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1. Summary

Produced by the Auckland Council Research and Evaluation Unit (RIMU), the Auckland Monthly Housing Update brings together a number of significant Auckland housing related statistics.

The report includes:

- dwellings – consented, by type, and with CCCs issued
- residential parcels – created, and inside Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries – 2010 Metropolitan Urban Limit (MUL) and Rural Urban Boundary (RUB)
- permanent and long-term migration
- median residential sales price
- residential property buyer classification
- public housing supply and demand in Auckland.
2. Highlights

- 1228 dwellings were consented in December 2019.
- In the year ending December 2019, 15,154 dwellings were consented in the region.
- 46 per cent of new dwellings consented in December 2019 were houses, 30 per cent were apartments and 25 per cent were townhouses, flats, units, retirement village units, or other types of attached dwellings.
- 168 dwellings were consented on Housing New Zealand or Tāmaki Regeneration Company owned land in December 2019.
- 1168 dwellings consented in December 2019 were inside the RUB. Over the past 12 months, 94 per cent of new dwellings consented were inside the RUB.
- 37 per cent of dwellings consented were inside the 1500m walking catchments of the rapid transport network in December 2019.
- 1329 dwellings were ‘completed’ by having a Code Compliance Certificate (CCC) issued in December 2019.
- In the year ending December 2019, 13,162 dwellings had a CCC issued.
- 558 new residential parcels under 5000m² were created in January 2020.
- In the past 12 months, 7744 new residential parcels under 5000m² were created – an average of 645 each month.
- In January 2020, 535 new residential parcels of all sizes were created inside the RUB.
- Long-term arrivals in November 2019 were 3790.
- 27 per cent of residential properties sold in Auckland were purchased by first home owners in December 2019.
- 1027 public housing applications have been housed in the September quarter 2019.
3. Dwellings consented

In December 2019, 1,226 dwelling consents were issued, which saw 15,154 consents issued for the past 12 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dec 18</th>
<th>Sep 19</th>
<th>Oct 19</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Statistics New Zealand
4. Dwellings consented by type

Of all the dwellings consented in December 2019, 561 were houses, 365 were apartments, and 300 were townhouses, flats, units, retirement village units or other types of attached dwellings.

Data source: Statistics New Zealand
5. Dwellings consented on Housing New Zealand or Tāmaki Regeneration Company owned land

In December 2019, 168 dwellings (14 per cent of total dwellings consented) were consented on Housing New Zealand (HNZ) or Tāmaki Regeneration Company (TRC) owned land. These included 95 apartment units, 39 houses and 34 townhouses, flats, and other attached dwelling types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dec 18</th>
<th>Sep 19</th>
<th>Oct 19</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of HNZ/TRC dwellings</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consenting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total dwellings</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consenting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dwellings consented by type

Data sources: Statistics New Zealand and Auckland Council
6. Dwellings consented by Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries

In December 2019, 1054 dwellings consented were inside 2010 MUL and a total of 1168 dwellings consented were inside the RUB. Over the past 12 months, 94 per cent of the dwellings were consented inside the RUB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dec 18</th>
<th>Sep 19</th>
<th>Oct 19</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside 2010 MUL</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>1054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2010 MUL and RUB</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside RUB</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dwellings consented by Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries

Data source: Statistics New Zealand
7. Dwellings consented along the rapid transport network

In December 2019, 453 dwellings (37 per cent of total dwellings consented) were consented inside the rapid transport network’s (RTN) 1500m walking catchments. In the last 12 months, 4244 dwellings were consented inside the 1500m RTN walking catchments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dec 18</th>
<th>Sep 19</th>
<th>Oct 19</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings consented inside the 1500m RTN walking catchments</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total dwellings consented</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-month rolling total inside RTN walking catchments</td>
<td>3,498</td>
<td>4,130</td>
<td>4,231</td>
<td>4,151</td>
<td>4,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion from the last 12-month inside RTN walking catchments</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Dwellings consented inside 1500m RTN walking catchments](chart)

Data sources: Statistics New Zealand and Auckland Council
Spatial distribution of dwelling consents

Data sources: Statistics New Zealand and Auckland Council
8. Dwellings with CCCs issued (completions)

1329 dwelling units had received CCCs in December 2019. 97 per cent of the CCCs were issued to dwelling units that had building consents granted within the past two years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCCs issued</th>
<th>Dec 18</th>
<th>Sep 19</th>
<th>Oct 19</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>1,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Auckland Council
9. Residential parcels created

In January 2020, the total number of residential parcels under 5000m² created was 558.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel size category</th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Oct 19</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1000 m²</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 m² to 1999 m²</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 m² to 2999 m²</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 m² to 3999 m²</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 m² to 4999 m²</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of residential parcels &lt; 5000m²</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: RMU and Land Information New Zealand
10. Residential parcels by Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries

413 of new residential parcels of all sizes created in January 2020 were inside 2010 MUL and a total of 535 new residential parcels were inside the RUB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Oct 19</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside 2010 MUL</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2010 MUL and RUB</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside RUB</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: RMU and Land Information New Zealand
11. Permanent and long-term migration

Long-term arrival number in November 2019 was 3790. Net migration to Auckland data was not available because the requirement for passengers to complete departure cards stopped in November 2018. A new methodology was developed by Statistics New Zealand, however, no regional output was released at the time this monitoring report was produced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Nov 18</th>
<th>Aug 19</th>
<th>Sep 19</th>
<th>Oct 19</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrivals</td>
<td>3,970</td>
<td>4,023</td>
<td>4,357</td>
<td>4,366</td>
<td>3,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departures</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Permanent and long-term migration in Auckland (last five years)](image)

