, there would be about 29 seconds before the train entered the crossing (and 18 seconds after the half-arm barriers were fully down) – similar to the safety margin for in-bound trains at this level crossing. This would reduce the cycle time which currently halts the flow of traffic for 95 seconds to about 66 seconds without compromising safety.

Rossgrove Terrace Crossing Analysis (see details of events and timing in the Appendix):
The current situation:
- The situation at the Rossgrove Terrace Level Crossing is more complex than at the others as there is another level crossing about 90 metres North East of it and a pedestrian-only level crossing 10 metres South West of the Baldwin Avenue Station platforms (180 metres South West of the Rossgrove Terrace Level Crossing). However, after delving through the details, the same kind of discrepancy is evident and a similar solution appears to be possible.
- In-bound trains from the South West trigger the bells at the pedestrian-only level crossing 40 seconds before entering the Baldwin Avenue Station and that cycle ends 7 seconds before the
train stops. The nose of a 6-car train halts 40 metres from the Rossgrove Terrace Level Crossing. The cycle of warning signals at the level crossing starts just 2 seconds later, even before the doors have started to open – the doors are open for 20-30 seconds so the train is not ready to leave until 38 seconds after the bells began sounding. The train begins moving very slowly until it crosses over the bails [see notes] which permits the train to accelerate and does not enter the hatched area marked on Rossgrove Terrace for a further 20-30 seconds. The resultant interruption to the flow of traffic on Rossgrove Terrace averages 94 seconds.

- Out-bound trains from the North East trigger the alarm signals at Asquith Avenue about 4 seconds before the cycle at Rossgrove Terrace Level Crossing begins. The train enters the Rossgrove Terrace Level Crossing 32 seconds after the cycle of bells and barrier arms begins and the cycle ends 11 seconds after the train has cleared the level crossing. The resultant interruption to the flow of traffic on Rossgrove Terrace averages 49 seconds.

- The discrepancy between the in-bound and out-bound trains averages 45 seconds.

Possible solution:

- A similar reduction in the cycle time for in-coming (North bound) services could be achieved by moving the trigger point from the arrival of the train to a time delay similar to that which applies at Mount Albert Station for south-bound trains. So instead of the cycle beginning just seconds after an in-bound train halts at Platform 1, it should start much later, say when the plug doors close 38 seconds after the train halts and 38 seconds before the train enters the level crossing. This would reduce the interruption to the flow of traffic to about 56 seconds, but that time could vary (depending largely on the time that the doors were open) from about 45 seconds to 65 seconds or more.

- Alternatively, there could be a fixed delay of say 30 seconds after the train stops, which would be easier to apply and would give a consistent outcome with an interruption of 64 seconds, just 11 seconds longer than that for out-bound trains.

- If the bails [see Appendix] currently located 12 metres North of Platform 1 had an additional module located at or just before the end of the platform then trains could begin accelerating 10 seconds or so earlier which would correspondingly reduce the delay at both level crossings (Rossgrove Terrace and Asquith Avenue).

The Appendix to this report documents current cycles and timings at the relevant level crossings. It also includes notes on train operations in Auckland which include a brief discussion of the ETCS (European Train Control System) which is used in many countries as well as in Auckland.

Signatory:

| Author | Graeme East, Board Member |
Appendix: Survey of Current Cycles and Timings at Relevant Level Crossings
- times in seconds averaged over 6-10 cycles
  - zero point is when bells begin
  - times prior to that are expressed as negative numbers

Morningside Drive Level Crossing (MD-LC)
- 30m NE of Morningside Station platform - 151 m island (7m longer than a 6-car train)
- rear end of out-bound 6-car train is 28m West of level crossing when stopped at station
- front end of in-bound 6-car train is 35m West of level crossing when stopped at station

