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Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board feedback on proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity

Background

- Aotea / Great Barrier Island lies 90km east of Auckland City in the Hauraki Gulf and is Auckland Council’s most remote and isolated area.
- Over 60 per cent of the island is Department of Conservation (DoC) estate; 43 per cent of which is the Aotea Conservation Park.
- The island has a permanent population of 936 residents (2018 Census)
- Aotea Great Barrier Local Board Plan 2017 has an outcome where ‘Our environment is protected and enhanced’
- ‘Aotea Great Barrier Island: A world of its own, where people and place are woven in a tapestry of ecological richness’ - Aotea Great Barrier Island Ecology Vision statement 2016
- The island is free of possums and mustelids.
- Aotea is home to many of New Zealand’s endemic species including Chevron skink, Hochstettters frog, Black petrel, Paua slug and smaller banded Dotterel.

Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board feedback

1. Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board supports the overall intent of a National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity to protect and maintain indigenous biodiversity to reach levels of biodiversity abundance.

2. We acknowledge the reference to the Treaty of Waitangi, however the Treaty principle of partnership should be explicitly mentioned - particularly as the policy is ‘Indigenous’ Biodiversity as opposed to non-indigenous/introduced.

3. There is no mention of the Wai 262 Claim or recommendations (Flora and Fauna claim) – some consideration/inclusion should be noted.

4. There is also no reference to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (parts 3, 24, 25, 26, 27).
Feedback on:
25 February 2020

For clarifications and questions, please contact:
Mal Ahmu
Local Board Advisor – Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board

Context
1. The proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB), is intended to provide consistency for council’s interpreting and applying the Resource Management Act 1991 provisions relating to indigenous biodiversity. This includes protecting significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for fauna and to maintain indigenous biodiversity.
2. NPSIB has been developed by the MFE and DOC based on an initial draft developed by the stakeholder-led Biodiversity Collaborative Group. This group comprised industry representatives, environmental groups and an iwi advisor.
3. The primary objective of the proposed NPSIB is to maintain indigenous biodiversity through directions relating to:
   - applying the concept of Hūti te Rito when implementing the NPSIB and managing indigenous biodiversity.
   - providing opportunities for tangata whenua involvement in the management of indigenous biodiversity.
   - processes and criteria to identify, assess and protect areas as significant natural areas (areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna).
   - managing adverse effects of activities within significant natural areas and managing effects on indigenous biodiversity that occur outside of significant natural areas.
   - identifying and protecting taonga species and ecosystems.
   - identifying and managing locations for highly mobile fauna.
   - promoting and providing for restoration and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity.
   - requiring development of regional biodiversity strategies and monitoring plans.
4. At the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board’s 25 February 2020 business meeting, it delegated authority to local board member, Nairna Henry to input into Auckland Council’s submission on, He Kura Koiora i hokia: A discussion document on a proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (resolution: MT/2020/17).
5. The due date for submissions to the Ministry for the Environment is 14 March 2020. The draft Auckland Council submission will be presented to the Planning Committee for its approval on 5 March 2020. To meet these timeframes local board feedback is due by 3 March 2020.
Relevance to the Local board

6. Local boards are responsible for decision-making on local issues, activities and services and providing input into regional strategies, policies and plans. Local boards also have a role in representing the views of their communities on issues of local importance.

7. Maungakiekie-Tāmaki local board previously provided feedback on the Department of Conservation’s discussion document on proposals for a national biodiversity strategy, Te Koirao a te Koiora – our shared vision for living with nature. The local board’s feedback endorsed the proposed national biodiversity strategy and noted that there is a vast amount of development occurring and planned to occur in the local board area and in the Auckland region that will have a significant impact on biodiversity.

8. Every three years local boards set their strategic direction through a local board plan. The Proposed Priority Products and Priority Product Stewardship Scheme Guidelines have relevance to the following outcomes and objectives the 2017 Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is an active and engaged community</td>
<td>People are cared for and enabled to participate, celebrate and contribute to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is a community that cares about its environment</td>
<td>Demonstrate environmental leadership and support community sustainability initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is the place to be</td>
<td>Clean, beautiful waters and waterside areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki has quality infrastructure to match growth</td>
<td>New developments are high-quality and reflect the flavour and character of our area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki has quality infrastructure to match growth</td>
<td>Good-quality open spaces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board feedback on the He Kura Koiora i hokia: A discussion document on a proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity:

The Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board provides the following input:

a) note that an objective in the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Plan 2017 is, *Maungakiekie-Tāmaki is a community that cares for its environment*, which outlines the local boards commitment to protecting, enhancing and restoring our native plants and animals (particularly our native birdlife) within the local board area

b) endorse Auckland Council’s draft submission on the proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity, noting the key points below:

   i) endorse the need to strengthen requirements for protecting our native plants, animals and ecosystems under the Resource Management Act 1991

   ii) endorse the underlying concept of the NPSIB, *Huta te Rito*, which recognises that the health and well-being of nature is vital to our own health and wellbeing

   iii) recommend ensuring that this National Policy Statement aligns with other national and regional related policies, plans and strategies

   iv) recommend that sufficient financial support accompanies the implementation of the NPSIB, for both territorial authorities and tangata whenua.

End.
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15 Puketāpapa Local Board feedback on the proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity

Ben Moimoi, Local Board Advisor was in attendance to speak to the report.

Resolution number PKTTPP/2020/9

MOVED by Deputy Chairperson J Fairey, seconded by Member B Shen:

That the Puketāpapa Local Board:

a) note the importance of having a National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity.

b) support Auckland Council’s draft submission on the proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity.

c) thank Ben Moimoi for his attendance.

CARRIED
Waiheke Local Board feedback on the draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity.

The National policy statement for indigenous biodiversity seeks to address New Zealand’s declining biodiversity by providing national direction on how to maintain indigenous biodiversity under the Resource Management Act (1991). It sets out a requirement for councils to identify significant vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna, and manage their protection through plans and resource consent processes. This will apply to all land tenures: public conservation land, Maori land and private land.

The Waiheke Local Board is committed to environmental protection, restoration and enhancement. The 2017 Local Board Plan¹ states:

“Waiheke’s environment is treasured” – key objectives include:

- Restore and protect our natural environment in partnership with the community.
- Minimise the impact of climate change.
- Improve conservation of our coastal environment including the marine area.
- Reduce the waste stream.

Waiheke Local Board wishes to provide the following feedback on the draft National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity (NPSIB).

- The board supports the objectives and policies of the draft NPSIB.
- The board is seriously concerned about the extent of the biodiversity crisis facing New Zealand and the Hauraki Gulf.
  - In New Zealand alone, over three quarters of all species of terrestrial birds, reptiles, butterflies and moths, frogs, bats and freshwater fish are either threatened or at risk of extinction (Te Kopoa o te Koiora², 2019 p.13).
  - The tussock-lands, estuaries, forests, wetlands, marine environments which sustain these species are equally under threat.
  - Despite the existence of Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act and the Hauraki Gulf Forum, the biodiversity of the Hauraki Gulf continues to decline at an alarming rate.

- Waiheke has a major problem with marine and terrestrial pest infestations. The board is a key supporter, and Auckland Council and Government two of the main funders, of Te Koporai o Waiheke, a local collective organisation aiming to make Waiheke Island predator-free by 2050. The NPSIB must recognise the importance of pest management in restoring significant natural areas and should provide direction to ensure integration across the biosecurity planning system.

Council has the ability to include special conditions in its resource consent approvals for applications in Special Ecological Areas and bush sites on Waiheke, to protect native flora and fauna. The board recommends that the NPSIB strengthens the ability of local councils to restore native plant and animal species and to direct landowners to partner with local organisations on pest management and reforestation strategies.

The NPSIB should also encourage the use of covenants as part of the resource consenting process which commit landowners to best ecological restoration practice in areas where endangered flora and fauna could flourish.

Given the degradation of biodiversity through adverse planning decisions, the board recommends that a new biodiversity National Environmental Standard be developed which informs all Resource Management Act and Environmental Protection Agency decisions.

Private land needs to be included on the biodiversity strategy to more strongly including private landowners in contributing to solutions.

The NPSIB should encourage measures and rules to promote and incentivise the extensive planting of native forests and shrublands to provide habitats for the recolonisation of native flora and fauna.

Stronger controls are required to protect extensive shrubland habitats, as well as native forests, and to limit development in coastal and ridgeline locations.

The NPSIB should promote new strategies for local authorities to avoid bush clearance and to maintain controls to protect vegetation in Special Ecological Areas.

The Controlled Area Notices, which prescribe rules for entering or leaving sensitive areas, are being used for protecting the Hauraki Gulf Islands and these should align with any new provisions in the NPSIB.