Data source: Statistics New Zealand
12. Median residential sales price

The median residential sales price from REINZ in December 2019 was $890,000. The District Valuation Roll (DVR) median sales price in November 2019 was $842,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Dec 18</th>
<th>Sep 19</th>
<th>Oct 19</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REINZ</td>
<td>$862,000</td>
<td>$848,000</td>
<td>$888,000</td>
<td>$885,000</td>
<td>$890,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVR sales(^1)</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$802,000</td>
<td>$805,000</td>
<td>$842,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Back data has been updated to reflect the latest sales records captured in council’s District Valuation Roll database. Although conveyancers are required to inform council within 30 days after transactions have occurred, the monitoring team has identified the reporting process has not been thoroughly implemented. It should be noted that there is no penalty if a conveyancer fails to report to council within the 30-day period. As a result, the reporting lag varies from as short as one working day to as long as six months.
13. Residential property buyer classification

In December 2019, 27 per cent of residential properties sold in Auckland were purchased by first homeowners, 21 per cent were purchased by movers and 40 per cent were purchased by multi-property owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buyer classification</th>
<th>Dec 18</th>
<th>Sep 19</th>
<th>Oct 19</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First home buyer</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mover</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-property owner</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New to market</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-entry</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: CoreLogic NZ
14. Public housing in Auckland

This section provides an overview of public housing demand and supply in Auckland region. These data are collected and distributed by the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development on a quarterly basis. In the September quarter 2019, 1027 public housing applications have been housed with Housing New Zealand or with a Community Housing Provider.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>September quarter 2018</th>
<th>December quarter 2018</th>
<th>March quarter 2019</th>
<th>June quarter 2019</th>
<th>September quarter 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public housing stock</td>
<td>31,004</td>
<td>31,341</td>
<td>31,452</td>
<td>32,184</td>
<td>32,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public housing register - housing register (top row) and transfer register (bottom row)</td>
<td>3,908</td>
<td>4,363</td>
<td>4,409</td>
<td>4,846</td>
<td>5,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>910</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public housing register – applications housed</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>1,027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Ministry of Housing and Urban Development

---

2 Public housing data are extracted from the Public Housing in Auckland Region factsheet. Detailed monthly and quarterly information can be found on the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development’s website. [https://www.hud.govt.nz/community-and-public-housing/follow-up-progress/]
15. Notes on data and analysis

Dwellings consented and dwellings consented by type
Monthly building consent information is sourced from Statistics New Zealand’s InfoShare online portal, which includes counts of number of new dwellings consented, by type of dwelling.

Dwellings consented by Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries
Monthly data for individual building consents is supplied by Statistics New Zealand and mapped to properties by RIMU. This data is then analysed against its location relevant to the Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries, namely the 2010 Metropolitan Urban Limit (MUL) and the Rural Urban Boundary (RUB).

Dwellings with CCCs issued (completions)
Monthly building consent completions data is supplied by Auckland Council Building Control. The data shows the total number of dwelling units which have had Code Compliance Certificate (CCC) issued in that month. This gives an estimation of the number of dwellings being "completed", or "released to the market".

Residential parcels created and residential parcels created inside the 2010 Metropolitan Urban Limit and the Rural Urban Boundary
Parcel data is sourced from Land Information New Zealand (LINZ). A new dataset is downloaded from the LINZ Data Service by RIMU monthly. A list of parcels created in the previous month is also downloaded; this is used to extract new parcels created in the previous month. The new parcels created data is then analysed for size, the Auckland Unitary Plan (decisions version) zone it falls in and its location relevant to the 2010 MUL and the RUB.

Permanent and long-term migration
Migration data is sourced from Statistics New Zealand’s InfoShare online portal; arrivals, departures and net change are estimated for Auckland.

Median residential sales price
The Real Estate Institute of New Zealand (REINZ) produces monthly statistics on the median house price sales for Auckland from data provided to it by its members. This data is available on the REINZ website.
Public housing supply


Public Housing Register

The Public Housing Register is comprised of a Housing Register and a Transfer Register. The Housing Register is prioritised by need and consists of public housing applicants who have been assessed as being eligible. The Transfer Register is made up of people already in public housing, but who have requested and are eligible for a transfer to another property. (definition extracted from Ministry of Housing and Urban Development 2019, Public Housing in Auckland factsheet September 2019, page 3. https://www.hud.govt.nz/assets/Community-and-Public-Housing/Follow-our-progress/September-2019/Housing-regional-factsheets-September-2019/67824a28bb/Housing-regional-Factsheets-September-2019-Auckland.pdf)
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1. Summary

Produced by the Auckland Council Research and Evaluation Unit (RIMU), the Auckland Monthly Housing Update brings together a number of significant Auckland housing related statistics.

The report includes:

- dwellings – consented, by type, and with CCCs issued
- residential parcels – created, and inside Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries – 2010 Metropolitan Urban Limit (MUL) and Rural Urban Boundary (RUB)
- permanent and long-term migration
- median residential sales price
- residential property buyer classification
- public housing supply and demand in Auckland.
2. Highlights

- 1,232 dwellings were consented in February 2020.
- In the year ending February 2020, 14,854 dwellings were consented in the region.
- 50 per cent of new dwellings consented in February 2020 were houses, 7 per cent were apartments and 43 per cent were townhouses, flats, units, retirement village units, or other types of attached dwellings.
- 120 dwellings were consented on Housing New Zealand or Tāmaki Regeneration Company owned land in February 2020.
- 1,158 dwellings consented in February 2020 were inside the RUB. Over the past 12 months, 94 per cent of new dwellings consented were inside the RUB.
- 23 per cent of dwellings consented were inside the 1,500m walking catchments of the rapid transport network in February 2020.
- 1,000 dwellings were ‘completed’ by having a Code Compliance Certificate (CCC) issued in February 2020.
- In the year ending February 2020, 13,862 dwellings had a CCC issued.
- 496 new residential parcels under 5,000m² were created in March 2020.
- In the past 12 months, 7,685 new residential parcels under 5,000m² were created – an average of 640 each month.
- In March 2020, 502 new residential parcels of all sizes were created inside the RUB.
- Long-term arrivals in February 2020 were 4,996.
- 25 per cent of residential properties sold in Auckland were purchased by first home owners in February 2020.
- 1,023 public housing applications have been housed in the December quarter 2019.
3. Dwellings consented

In February 2020, 1232 dwelling consents were issued, which saw 14,854 consents issued for the past 12 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1,232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Statistics New Zealand
4. Dwellings consented by type

Of all the dwellings consented in February 2020, 619 were houses, 82 were apartments, and 531 were townhouses, flats, units, retirement village units or other types of attached dwellings.