Out Bound Trains (heading SW) ~ Cycle time of bells averages 61 seconds
- 21 Train departs Kingsland Station ~ front end of 6-car train is 700 m from MD-LC
- 0 MD-LC bells and flashing lights start ~ half-arms are in vertical (stored) position
- 4 MD-LC half-arm barriers begin to descend from vertical (stored) position
- 5 MD-LC pedestrian gates open on South side of level crossing begin to close
- 6 Train about 450m North East of MD-LC, still not yet visible from station
- 10 MD-LC pedestrian gates (on South side of level crossing) are fully closed
- 12 MD-LC half-arm barriers are down (in horizontal position)
- 24 Train just visible from Morningside Station platform ~ train is 150 m NE of MD-LC
- 35 Train enters MD-LC ~ front of train enters East side of hatched area on road
- 51 Train exits MD-LC ~ rear of train exits West side of hatched area on road
- 54 MD-LC half-arm barriers begin lifting ~ pedestrian gates open
- 60 MD-LC half-arm barriers are back up ~ arms returned to vertical (stored) position
- 61 MD-LC bells & flashing lights stop ~ overall cycle time varies from 58-63 secs
- 63 Train stops at Morningside Station ~ rear of 6-car train is 28 m from MD-LC
- 72 Plug Doors of EMU start to open ~ green lights lit, doors can open on demand
- 102 Plug Doors of EMU fully closed ~ all doors close on train manager instruction
- 112 Train starts to leave Morningside Station ~ time at varies from 30-55 seconds
- 145 Train clears platform ~ rear end of train at SW end of platform 185m from MD-LC
- 160 Train 430m West of MD-LC ~ rear of train enters New North Road bridge
- 212 Train stops at Baldwin Avenue Station ~ rear of train is 1,341 m from MD-LC

In-Bound Trains (heading NE) ~ Cycle time of bells averages 93 seconds
- 113 Train departs Baldwin Avenue Station ~ front end of train is 1,376 m from MD-LC
- 48 Train starts slowing as it exits New North Road bridge, 250m W of platform
- 32 Train at W end of platform ~ front of train at end of platform, 180 m from MLD-LC
- 15 Train passes station shelters ~ train slowing as it passes midpoint of platform
- 0 MD-LC bells and flashing lights start ~ half-arms are in vertical (stored) position
- 4 MD-LC half-arms begin to descend from stored (vertical) position
- 5 MD-LC pedestrian gates open on North side of level crossing begin to close
- 8 Train stops at Morningside Station ~ front of 6-car train is 35 m from MD-LC
- 10 MD-LC pedestrian gates (on South side of level crossing) are closed
- 12 MD-LC Half-arm barriers are down (in horizontal position)
- 15 Plug Doors of EMU start to open ~ green lights lit, doors can open on demand
- 35 Plug Doors of EMU fully closed ~ all doors close on train manager instruction
- 55 Train starts to leave Morningside Station ~ train moves very slowly at first
- 65 Train enters MLD-LC ~ train enters West side of hatched area on road
- 83 Train exits MLD-LC ~ train exits East side of hatched area on road
- 86 MD-LC half-arms begin lifting ~ pedestrian gates open
- 94 MD-LC half-arm barriers are back up ~ half-arms returned to vertical position
- 95 MD-LC bells & flashing lights stop ~ overall cycle time varies from 85-100 secs
- 120 Train passes out of view ~ train rounds bend about 150m East of MLD-LC
- 148 Train stops at Kingsland Station ~ rear of 6-car train is 886 m from MLD-LC
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Rossgrove Terrace Level Crossing (RT-LC)
- 14-34 metres NE of Baldwin Avenue Station - side platforms (157 metres long, offset by 20 m)
- front end of in-bound 6-car train is 40m SW of level crossing when stopped at station
- rear end of out-bound 6-car train is 20m SW of level crossing when stopped at station
- times in seconds averaged over 5 cycles ~ zero point is when bells and flashing lights begin
  ~ times prior to that are expressed as negative numbers
- times also noted for the Asquith Avenue Level Crossing (AA-LC), which is 89-97m NE of the RT-LC and for the pedestrian only level crossing 10m South of the station