The Hauraki Gulf Islands have much stronger tree rule protections than the rest of the Auckland region, except for the Waitakere area, but these protections are still proving inadequate to prevent loss of local habitats for flora and fauna in the face of development.

The board believes that there needs to be greater emphasis on restoring biodiversity in the marine environment. The board is supporting a local initiative called the Waiheke Collective Marine Project which is an iwi and community-led project bringing together diverse interests to generate solutions for marine protection in the Gulf. However, there is a critical lack of imperative at a national level to support local and regional efforts.

The board believes that there needs to be stronger focus on Te Ao Māori perspectives as guiding the way forward to rebuilding biodiversity. The board recommends that local boards should partner with mana whenua in the management of indigenous biodiversity going forward.

The NPSIB needs to be stronger on protecting indigenous biodiversity from the increased risks due to climate change such as drought, fire, flood and invasive

species. The board would like to see a clause in the NPSIB on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The board notes that extensive reforestation in line with the government’s tree-planting policies will not only support greater biodiversity but also assist with the country’s reduced carbon goals.

- NPSIB should consider catchment and hydrological impacts to provide better direction and stronger protection for biodiversity significantly impacted by New Zealand’s increasing urban environments. Reticulation and development rules need to consider wider ecosystem function and impacts. Increasing flood events and sea level rise combined with increasing urban development are exacerbating existing erosion and sedimentation problems which need consideration beyond the maintenance and management of visible fragments.

Draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity: feedback from the Waitakere Ranges Local Board

The Waitakere Ranges Local Board of Auckland Council:

a) supports the development of a draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity to recognise the importance of maintaining biodiversity.

b) considers there is a need to do more than just maintain indigenous biodiversity, recognising the reference to ‘at least no reduction’ currently proposed in the NPSIB (clause 1.7). There needs to be a positive gain for nature to build resilience to impacts of climate change and enable nature-based solutions.

c) considers the primary purpose should be to protect, restore and enhance existing significant indigenous biodiversity with direction on how this is to be achieved by local authorities.

d) Considers that in order to achieve goals of maintaining indigenous biodiversity (at a minimum) the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity should explicitly enable general tree protection. This will enable local authorities to nominate and protect forest ecosystems as a whole, as well as wildlife corridors.

e) highlights the need to align National Policy Statements on Biodiversity and Freshwater for effective wetland restoration and management.

f) noting the intent to manage significant natural areas through district plans, we seek the repeal of section 76 (4A) – (4D) of the Resource Management Act which restricts urban tree protection through district rules. This is of particular concern for the bush covered west Auckland suburbs of Titirangi and Laingholm which are classed as urban.

g) as a regional vision for restoration and enhancement, we support regional biodiversity strategies promoting other outcomes such as predator control and prevention of spread of pests and pathogens.

h) does not support using a high and medium classification of significant natural areas. It doesn’t recognise that areas may transition from one to the other and may discourage restoration of degraded natural areas.

i) considers Significant Ecological Area to be a clearer description than Significant Natural Area so supports using this term instead.

j) supports greater guidance and direction on monitoring of indigenous biodiversity as proposed in clause 3.20 of the NPSIB.

k) supports Significant Natural Areas being identified on public conservation land.

l) endorses the Auckland Council submission.

To provide context for our views we have provided a description of the Waitakere Ranges area below and outline the biodiversity / biosecurity challenges it faces.

Local significance

Our area in west Auckland includes some 20 percent of the Auckland region’s native vegetation. The Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008 (WRHAA) established a heritage area of around 28,000 hectares and recognised it as being of local, regional, and national significance:
The area is outstanding in northern New Zealand for its terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, which include large continuous areas of primary and regenerating lowland and coastal rainforest, wetland, and dune systems with intact ecological sequences. The area contains distinctive and outstanding flora, fauna, and landscapes.

A unique feature is there are around 20,000 people living in distinctive small communities within a conservation area. The mix of public and private land makes integrated management all the more important. 8

Restoration and enhancement (Objective 5, Policy 11, s3.16)

There are significant biodiversity and biosecurity issues to be addressed in our area. Pest plants and animals are a serious threat to biodiversity values. The area is heavily infected with kauri dieback. Following the findings of Auckland Council’s kauri dieback survey in 2016 Te Kawerau a Maki placed a rahui over the forested area of the ranges, council subsequently closed the regional and some local parks, and a controlled area notice was put in place under the Biosecurity Act.