[Bar chart showing dwellings consented by type for each month from Feb-19 to Feb-20, with categories for houses, apartments, townhouses, flats, units, retirement village units.]

Data source: Statistics New Zealand
5. Dwellings consented on Housing New Zealand or Tāmaki Regeneration Company owned land

In February 2020, 120 dwellings (10 per cent of total dwellings consented) were consented on Housing New Zealand (HNZ) or Tāmaki Regeneration Company (TRC) owned land. These included 62 apartment units, 30 houses and 28 townhouses, flats, and other attached dwelling types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Feb 1</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of HNZ/TRC dwellings</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total dwellings</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dwellings consented by type**

Data sources: Statistics New Zealand and Auckland Council
6. Dwellings consented by Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries

In February 2020, 954 dwellings consented were inside 2010 MUL and a total of 1158 dwellings consented were inside the RUB. Over the past 12 months, 94 per cent of the dwellings were consented inside the RUB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
<th>Dec 19/Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside 2010 MUL</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2010 MUL and RUB</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside RUB</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Statistics New Zealand
7. Dwellings consented along the rapid transport network

In Error! Reference source not found., 281 dwellings (23 per cent of total dwellings consented) were consented inside the rapid transport network’s (RTN) 1500m walking catchments. In the last 12 months, 4,131 dwellings were consented inside the 1500m RTN walking catchments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings consented inside the 1500m RTN walking catchments</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total dwellings consented</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-month rolling total inside RTN walking catchments</td>
<td>3,843</td>
<td>4,151</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>4,177</td>
<td>4,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion from the last 12-month inside RTN walking catchments</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dwellings consented inside 1500m RTN walking catchments

Data sources: Statistics New Zealand and Auckland Council
Spatial distribution of dwelling consents

Data sources: Statistics New Zealand and Auckland Council
8. Dwellings with CCCs issued (completions)

1,000 dwelling units had received CCCs in February 2020. 95 per cent of the CCCs were issued to dwelling units that had building consents granted within the past two years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCCs issued</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Auckland Council
9. Residential parcels created

In March 2020, the total number of residential parcels under 5000m² created was 496.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel size category</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1000 m²</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 m² to 1999 m²</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 m² to 2999 m²</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 m² to 3999 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 m² to 4999 m²</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of residential parcels &lt; 5000m²</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: RIMU and Land Information New Zealand
10. Residential parcels by Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries

407 of new residential parcels of all sizes created in March 2020 were inside 2010 MUL and a total of 502 new residential parcels were inside the RUB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside 2010 MUL</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2010 MUL and RUB</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside RUB</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing residential parcels created by Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries]
11. Permanent and long-term migration

Long-term arrival number in February 2020 was 4996. Net migration to Auckland data was not available because the requirement for passengers to complete departure cards stopped in November 2018. A new methodology was developed by Statistics New Zealand, however, no regional output was released at the time this monitoring report was produced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrivals</td>
<td>4,719</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>5,059</td>
<td>4,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departures</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Permanent and long-term migration in Auckland (last five years)](image)

Data source: Statistics New Zealand
12. Median residential sales price

The median residential sales price from REINZ in February 2020 was $885,000. The District Valuation Roll (DVR) median sales price in January 2020 was $820,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REINZ</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$885,000</td>
<td>$890,000</td>
<td>$872,000</td>
<td>$885,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVR sales(^1)</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$885,000</td>
<td>$885,000</td>
<td>$820,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Real Estate Institute of New Zealand and Auckland Council

---

\(^1\) Back data has been updated to reflect the latest sales records captured in council's District Valuation Roll database. Although conveyancers are required to inform council within 30 days after transactions have occurred, the monitoring team has identified the reporting process has not been thoroughly implemented. It should be noted that there is no penalty if a conveyancer fails to report to council within the 30-day period. As a result, the reporting lag varies from as short as one working day to as long as six months.
13. Residential property buyer classification

In February 2020, 26 per cent of residential properties sold in Auckland were purchased by first homeowners, 21 per cent were purchased by movers and 42 per cent were purchased by multi-property owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buyer classification</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First home buyer</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mover</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-property owner</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New to market</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-entry</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: CoreLogic NZ
14. Public housing in Auckland

This section provides an overview of public housing demand and supply in Auckland region. These data are collected and distributed by the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development on a quarterly basis. In the December quarter 2019, 1023 public housing applications have been housed with Housing New Zealand or with a Community Housing Provider.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>December quarter 2018</th>
<th>March quarter 2019</th>
<th>June quarter 2019</th>
<th>September quarter 2019</th>
<th>December quarter 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public housing stock</td>
<td>31,341</td>
<td>31,452</td>
<td>32,184</td>
<td>32,326</td>
<td>32,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public housing register - housing register (top row) and transfer register (bottom row)</td>
<td>4,363</td>
<td>4,409</td>
<td>4,846</td>
<td>5,257</td>
<td>5,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>1,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public housing register – applications housed</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1,023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Ministry of Housing and Urban Development

---

2 Public housing data are extracted from the Public Housing in Auckland Region factsheets. Detailed monthly and quarterly information can be found on the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development’s website.