Part 1: Out-Bound Trains (heading SW)
- Cycle time of Rossgrove Terrace Level Crossing bells averages 49 seconds
  Focus is on impact of trains on the Rossgrove Terrace Level Crossing (RT-LC)
  But - times etc. for Asquith Avenue Level Crossing (AA-LC) and the pedestrian-only level-crossing South of Baldwin Avenue Station are italicized and indented

- 47 Train departs Morningside Station ~ front end of 6-car train is 1,150 m from RT-LC
- 44 AA-LC bells start ~ about 90 m NE of RT-LC ~ train not yet visible

0 RT-LC bells and flashing lights start ~ half-arms are in vertical (stored) position
  Cycle starts 16 seconds before train becomes visible from Baldwin Avenue Station
  0 AA-LC half-arms begin to descend from vertical (stored) position
  1 AA-LC pedestrian gates begin to close on both sides of Asquith Avenue
  4 RT-LC half-arms begin to descend from vertical (stored) position
  5 RT-LC pedestrian gates begin to close on both sides of Rossgrove Terrace
  6 AA-LC pedestrian gates are fully closed
  8 AA-LC half-arms are down in horizontal position
  10 RT-LC pedestrian gates are fully closed
  12 RT-LC half-arms are down in horizontal position
  16 Front of train appears under St. Lukes Road Bridge ~ 375m NE of RT-LC
  24 Train begins slowing about 85 m before reaching Asquith Avenue
  27 Train crosses AA-LC at speed of about 10 metres per second (55kmph)
  30 AA-LC half-arm barriers start to lift
  32 Train enters RT-LC ~ front of train enters North side of hatched area on road
  36 AA-LC bells stop ~ half-arm barriers are back up & pedestrian gates closed
  38 Train exits RT-LC ~ rear of train exits South side of hatched area on road
  40 RT-LC half-arms begin lifting from horizontal
  41 RT-LC pedestrian gates begin opening
  48 RT-LC half-arms are back up ~ half-arms returned to vertical (stored) position
  49 RT-LC bells and flashing lights stop ~ cycle time varies from 45-55 seconds
  50 Train Stops at Baldwin Avenue Station ~ rear of 6-car train is 20 m from RT-LC
  54 Pedestrian gate 10m S of Baldwin Avenue platform begins closing
  58 Plug Doors of EMU start to open ~ green lights lit, doors can open on demand
  80 Plug Doors of EMU fully closed ~ all doors close on train manager instruction
  87 Train starts to leave Baldwin Avenue Station ~ overall time at station 30-50 secs
  103 Train clears platform ~ end of train at SW end of platform ~ 175 m from RT-LC
  104 Pedestrian gate 10m S of Baldwin Avenue platform opens
  105 Bells and flashing lights for pedestrian crossing stop
  130 Train 150m South of platform ~ rear of train rounds bend about 300 m from RT-LC
  185 Train stops at Mount Albert Station ~ rear of train is 1,063 m from RT-LC

In-Bound trains at Rossgrove Terrace Level Crossing are on the next page
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Out-Bound trains at Rossgrove Terrace Level Crossing are on the previous page.

Rossgrove Terrace Level Crossing (RTLC)

Part 2 In-Bound Trains (heading North East)

- Cycle time of Rossgrove Terrace Level Crossing bells averages 94 seconds
  Focus is on impact of trains on the Rossgrove Terrace Level Crossing (RT-LC)
  But - times etc. for Asquith Avenue Level Crossing (AA-LC) and the pedestrian-only
  level-crossing South of Baldwin Avenue Station are italicized and indented

- 109 Train departs Mt. Albert Station ~ front end of train is about 1,060m from RT-LC
- 60  Bells start at pedestrian level crossing 10m S of Baldwin Avenue Platform 1
- 58  Pedestrian gates begin closing
- 52  Pedestrian gates shut ~ pedestrian gates at south end of station closed