The quality of the WRHA is deteriorating with pest plant infestations. We need to look after what we have got. There is more emphasis now on natural regeneration – just control the weeds and let regrowth happen.

The NP5 should recognise the critical role of pest management in maintaining and restoring significant ecological areas and provide direction to ensure there is integration across to the related biosecurity planning framework.

Significant Natural Area terminology and classifications (s3.8, Appendix 1 and 2)

The Auckland Unitary Plan uses the term Significant Ecological Areas (SEA). This seems a clearer description than Significant Natural Areas and makes it easier to distinguish it from terms such outstanding natural features, natural landscapes, natural character.

High and medium classification of natural areas is not supported. The medium SNA category puts them at risk of being seen as less important for protection and restoration. It doesn’t recognise that areas may transition from medium to high, and may discourage community restoration efforts. A medium SNA could be a future high SNA. The proposed classification levels would undermine areas that are currently infested with weeds or pests.

Ecological areas like the WRHA should be maintained as one SEA because of their size, and to ensure integrated management. While there may be different values throughout we would not support it being split into high and medium classifications.

Mapping natural areas on public land (discussion document)

The discussion document asks for views on whether natural areas should be mapped on various kinds of public land and who would pay.

We strongly support SNAs being mapped on public conservation land and all other public land including council-owned to ensure integrated management. The Waitakere Ranges is a unique mix of public and privately-owned land in a continuous forested area with a surrounding rural buffer zone. If SNA provisions were to apply only to private land it may undermine public acceptability and understanding.
In our region, the mapping of significant ecological areas on public and private land has been done by Auckland Council in developing its Unitary Plan. However, we don’t favour a “one size fits all” approach with regards to who pays for this in other local authority areas.

*Integrated management (Objective 4, Policy 4, and s3.4)*

The draft NPS recognises the need for improving integrated management of biodiversity. However, more detail is needed to give direction on what that might look like, along with a recognition of the critical role pest control plays. The successful possum control programmes by the former Auckland Regional Council are cited, by one local board member, as having turned “bush into forest” in Huia. There is a transformational opportunity there to allow natural regeneration if we just control the weeds and let re-growth happen. There needs to be a clearer link between the NPS for Biodiversity and the biosecurity planning framework.

Under section 3.4, we recommend adding an explicit reference to road controlling authorities, and the need for integrated management of road reserves in significant natural areas to achieve biodiversity outcomes.

*Resilience to climate change (s3.5)*

Climate change will result in changed weather patterns and conditions, with accumulating impacts, as well as increased risk of extreme events that damage ecosystems.

A recent Auckland Council technical report notes: “there is a lack of detailed knowledge on how different ecosystems and their species components react to climate change and so future predictions cannot be accurately made, particularly as accumulating impacts of climate change will impact species uniquely.”

We would like to see stronger direction from the NPS on protecting indigenous biodiversity from the increasing risks of changing weather patterns, drought, fire, flood and invasive species.

*Monitoring (Policy 15, s3.20)*

Monitoring is a critical part of achieving the NPS objectives. Monitoring needs to be adequate to inform decisions at a local, regional and national level. From our own experience this is not always the case.

A five-yearly monitoring report “State of the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area 2018” looks at how well the WRHA area is being looked after. One of its overall conclusions is that Auckland Council does not have baseline data to inform decisions on pest plant management in the area, and that more monitoring sites are needed. The report largely draws on available information from existing monitoring systems. The report identified information gaps and in places highlighted the difficulty of extracting quantitative information from council systems.

We recommend s3.20(1) include a requirement for a unitary authority to work with local boards to develop monitoring plans.

---

1 “Climate change risk assessment for terrestrial species and ecosystems in the Auckland region”, Auckland Council technical report, TR2019/015
Overall

We generally support the objectives and policies of the draft NPS though ask that they be reviewed against the WRHAA to ensure they are not inconsistent, and that the NPS does not undermine existing protections. We have some concern that the exemption clause s3.9(4)(d) in the section on managing adverse effects is too wide.
Proposed NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity – Auckland Council Submission

Planning Committee
5 March 2020

Development of NPS

• Biodiversity Collaborative Group developed draft NPSIB, refined by MfE and DOC
• Need for NPS:
  • RMA provisions lack clarity and have different interpretation by councils
  • Uncertainty and undervaluing indigenous biodiversity
  • On-going loss of indigenous biodiversity
  • Opportunities to increase amount and effectiveness of active management
Draft NPSIB objective & scope