15. Notes on data and analysis

Dwellings consented and dwellings consented by type
Monthly building consent information is sourced from Statistics New Zealand’s InfoShare online portal, which includes counts of number of new dwellings consented, by type of dwelling.

Dwellings consented by Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries
Monthly data for individual building consents is supplied by Statistics New Zealand and mapped to properties by RIMU. This data is then analysed against its location relevant to the Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries, namely the 2010 Metropolitan Urban Limit (MUL) and the Rural Urban Boundary (RUB).

Dwellings with CCCs issued (completions)
Monthly building consent completions data is supplied by Auckland Council Building Control. The data shows the total number of dwelling units which have had Code Compliance Certificate (CCC) issued in that month. This gives an estimation of the number of dwellings being “completed”, or “released to the market”.

Residential parcels created and residential parcels created inside the 2010 Metropolitan Urban Limit and the Rural Urban Boundary
Parcel data is sourced from Land Information New Zealand (LINZ). A new dataset is downloaded from the LINZ Data Service by RIMU monthly. A list of parcels created in the previous month is also downloaded; this is used to extract new parcels created in the previous month. The new parcels created data is then analysed for size, the Auckland Unitary Plan (decisions version) zone it falls in and its location relevant to the 2010 MUL and the RUB.

Permanent and long-term migration
Migration data is sourced from Statistics New Zealand’s InfoShare online portal; arrivals, departures and net change are estimated for Auckland.

Median residential sales price
The Real Estate Institute of New Zealand (REINZ) produces monthly statistics on the median house price sales for Auckland from data provided to it by its members. This data is available on the REINZ website.
Public housing supply


Public Housing Register

The Public Housing Register is comprised of a Housing Register and a Transfer Register. The Housing Register is prioritised by need and consists of public housing applicants who have been assessed as being eligible. The Transfer Register is made up of people already in public housing, but who have requested and are eligible for a transfer to another property. (definition extracted from Ministry of Housing and Urban Development 2019, Public Housing in Auckland factsheet September 2019, page 3. https://www.hud.gov.nz/assets/Community-and-Public-Housing/Follow-our-progress/September-2019/Housing-regional-factsheets-September-2019/67824a28bb/Housing-regional-Factsheets-September-2019-Auckland.pdf)
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1. Summary

Produced by the Auckland Council Research and Evaluation Unit (RIMU), the Auckland Monthly Housing Update brings together a number of significant Auckland housing related statistics.

The report includes:

- dwellings – consented, by type, and with CCCs issued
- residential parcels – created, and inside Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries – 2010 Metropolitan Urban Limit (MUL) and Rural Urban Boundary (RUB)
- permanent and long-term migration
- median residential sales price
- residential property buyer classification
- public housing supply and demand in Auckland.
2. Highlights

- 1,187 dwellings were consented in March 2020.
- In the year ending March 2020, 14,932 dwellings were consented in the region.
- 41 per cent of new dwellings consented in March 2020 were houses, 16 per cent were apartments and 44 per cent were townhouses, flats, units, retirement village units, or other types of attached dwellings.
- 58 dwellings were consented on Kāinga Ora or Tāmaki Regeneration Company owned land in March 2020.
- 1,117 dwellings consented in March 2020 were inside the RUB. Over the past 12 months, 94 per cent of new dwellings consented were inside the RUB.
- 26 per cent of dwellings consented were inside the 1,500m walking catchments of the rapid transport network in March 2020.
- 1,344 dwellings were ‘completed’ by having a Code Compliance Certificate (CCC) issued in March 2020.
- In the year ending March 2020, 14,528 dwellings had a CCC issued.
- 292 new residential parcels under 5,000m² were created in April 2020.
- In the past 12 months, 7,521 new residential parcels under 5,000m² were created – an average of 627 each month.
- In April 2020, 291 new residential parcels of all sizes were created inside the RUB.
- Long-term arrivals in February 2020 were 4,996.
- 24 per cent of residential properties sold in Auckland were purchased by first home owners in March 2020.
- 1,023 public housing applications have been housed in the December quarter 2019.
3. Dwellings consented

In March 2020, 1,187 dwelling consents were issued, which saw 14,932 consents issued for the past 12 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consents</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>1,187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Statistics New Zealand
4. Dwellings consented by type

Of all the dwellings consented in March 2020, 481 were houses, 187 were apartments, and 519 were townhouses, flats, units, retirement village units or other types of attached dwellings.

---

Data source: Statistics New Zealand
5. Dwellings consented on Kāinga Ora or Tāmaki Regeneration Company owned land

In March 2020, 58 dwellings (five per cent of total dwellings consented) were consented on Kāinga Ora (KO) or Tāmaki Regeneration Company (TRC) owned land. These included 39 apartment units, 12 houses and 7 townhouses, flats, and other attached dwelling types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of KO/TRC dwellings consented</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total dwellings consented</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dwellings consented by type

Data sources: Statistics New Zealand and Auckland Council
6. Dwellings consented by Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries

In March 2020, 975 dwellings consented were inside 2010 MUL and a total of 1117 dwellings consented were inside the RUB. Over the past 12 months, 94 per cent of the dwellings were consented inside the RUB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside 2010 MUL</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2010 MUL and RUB</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside RUB</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dwellings consented by Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries

Data source: Statistics New Zealand
7. Dwellings consented along the rapid transport network

In March 2020, 303 dwellings (28 per cent of total dwellings consented) were consented inside the rapid transport network’s (RTN) 1500m walking catchments. In the last 12 months, 4,208 dwellings were consented inside the 1500m RTN walking catchments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings consented inside the 1500m RTN walking catchments</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total dwellings consented</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-month rolling total inside RTN walking catchments</td>
<td>3,796</td>
<td>4,244</td>
<td>4,177</td>
<td>4,131</td>
<td>4,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion from the last 12-month inside RTN walking catchments</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dwellings consented inside 1500m RTN walking catchments

Data sources: Statistics New Zealand and Auckland Council
Spatial distribution of dwelling consents

The map shows the distribution of dwelling consents across Auckland Council. The map includes symbols for dwelling consents, rail stations, and various urban boundaries. The pedestrian catchment of RTN stops is indicated by different colors, with areas categorized as 0-500m, 500-1000m, and 1000-1500m.