- 48 Train slows as it rounds bend 160 m South of platform ~ train 350 m Sth of RT-LC
- 30  train enters pedestrian-only level crossing ~ front end enters the crossing
- 20  train enters station ~ front end of train slowly passes South end of Platform 1
- 17  train clears pedestrian-only level crossing ~ rear end exits the crossing
- 15  Pedestrian gates begin closing
- 9  Pedestrian gates closed and southern signals stop

- 2 Train Stops at Baldwin Avenue Station ~ front of 6-car train 40m from RT-LC
  Note: time varies ~ bells can begin up to 10 seconds prior to train halting
  0 RT-LC bells and flashing lights start ~ 2 seconds after the train has halted
  4 RT-LC arms descend ~ half-arm barriers begin to descend from stored position
  5 AA-LC bells start ~ 90 m NE of RT-LC ~ 65 seconds before train enters
  6 Plug Doors of EMU start to open ~ green lights lit, doors can open on demand
  4 AA-LC half-arm barriers start to descend

- 10 RT-LC pedestrian gates are closed
- 12 RT-LC half-arms are down (horizontal)
  15 AA-LC pedestrian gates are closed
  17 AA-LC half-arms are down in horizontal position

- 36 Plug Doors of EMU fully closed ~ all doors close on train manager instruction
- 45 Train starts to leave Baldwin Avenue Station ~ time varies (35-55 seconds)
- 58 Front of train passes over balises which allow ETCS to permit driver to accelerate
- 73 Train enters RT-LC ~ front of train enters South side of hatched area on road
- 83 Train exits RT-LC ~ rear of train exits North side of hatched area on road
- 85 RT-LC half-arms begin lifting ~ pedestrian gates begin opening
- 90  Train enters AA-LC ~ train about 90m from RT-LC

- 93 RT-LC half-arms are back up ~ pedestrian gates are closed
- 94 RT-LC bells and flashing lights stop ~ cycle time varies from 85-115 seconds
  96  Train exits AA-LC ~ train about 100m from RT-LC, speed about 20 mps
- 98 AA-LC half arm barriers start to lift
- 106 AA-LC half-arms are back up ~ pedestrian gates closed, bells stop

118 Train disappears from view under St. Lukes Road Bridge ~ 375 m from RT-LC

159 Train stops at Morningside Station ~ rear of train is 1,150 m from RTLC

Notice of Motion – Level Crossing Timing
Woodward Road Level Crossing (WR-LC)
- 450 m SW of Mount Albert Station ~ 163m island platform (19m longer than a 6-car train)
- front end of out-bound 6-car train is 480m North of WR-LC when stopped at station
- rear end of in-bound 6-car train is 460m North of WR-LC when stopped at station
- note that the in-bound and out-bound cycles frequently overlap which can extend the cycle time
  by a minute or so. ~ this occurs when one train is well behind schedule
- times in seconds averaged over 5 cycles ~ zero point is when bells and flashing lights begin
  ~ times prior to that are expressed as negative numbers

Out-Bound Trains (heading South West) ~ Cycle time of bells averages 95 secs
-116 Train leaves Baldwin Avenue Station ~ front of train almost 1,500m from WR-LC
-54 Train at Carrington Road Bridge ~ front of train under bridge (660m from WW-LC)
-48 Train at N end of Mount Albert Station ~ front of train passes NE end of platform
-38 Train passes mid-point ~ train slowing as it passes mid-point of platform
-26 Train stops at Mount Albert Station ~ front of 6-car train now 482m from WR-LC
-15 Plug Doors of EMU start to open ~ green lights lit, doors can open on demand
  0 WR-LC bells and flashing lights start ~ half-arms are in vertical (stored) position
  4 WR-LC half-arms begin to descend from vertical (stored) position
 12 WR-LC half-arms are down (horizontal) ~ pedestrian gates are closed as well
  20 Plug Doors of EMU fully closed ~ all doors close on train manager instruction
 32 Train starts to leave Mount Albert Station ~ train moves very slowly at first
  51 Train clears South end of Mount Albert Station platform ~ 450 m N of WR-LC
  68 Train enters WR-LC ~ front of train enters North side of hatched area on road
  75 Train exits WRLC ~ rear of train exits South side of hatched area on road
  76 WR-LC half-arms begin lifting ~ pedestrian gates open
  94 WR-LC half-arms are back up ~ pedestrian gates close
 95 WR-LC bells stop ~ overall cycle time varies from 85-100 seconds
 97 Train runs out of view from level crossing ~ train rounds bend 480m SW of WR-LC
190 Train stops at Avondale ~ rear of train about 1,365m from WR-LC