- Key objective is to maintain indigenous biodiversity as a matter of national significance
- Maintain includes no reductions in population size of species, ecosystem function & range, connectivity, resilience & adaptability
- Requires identification and management of Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) & Significant Ecosystem Areas (SEAs) & classification of them into ‘High’ and ‘Medium’
- Directs that adverse effects are first avoided, then remedied, then mitigated, then offsets/compensation considered
- Applies more stringently to ‘High’ SNAs
- Requires preparation of a regional biodiversity strategy and restoration and enhancement of ecosystems and habitats
- NPSIB only applies to terrestrial biodiversity except includes wetland restoration and enhancement (wetlands also protected under NPS Freshwater Management)
- NPSIB must be given effect to in the Unitary Plan

Submission - key points

- Generally supportive and quite well aligned to AC current approach – opportunity to consolidate and improve AC regulatory and non-regulatory approaches
- Greater need for integration of national tools – including NPSUD and NPSFM
- Suggest some ‘stretch’ provisions be voluntary rather than mandatory – to support position of other councils in NZ
- Needs to recognise regionally and locally important infrastructure
- Some role for all indigenous biodiversity and in particular in relation to ecotones and gradients – i.e. where indigenous biodiversity extends across freshwater/coastal/terrestrial boundaries
Submission - key points

- Support ecological significance criteria with improvements to be more objective and appropriate including:
  - recognising regionally threatened species and ecosystems
  - underpinned by recognised ecosystem classification system
- Concern with direction to distinguish ‘High’ and ‘Medium’ SNAs:
  - subjective ‘distinguishing attributes’
  - potentially inappropriate distinctions between different SNAs
  - could undermine protection of ‘Medium’ SNAs
  - unlikely to reduce litigation/contention
  - unnecessary for most SNAs

Feedback from IMSB

- Needs to be recognition of rangatiratanga and a partnership approach
- Māori as partners, not just stakeholders
Local Board Feedback

- Feedback from 10 Local Boards has been received
- In general, aligned with draft submission
- Strong support for the need for a NPSIB – including in the context of local biodiversity restoration and enhancement initiatives and projects
- Many support the NPSIB applying to all environmental domains
- Several identify need for general tree protection rules to be reinstated
- Pakuranga, Maungakiekie-Takini and Waitakere Ranges Local Board support the draft submission
- Several Lisa see greater acknowledgement of TiP and partnership with Māori
- Upper Harbour supports ‘High’ and ‘Medium’ distinction – “any habitat made up of indigenous vegetation [except mangroves] should be considered at high value... [with] maximum protection”

CCO and Healthy Waters Feedback

- As drafted NPSIB implies a management approach that will impact on the delivery, operation and maintenance of necessary infrastructure
- Supports submission point regarding regionally and locally important infrastructure
- Some support for greater integration across ‘environmental domain boundaries’ (noting some reservations from HW if NPSIB scope increased to address freshwater environments)
- Watercare may be doing their own submission (have incorporated their feedback into the draft AC submission)
Implementation feedback

- Have worked with central government to inform their ‘section 32’ analysis of the draft
- Also providing more detailed feedback on implementation issues
- In general consider can be done within existing budget and resources – timing works for Unitary Plan review
- Outlines implementation challenges including distinguishing between ‘High’ and ‘Medium’
- Seeks guidance and material support – particularly for less resourced councils

Next Steps

- Finalise submission (with delegated authority)
- Lodge by March 14
- Seek opportunities to engage with central government on issues of concern
Auckland Plan 2050
Three Yearly Progress Report
Strategic Advice Unit | Auckland Plan Strategy and Research Dept

Auckland Plan 2050 Monitoring Framework

Six monthly updates → Annual Scorecard Development Strategy monitoring report (annual) → Three Yearly Progress Report
Process to develop the Three Yearly Progress Report

- Trends and results:
  - AP outcome measures
  - Supporting outcome measures
- Research:
  - Evidence of progress and opportunities for greater progress
- Strategic context:
  - National/global trends
  - Future trends
  - Local and central government initiatives

Opportunities for greater progress

**Belonging and participation**
1. Supporting community connection and resilience
2. Improving physical activity and mental health
3. Supporting communities of greatest need

**Māori identity and wellbeing**
4. Ensuring physical and cultural revitalisation of marae
5. Increasing Māori capacity in decision making and leadership
6. Supporting te reo Māori to flourish for future generations