Data sources: Statistics New Zealand and Auckland Council
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8. Dwellings with CCCs issued (completions)

1,344 dwelling units had received CCCs in March 2020. 81 per cent of the CCCs were issued to dwelling units that had building consents granted within the past two years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCCs issued</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>1092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Auckland Council
9. Residential parcels created

In April 2020, the total number of residential parcels under 5000m² created was 292.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel size category</th>
<th>Apr 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>Apr 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1000 m²</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 m² to 1999 m²</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 m² to 2999 m²</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 m² to 3999 m²</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 m² to 4999 m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of residential parcels &lt; 5000m²</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: RMU and Land Information New Zealand
10. Residential parcels by Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries

264 of new residential parcels of all sizes created in April 2020 were inside 2010 MUL and a total of 291 new residential parcels were inside the RUB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Apr 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>Apr 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside 2010 MUL</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2010 MUL and RUB</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside RUB</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Residential parcels created by Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries](image-url)
11. Permanent and long-term migration

Long-term arrival number in February 2020 was 4996. Net migration to Auckland data was not available because the requirement for passengers to complete departure cards stopped in November 2018. A new methodology was developed by Statistics New Zealand, however, no regional output was released at the time this monitoring report was produced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Feb 19</th>
<th>Nov 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrivals</td>
<td>4,719</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>5,059</td>
<td>4,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departures</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permanent and long-term migration in Auckland (last five years)

Data source: Statistics New Zealand
12. Median residential sales price

The median residential sales price from REINZ in March 2020 was $950,000. The District Valuation Roll (DVR) median sales price in February 2020 was $870,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REINZ</td>
<td>$856,000</td>
<td>$890,000</td>
<td>$872,000</td>
<td>$885,000</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVR sales¹</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$865,000</td>
<td>$820,000</td>
<td>$870,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Median residential sale price chart]

Data source: Real Estate Institute of New Zealand and Auckland Council

¹ Back data has been updated to reflect the latest sales records captured in council’s District Valuation Roll database. Although conveyancers are required to inform council within 30 days after transactions have occurred, the monitoring team has identified the reporting process has not been thoroughly implemented. It should be noted that there is no penalty if a conveyancer fails to report to council within the 30-day period. As a result, the reporting lag varies from as short as one working day to as long as six months.
13. Residential property buyer classification

In March 2020, 24 per cent of residential properties sold in Auckland were purchased by first homeowners, 22 per cent were purchased by movers and 41 per cent were purchased by multi-property owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buyer classification</th>
<th>Mar 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First home buyer</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mover</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-property owner</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New to market</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-entry</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: CoreLogic NZ
14. Public housing in Auckland^2

This section provides an overview of public housing demand and supply in Auckland region. These data are collected and distributed by the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development on a quarterly basis. In the December quarter 2019, 1023 public housing applications have been housed with Kāinga Ora or with a Community Housing Provider.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>December quarter 2018</th>
<th>March quarter 2019</th>
<th>June quarter 2019</th>
<th>September quarter 2019</th>
<th>December quarter 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public housing stock</td>
<td>31,341</td>
<td>31,452</td>
<td>32,184</td>
<td>32,326</td>
<td>32,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public housing register - housing register (top row) and transfer register (bottom row)</td>
<td>4,363</td>
<td>4,409</td>
<td>4,846</td>
<td>5,257</td>
<td>5,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>1,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public housing register – applications housed</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1,023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Ministry of Housing and Urban Development

15. Notes on data and analysis

Dwellings consented and dwellings consented by type
Monthly building consent information is sourced from Statistics New Zealand's InfoShare online portal, which includes counts of number of new dwellings consented, by type of dwelling.

Dwellings consented by Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries
Monthly data for individual building consents is supplied by Statistics New Zealand and mapped to properties by RIMU. This data is then analysed against its location relevant to the Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries, namely the 2010 Metropolitan Urban Limit (MUL) and the Rural Urban Boundary (RUB).

Dwellings with CCCs issued (completions)
Monthly building consent completions data is supplied by Auckland Council Building Control. The data shows the total number of dwelling units which have had Code Compliance Certificate (CCC) issued in that month. This gives an estimation of the number of dwellings being "completed", or "released to the market".

Residential parcels created and residential parcels created inside the 2010 Metropolitan Urban Limit and the Rural Urban Boundary
Parcel data is sourced from Land Information New Zealand (LINZ). A new dataset is downloaded from the LINZ Data Service by RIMU monthly. A list of parcels created in the previous month is also downloaded; this is used to extract new parcels created in the previous month. The new parcels created data is then analysed for size, the Auckland Unitary Plan (decisions version) zone it falls in and its location relevant to the 2010 MUL and the RUB.

Permanent and long-term migration
Migration data is sourced from Statistics New Zealand's InfoShare online portal; arrivals, departures and net change are estimated for Auckland.