In-Bound Trains (heading North East) ~ Cycle time of bells averages 46 seconds
-108 Train leaves Avondale Station ~ front of train about 1,376m from WR-LC
  0 WR-LC bells and flashing lights start ~ half-arms are in vertical (stored) position
  Front of train is 800m SW of level crossing ~ behind Pak’N’Save Supermarket
  4 WR-LC half-arm barriers begin to descend from vertical (stored) position
  6 Train appears from South ~ train rounds bend about 480 metres SW of WR-LC
 12 WR-LC half-arm barriers are down ~ pedestrian gates are closed as well
  27 Train enters WR-LC ~ front of train enters South side of hatched area on road
  35 Train exits WR-LC ~ rear of train exits North side of hatched area on road
  38 WR-LC half-arms begin lifting ~ pedestrian gates open
  40 Front of Train passes South end of platform ~ 450 m from WR-LC
  45 WR-LC half-arms are back up ~ pedestrian gates close
  46 WR-LC bells stop ~ overall cycle time varies from 42-62 seconds
  55 Train stops at Mt. Albert Station ~ rear of train now 460m from WR-LC
  62 Plug Doors of EMU start to open ~ green lights lit, doors can open on demand
  90 Plug Doors of EMU fully closed ~ all doors close on train manager instruction
 117 Train starts to leave Mount Albert Station ~ cycle time varies from 85-120 secs
 130 Rear end of train clears NE end of platform ~ 600 m from WR-LC
 228 Train stops at Baldwin Avenue Station ~ rear of train about 1,800 m from WR-LC
Notes: applying to all level-crossings and the operation of EMU trains:

- delay between start of cycle (bells start) and arms starting to descend 4 seconds
- time for arms to descend from stored (vertical) position to horizontal 6 seconds
- time for arms to lift from horizontal to vertical (stored) position 8 seconds
- delay after arms return to vertical (stored) position and bells stop under 1 sec
- time taken pedestrian gates to open or close 6 seconds
- time taken for plug doors on EMUs to open or close 6 seconds

Some parts of the cycle are at least partly manual and vary a lot in the time taken:

- delay between train halting at station and doors being able to open 6-12 seconds
- period that doors are open – depends on last passenger entering/exiting 10-30 seconds
- delay between all doors being closed and train starting to move off 8-16 seconds
- thus total time between stopping and starting again can vary from about 24 to 48 secs

Much of this inconsistency could be eliminated if the systems were fully automated.

For the purposes of the measurements I have used the edges of the yellow diamond road marking to define the level crossing – measurements are taken from the nearest edge of the road marking using the measurement tool on GeoMaps.

Auckland suburban trains consist of 3-car EMUs (71.8m long) but frequently two such units are linked to make a 6-car EMU (144m long); these longer units are nearly as long as the 150 metre platforms at suburban stations.

The EMUs are capable of exceeding 36 metres per second (100kmph) and accelerating and decelerating at 1 metre per second per second, and achieved these rates during trials, but rarely operate at these rates. Frequent curves and relatively close stations limit the maximum safe operating speed as shown below – and drivers are often limited to only moderate rates of acceleration.

In general, the Southern line allows higher speeds (much of it is 90kmph and even up to 110kmph) than the Western line which has more hazards such as level crossings and relatively tight curves, and which is predominantly limited to 75 or 80 kmph maximum speed with some sections limited to under 70 kmph.