**Homes and places**
7. Tackling growth in the intermediate housing market
8. Preventing homelessness
9. Ensuring low carbon, resilient, healthy homes and places
Opportunities for greater progress

Transport and access
10. Responding to climate change through transport
11. Ensuring equity in access to transport
12. Improving safety on the transport network

Environment and cultural heritage
13. Transitioning to sustainable urban planning and development approaches
14. Building resilience of our environment, species, cultural heritage and infrastructure to climate change impacts

Opportunity and prosperity
15. Addressing the ability to afford everyday needs
16. Ensuring skills for the future
17. Supporting business resilience through innovation

Key challenges and emerging themes

The main findings of this report support the Plan’s key challenges of high population growth, shared prosperity and environmental degradation. These are reinforced by emerging themes across all the outcomes:

- Equity
- Climate change transition
- Community resilience
Next steps

- Publish report
- Use the opportunities for greater progress as a basis for alignment with the 10-year budget and other decision making as appropriate
- Distribute report to Local Board Services.

Future reporting

- Update report (July 2020)
- Auckland Plan annual scorecard (July 2020)
- Development Strategy monitoring report (September 2020)
- Three Yearly Progress report (March 2023)
ACCAB held a planning workshop during April and identified the following key priorities that relate to the CCMP refresh:

- **City Centre MasterPlan and Waterfront Plan integrated into one document** that includes the area occupied by Ports of Auckland. This will ensure we achieve a holistic, integrated plan that will guide investment and progress towards achieving the CCMP vision.

- **Access for Everyone**
  - A transformative concept that would increase capacity of city centre’s economic engine, while also improving public amenity & air quality
  - Access provided for all stakeholders, including essential services such as loading, servicing & waste management
  - Lighter, quicker, cheaper concept is based on trialling initiatives with purposeful collaboration that will help address concerns with the impact of lengthy construction
  - The concept opens up opportunities to celebrate heritage, identity & other unique qualities of the city centre

- **We support the inclusion of Grafton Gully and Maori outcomes**

- **We have an interest in projects that make our growing urban community more resilient & connected and our city centre more welcoming & vibrant, including:**
  - Clean, green environment
  - Safety, lighting
  - Arts and culture
  - Initiatives that mitigate the impact of construction
  - Housing & support for rough sleepers
  - Public spaces
Other Comments

- We support developing a city centre that is great for people - who live, work, visit and study here
- Victoria Quarter is an important part of the city centre that requires further investment
- The Albert Park Tunnels potentially provide a unique opportunity to improve accessibility and walkability through to the Grafton Gully area
- The integrated masterplan will support improved delivery by the Auckland Council group (incl POAL) and facilitate the concept of ‘do it once, do it right’ - coordinated, responsive, faster delivery and cost effective.
Agenda

- Introduction
- CCMP refresh timeline
- Workshop on 19 February – summary
- Next steps
CCMP refresh
Timeline

2018

- CCMP Refresh & A4E Concept
- Resolution PLA/2018/121
  - Light-touch CCMP refresh
  - Waterfront Plan integration
  - Māori Outcomes
  - Grafton Gully B’yard
  - Access for Everyone

2019

- A4E Trials
  - 26 March WORKSHOP
- Diplomats
  - Conspiracy: strategy, Transformational Moves & Projects
  - 19 June WORKSHOP
- CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

2020

- Consult Feedback & Elected Members Input
  - Feb WORKSHOP
- 2021 LTP PREPARATION
  - A4E LTP BID
- Adoption of CCMP
  - March COMMITTEE

2021

- Detailed Design of A4E for Whole City
Resolution PLA/2018/121
Timeline

2018

Resolution PLA/2018/121
- Light-touch CCMP refresh
- Waterfront Plan integration
- Māori Outcomes
- Grafton Gully B'vard
- Access for Everyone

2019

CCMP Refresh & A4E Concept

2020

A4E Trials
- 26 March WORKSHOP

Digitisation Consultation strategy, Transformational Moves & Projects
- 12 June WORKSHOP

Decision on content and consultation strategy
- 2 July COMMITTEE

Consult Feedback & Elected Members Input
- Feb WORKSHOP

2021

2021 LTP Preparation
A4E LTP BID
DETAILED DESIGN OF A4E FOR WHOLE CITY

Adoption of CCMP
- March COMMITTEE
Planning Committee
5 March 2020

Attachment B
Item 10

Timeline

2018

- CCMP Refresh & A4E Concept

Resolution PLA/2018/121
- Light-touch CCMP refresh
- Waterfront Plan integration
- Māori Outcomes
- Grafton Gully B’yard
- Access for Everyone