Median residential sales price
The Real Estate Institute of New Zealand (REINZ) produces monthly statistics on the median house price sales for Auckland from data provided to it by its members. This data is available on the REINZ website.
Public housing supply

Public houses are properties owned or leased by Kāinga Ora and registered Community Housing Providers (CHPs) that can be tenanted by people who are eligible for public housing. (definition extracted from Ministry of Housing and Urban Development 2019, Public Housing in Auckland Region factsheet September 2019, page 1.

Public Housing Register

The Public Housing Register is comprised of a Housing Register and a Transfer Register. The Housing Register is prioritised by need and consists of public housing applicants who have been assessed as being eligible. The Transfer Register is made up of people already in public housing, but who have requested and are eligible for a transfer to another property. (definition extracted from Ministry of Housing and Urban Development 2019, Public Housing in Auckland factsheet September 2019, page 3.
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Auckland Council’s submission on the Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill

1. Auckland Council welcomes the opportunity to make a submission on the Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill.

2. This submission has been approved by the council’s Planning Committee. The address for service is Auckland Council, Private Bag 92300, Victoria Street West, Auckland 1142.

3. Please direct any enquiries to Matthew Walker, Group Chief Financial Officer, at matthew.walker@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz and/or on 021-229-4084.
Introduction

1. This submission sets out the council’s support for the Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill. This submission focuses on some administrative and implementation matters which may require clarification or further consideration.

2. The council’s response to these matters are set out in this submission, and commentary on specific clauses is outlined in Attachment A: Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill clauses. The council has also sought the views of its local boards. Feedback was received from three local boards. Their views are included in full in Attachment B: Local board views.

Executive summary

Overall conclusions

3. The council supports the Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill (IFF) which provides new tools to fund and finance infrastructure. We consider that the legislation will support the provision of infrastructure to accelerate housing and urban development.

4. The Auckland region needs to accelerate investment in infrastructure to address the city’s housing issues and to meet the goals of major public and private developers. There have been decades of under-investment in infrastructure in the Auckland region. While the council has committed to a record $26 billion capital investment programme, further infrastructure investment is required for this land to be developed at the pace required. Although record numbers of new dwellings are being consented in Auckland, our region still faces a significant housing shortfall. Significant investment in infrastructure to support more housing and is needed to keep pace with development and prepare our region for future population growth.

5. Auckland Council has adopted a debt ceiling as a prudent and sustainable approach to borrowing. The council’s investment plans over the period of the 10-Year Budget 2018-2028 take us very close to our ceiling. Our lack of debt headroom constrains our ability to provide the infrastructure needed to meet Auckland’s growth challenges. Borrowing beyond our debt ceiling – which the council is very close to – would risk a downgrade to the council’s credit rating, meaning higher interest costs across all our borrowing over time and would impact on our access to debt markets. Limits on the council’s ability to borrow mean that additional investments require new or alternative financing mechanisms allowing third parties to provide the capital for investment in public infrastructure.

6. Auckland Council sees the IFF Bill as a key tool to progress housing and urban development by supporting the acceleration of investment in infrastructure. Applying this tool to developments within the existing growth planning framework will deliver thriving connected communities and avoid negative outcomes such as increased congestion and environmental degradation.

7. The Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) provides the capacity for over one million dwellings on residential zoned land, and significant additional capacity for dwellings on business zoned land. Over 15,000 hectares of rural land has also been zoned for future urban development in the AUP. The Auckland Plan sets out the timing and location for future urban development based on our plans for infrastructure and achieving the city’s goals for a balance between brownfields and greenfields. The council encourages the government to promote the use of this tool to support development in alignment with the council’s plans to ensure the best community and urban development outcomes.

8. The council is pleased that it is intended that its endorsement is required for the technical specification of the assets, including the impact on the wider network, and its ability to meet the ongoing operating costs once the assets are vested. However, the council notes the current drafting requires amendment to clarify that these endorsements are compulsory prior to the approval of a levy. The council also agrees with the provisions for it to be compensated for the costs of collecting the levy.

9. The council supports the provision in the bill that safeguard the interests of levy payers including the:
   - cap on the total amount of money to be recovered by the levy
• requirement for the minister in approving the levy to consider factors which are consistent with clause 101(3) of the Local Government Act. These factors include who will benefit from the infrastructure to be funded and the affordability of the levy to those who will pay it.
• appointment of a monitor to oversee the ongoing application of the levy.

10. We consider that the bill as drafted will largely deliver the results the government and council are seeking. Our submission identifies several areas where changes would improve the prospects of these results being achieved. For local and central government to have confidence that the new financing and funding regime will operate smoothly, staff recommend that some technical issues should be addressed. These issues include:

• clarification that land purchase is included in construction costs and identifying how construction cost risks will be managed between lenders, the Crown, the territorial authorities and landowners;
• technical matters regarding implementation of the intent of the endorsements and provision for a dispute resolution process in the event a vesting agreement cannot be agreed;
• technical matters to ensure the alignment of the administration of rates and levies and reconciliation of the overlap of development contributions and levies;
• consider making provision for a broader range of options for setting charges on land to better suit the capital repayment role of the levy and inclusion of the levy in the Rates Rebates Act 1973;
• allowing for the bundling of financing for smaller projects and initiatives (such as connecting households currently on rainwater tanks to the reticulated water supply network).

11. Where the council is the proposer it will be required to undertake appropriate consultation under the Local Government Act. The council encourages the government to promote the value of fostering local elected member leadership and community engagement to support decision making where a third party proposes a levy.

Background

Special purpose vehicles model

12. The council supports the use of the Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) model to allow capital to be:
• raised for investment in infrastructure beyond the council’s capacity;
• provided by third parties;
• repaid by a levy secured over land, like rates.

13. Access to capital to invest in the infrastructure required to support growth is the key challenge facing the council. The SPV model is an effective means to address the constraints on our ability to raise additional capital. The council is pleased that developments supported by an SPV model will be subject to the provisions of the Auckland Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan and require regulatory approval through the standard resource and building consent processes.