The relative spacings of the stations surveyed and speeds between them are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stations</th>
<th>distance centre-to-centre</th>
<th>max speed</th>
<th>start-to-stop time out-bound</th>
<th>start-to-stop time in-bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingsland — Morningside</td>
<td>886m</td>
<td>70kph</td>
<td>86 secs</td>
<td>93 secs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morningside — Baldwin Avenue</td>
<td>1.341m</td>
<td>75kph</td>
<td>100 secs</td>
<td>121 secs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Avenue — Mount Albert</td>
<td>1.027m</td>
<td>75kph</td>
<td>98 secs</td>
<td>111 secs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Albert — Avondale</td>
<td>1.900m</td>
<td>80kph</td>
<td>152 secs</td>
<td>163 secs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Axle counters are used on railways throughout New Zealand to detect the passing of a train between two points on the track (a block). The rail network is treated as a series of blocks with the axle counters performing the vitally important block signaling function which does not permit two trains to be in the same section at the same time. Axle counters are also used to switch on and off warning equipment and barrier arms at level crossings. They are widely used internationally as they are relatively simple and cheap, and are favoured on electrified lines as they are immune to some of the electrical interference issues which alternative track circuit devices are prone to. However, axle counters can fail if they ‘forget’ (lose count of) how many axles are in the block, requiring a manual over-ride, and cannot detect
problems such as broken rails. KiwiRail has centralized national control of all axle-counters in Wellington which makes them vulnerable to any break in communication.

The Auckland suburban rail network has a positive train control system known as ETCS (European Train Control System) which is increasingly used worldwide. Balse units mounted in pairs on the sleepers between the tracks at key locations communicate ‘contactlessly’ with passing trains providing information specific to that location in the form of "telegrams". The telegrams are deliberately very brief (limited to 1 kilobyte of data) as they must be sent several times in the fraction of a second that the train antenna unit is within a metre of the balse – this repetition is in order to provide a fail-safe check against potential corruption of the signal due to stray electrical interference. The key information is the precise position of the balse (and hence the train) and the distance to the next one. There will also be coded information for the driver about track conditions ahead such as track geometry (curves and gradients), applicable speed restrictions, and features such as level crossings, points, etc. The telegrams are “fixed” – the same for every passing train – but can be updated as and when required. The balse units do not require a power source as they are “tele-powered” by a high frequency (27.095 MHz) amplitude-modulation radio signal from the on-board transmission equipment on passing trains.

The information from the ETCS guides the driver in selecting the appropriate speed, rate of acceleration/deceleration and braking, but "he has the con" and can drive the train according to his training, experience and best judgement. For example wet conditions affect braking so drivers may reduce speed earlier than normal. If the ETCS detects an unsafe condition, it can override the driver and apply the brakes to slow the train or bring it to a halt. Many believe that the parameters for the ETCS are set too conservatively, leading to such things as the painfully slow movement of trains in the first 10 seconds or so as they begin moving out of a station — after 10 seconds they could be travelling at 10 metres per second (36 kmph) but ETCS limits them to about 4 metres per second (under 15 kmph). Others go further and suggest upgrading the Auckland ETCS from Level 1 to Level 2 which would give much greater flexibility of operation while maintaining safety parameters – with a doubling of train frequencies once CRL opens in 2024 this may be required soon in any case.

Time taken for trains to pass over level crossings varies, depending on their length, average speed while crossing, and the road width. An incoming train will have slowed slightly but may still be travelling at up to 20 metres per second (72 kmph). An outgoing train has just started so speed is more like 10 metres per second (36 kmph) or less. At the crossings covered by this report the angle between the railway tracks and the road is close to 45 degrees, so the relevant widths are measured on the diagonal as follows: Morningside Drive (about 16m), Rossgrove Terrace (11m) and Woodward Road (11m). A 144 metre long train travelling at an average of say 20 metres per second will take 7.75 seconds to traverse an 11 metre wide crossing but at 10 metres per second this will increase to 15.5 seconds.

==========