2019

- A4E Trials
- 26 March WORKSHOP
- Digitisation Consultation strategy, Transformational Moves & Projects
- 12 June WORKSHOP
- Consultation and Public Engagement

Resolution PLA/2019/62
- Undertake targeted public engagement
- Report to Planning Committee in 2020

2020

- Planning Committee update: Outcomes
- 16 May WORKSHOP
- Decision on content and consultation strategy
- 2 July COMMITTEE
- Consult Feedback & Elected Members Input
- Feb WORKSHOP
- Adoption of CCMP
- March COMMITTEE
- 2021 LTP PREPARATION
- A4E LTP BID

2021

- DETAILED DESIGN OF A4E FOR WHOLE CITY
Consultation Documents
Timeline

2018

- CCMP Refresh & A4E Concept

Resolution PLA/2018/121
- Light-touch CCMP refresh
- Waterfront Plan integration
- Māori Outcomes
- Grafton Gully B’Vard
- Access for Everyone

2019

- A4E Trials
  - 26 March WORKSHOP
- Digitation
  - Consultation strategy
  - Transformational Moves & Projects
  - 12 June WORKSHOP

2020

2021

- Consult
  - Feedback & Elected Members Input
  - Feb WORKSHOP

- Adoption of CCMP
  - March COMMITTEE

Resolution PLA/2019/62
- Undertake targeted + public engagement
- Report to Planning Committee in 2020

CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

DETAILED DESIGN OF A4E FOR WHOLE CITY

LTP PREPARATION

A4E LTP BID
Attachment B

Item 10

Results

- 542 responses
- 76% support
- 82% support for Access for Everyone (A4E)
AT Feedback

- Modal shift and road safety are key priorities for AT and NZTA
- A4E and city centre works = opportunity to transform transport
- Scoping of comprehensive A4E investigations commencing
- AT and NZTA scoping initial RLTP bids
- Agencies will contribute to Council-led engagement on A4E
- AT will continue to develop comprehensive TDM programmes and work on:
  - city centre disruption management
  - network optimisation and works coordination
  - more customer-focused approach
- Seeking early pilots to showcase A4E while investigation and construction work is underway
Discussion

- Aligning transport decisions and investments with city centre visions
- Political risk and communications
- Functionality vs. aesthetics of roads, streets and movement networks for people and goods
- Number of consultation responses
- What about people who need to drive?
- Can Queen Street improvements be piloted earlier?
- City centre residents’ needs
- Regional significance of a successful city centre
- Regional significance of Access for Everyone
Timeline

2018

Resolution PLA/2018/121
- Light-touch CCMP refresh
- Waterfront Plan integration
- Māori Outcomes
- Grafton Gully B’vard
- Access for Everyone

2019

A4E Trials
- 26 March WORKSHOP

Digitisation Consultation strategy, Transformational Moves & Projects
- 12 June WORKSHOP

2020

Consult Feedback & Elected Members Input
- Feb WORKSHOP

2021

2021 LTP PREPARATION
A4E LTP BID

DETAILED DESIGN OF A4E FOR WHOLE CITY

Resolution PLA/2019/62
- Undertake targeted + public engagement
- Report to Planning Committee in 2020
Outcomes, Moves and Access for Everyone

Outcomes

1. Tāmaki Makaurau: Our place in the world
2. Connected city centre
3. Accessible and inclusive city centre
4. Green city centre
5. Public life
6. Residential City Centre Neighbourhoods
7. Quality built form
8. Heritage-defined city centre
9. Sustainable city centre
10. Prosperous city centre

Transformational Moves

1. Māori Outcomes
2. The East and West Stitch
3. Waihorotiu Queen Street Valley
4. Learning Quarter
5. Rapid Transit-Oriented Development
6. The Green Link
7. City to the villages
8. Harbour Edge Stitch

Access for Everyone

AT to develop A4E concept into a detailed plan in 2020
Next steps

• Digital CCMP website goes live on 30 March

• Council whanau to develop Long Term Plan (LTP) and Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP)

• AT undertaking comprehensive investigation into A4E, including pilots

• Panuku to update the Wynyard Quarter precinct of the Waterfront Plan.