14. The council supports the flexible approach the legislation provides for the establishment of an SPV and the levy. Each SPV will have flexibility to tailor the levy to the individual characteristics of specific development areas.

15. SPVs can finance the infrastructure required to allow development to proceed and the infrastructure required to build communities such as parks and community centres. This is consistent with the wellbeing approach in the Local Government Act (2002) as well as the (reinstated) remit of development contributions.

16. The Independent Māori Statutory Board (IMSB) is pleased that the minister can only consider the inclusion of protected Māori land within the levy area if the owners have given their consent. The IMSB suggests that there be alignment of the treatment of rating units used by the territorial authority and the levy setting by an SPV. They also recommend that the apportionment of protected Māori land should be treated similarly for both rates and an SPV levy.
17. The council has reviewed the funding arrangements proposed in this bill alongside those in the complementary Urban Development (UD) Bill, on which we made a submission on 14 February 2020. That submission included support for the funding and financing provisions that are similar to the provisions in the IFF Bill.

18. In the short term, it is very likely the focus of IFF proposals will be in greenfield areas where growth planning and consenting issues are already well progressed. The bill may have enough flexibility to enable it to apply to brownfields in the future. Establishing a levy scheme will improve transparency around the costs of growth-related infrastructure in brownfields. In these areas, a levy proposal could provide capital to address infrastructure capacity constraints for the greater development area. This could encourage further redevelopment in the surrounding area where costs for infrastructure could be shared.

Commentary

Infrastructure (definitions, risks and vesting)

Eligible costs

19. It would be helpful to be explicit that land acquisition costs are eligible costs. Land acquisitions are a major element of the cost of infrastructure, e.g. roads and stormwater management, but aren’t specifically included in the definition of construction costs. Our estimates indicate that land acquisitions make up approximately 40 per cent of infrastructure costs. It would be valuable to clarify that these are included as many projects would be unable to proceed without a way to finance and fund the land acquisition costs.

Eligible infrastructure

20. The bill refers to the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) to define eligible community facilities and community infrastructure. While this will include the acquisition of open space land administered under the LGA, the acquisition of reserves under the Reserves Act 1977 should also be included in the bill.

21. Consideration should also be given to including waste and resource recovery infrastructure such as community recycling centres within the definition of eligible infrastructure. Community recycling centres that operate as hubs across Auckland, as adopted in the Auckland Waste Minimisation Plan 2018, are an example of waste infrastructure. These kinds of hubs will be increasingly important to achieve the changes recently signalled by proposed amendments to the Waste Minimisation Act (increased waste levy and priority product designation), and to contribute to reaching the emissions reductions targets of the Zero Carbon Act 2019.

22. The council welcomes the inclusion of environmental resilience infrastructure in the bill as it recognises that natural environments can play a role as infrastructure needed to service development. The council’s Auckland’s Climate Action Framework and the environmental outcomes in the Auckland Plan 2050 outlines the use of environmental infrastructure to manage natural hazard risk.

23. The council suggests that the definition of environmental resilience infrastructure in the bill is broadened to include protection, restoration and enhancement. This will enable infrastructure that provides environmental improvements rather than only avoiding harm.

Risk

24. All infrastructure projects, and their associated funding, involve a certain measure of risk. The bill prohibits the provision of any guarantee or financial support of the SPV by the responsible levy authority (the council) but allows this to be provided by the Crown. Further documentation associated with this bill, such as cabinet papers and minutes, and information sheets published by the government is clear that residual risks associated with infrastructure projects funded by the levy sit with the Crown via a Government Support Package that will be provided on a case-by-case basis. They recognise without it the model would not work. The draft submission suggests that for clarity the legislation could make some reference to the role of the Government Support Package without committing the Crown to underwriting all SPV risks in every case.
25. The bill limits the ability of creditors to make claims on assets once assets have vested. The council considers that this protection should be extended to also cover the period when assets are under construction.

**Vesting**

26. The bill does not provide for a dispute resolution process should the SPV and the council be unable to agree on the terms of the vesting agreement. We note that the monitor may step in where an SPV and the territorial authority cannot agree on all the necessary terms of the levy administration agreement and recommend that this also be provided for in the vesting agreement. In addition, we suggest that the bill clearly states that vesting should be at no cost to the responsible infrastructure authority.

**Technical billing issues**

27. Collection of rates is essential to our ability to deliver services to Aucklanders. For the 2020/2021 year, we plan to collect rates of $1.9 billion which will make up 45% of our revenue. We set and collect the rates for 570,000 properties each year and invoice owners quarterly. To ensure this process runs smoothly and accurately we undertake several end-to-end production tests beginning in February each year. Rates assessments and the first instalment invoices are generated early July for delivery in early August.

28. The council has successfully added the charges for liable properties in the Milidale development to rates invoices with a manual process. These charges are set once for each property and change by a fixed amount annually.

29. If the IFF model is as successful as we hope, the number of properties involved will be much greater than Milidale. Additionally, each year there is the potential for levy changes. Supporting the inclusion of IFF levies on rates invoices will likely involve significant process changes within our billing team and likely system changes.

30. There are several legal, administrative and policy parameter considerations in the production of rates assessments and invoices each year. It is not possible at this time to determine exactly how the addition of a levy which is reset annually will work in practice. It is possible that unforeseen issues may arise with implementation of levy collection that weren’t contemplated when the bill was drafted. It would be desirable for there to be limited provision in the legislation for waivers from relevant legislation to be granted by Order in Council. The waiver should be available for transitional period of five years as it may take some time for the first levy to be set. The Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2000 made provision for the use of Orders in Council in such circumstances. The reason this provision was included was to allow issues to be addressed quickly which may not otherwise be possible given the other demands on the legislative timetable. This mechanism was used to adjust the rates transition mechanism so that it would function as intended.

31. The bill is not clear on the order of payment and that general rates will take priority over an SPV levy, if rates notices are not paid in full. This could be included in the levy agreement, but we suggest that this should be made explicit in the legislation. Other recommendations for changes to the rates provisions are identified in Attachment A: Infrastructure Funding and Finance Bill clauses.

**Refinements to rating legislation**

32. The rating mechanisms in the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 provide a fit for purpose funding tool for council operating costs. The funding tools in the IFF Bill (and UD Bill) are primarily designed to repay capital investments. Once the assets transfer to council ownership the ongoing operating and eventual replacement costs will transfer to council and be funded from general rates.

33. Auckland Council currently uses targeted rates to fund repayment of one-off capital investment in identified geographical areas. The benefits of these investments, and the ratepayers who benefit from them, are well defined. For our business improvement districts and the City Centre Targeted Rate there are established governance arrangements that provide ratepayer representation on the investment programmes. Benefits
will not be so well defined for some of the investments envisioned under the UD and IFF Bills. Additionally, some landowners are likely to be unwilling participants.

34. The key challenge an SPV will face when setting a levy will be to strike a balance between generating a reliable revenue stream to repay capital costs and setting a politically acceptable stream of compulsory charges on land.

35. The council suggests that the SPV levy should be included in the scope of the Rates Rebate Scheme. The purpose of the Rates Rebate Scheme is to provide additional financial assistance to ratepayers on lower incomes. The application of an SPV levy will increase the financial burden on these ratepayers. Without adding it to the Rates Rebate Scheme, the impacted ratepayers would be under additional financial burden.

36. Current legislation allows targeted rates that reflect size and development potential (as it relates to zoning) to be set. However, additional rating methods would allow an SPV greater flexibility to better align benefits received from infrastructure investment and to manage the incidence of rates used to recover those costs.

37. Under the UD and IFF bills, targeted rates will be funding infrastructure that supports development of land that has widely varying
   - development potential
   - development cost
   - size

38. Land title structure and ownership changes over time as it is developed and subdivided. As land is subdivided into smaller blocks as development proceeds, a proportion of the land area ends up as non-rateable roads and parks. The value of these improvements is added to the sub-divided land.

39. In any one defined geographic area the land will have different types of owners (e.g. owner occupiers, landlords, the Crown, land bankers and developers) and they will have widely divergent interests, objectives, levels of equity and cashflows.

40. To help manage the challenges that will be faced by an SPV, the legislation should provide the broadest flexibility to set levies so that the fairest outcomes can be achieved. We suggest that additional mechanisms are required to:
   - allow the charge to be set up front so that levy payers have certainty regarding their liability through time, without the need for annual adjustments
   - provide additional rating methods that reflect feasible development capacity, so that ratepayers aren’t charged for benefits which are not financially viable
   - defer the incidence of liability for owner/occupiers to a point when land is developed or changes ownership.

Implementation issues

Endorsement

41. The bill provides that a recommendation must not be made to the minister unless all requested endorsements have been received (clause 25). The council supports the intention of the bill to require the council’s endorsement. However, the council notes that this only applies where an endorsement is requested. The bill also does not require the council’s response to be affirmative for a proposal to be recommended to the minister. The legislation should require a positive endorsement from the responsible levy authority before a recommendation can be made to the minister.

42. In Auckland transport assets are owned by Auckland Council and managed by Auckland Transport. Under the bill Auckland Council will be the responsible infrastructure authority because the assets will be vested in. The council suggests that the government considers providing for Auckland Transport to be the responsible infrastructure authority.
Protected Māori land

43. The Independent Māori Statutory Board (IMS) welcomes the requirement that the owners of protected Māori land must give their consent before the minister can consider including the land in the levy area.

44. To avoid inconsistent rating treatment of Māori land between an SPV and the relevant council, the IMS suggests that the bill should require alignment in the rating treatment of protected Māori land. In Auckland, this would imply that calculation of liability for the levy on protected Māori land should be apportioned between customary or community use and development land in the same way it is apportioned by Auckland Council.

Disclosure

45. It is important that prospective land buyers in an SPV area are aware of a levy so that they are sufficiently informed prior to making a decision to purchase. The bill makes provision for this by requiring the levy information to be published by the monitor and the territorial authority to include it on the Land Information Memorandum.

46. The council notes that further protections for land buyers are present at Crown Infrastructure Partners involvement at Milldale where sellers are required to disclose this information to prospective buyers and information is registered on the land title. The council recommends that consideration of these additional measures be given to strengthen transparency of the SPV levy to prospective land buyers.

Potential application to a broader range of issues

47. The IFF model as proposed in the bill envisages investment in a significant stand-alone project to support development in a defined area. The investment is repaid from levy revenue collected from that area. Establishment costs for this type of scheme means it is not economic to consider stand-alone projects below around $50 million.

48. Security for the investment is a charge over property and therefore largely uniform in terms of credit quality across different areas. An alternative approach would be to bundle the financing together into a single national-level entity. This would not change how the construction SPV part of the model would work. However, it could make the financing more economically efficient by allowing many smaller projects in different areas to be bundled together.

49. It may be difficult to use the IFF model for brownfield areas, where the desired approach might be to target new developments as they occur without impacting existing residents. A bundled approach to financing may be better able to deal with variation in the timing of levy receipts by spreading this variation out across many projects and areas.

50. In Milldale new property buyers have the option to pay off the infrastructure charge as a lump sum. However, this may not be desirable for all levy proposals as it doesn’t provide the predictable stream of cashflows which make these arrangements attractive to financiers. A bundled approach to financing may make lump sum payments (either partial or full) more feasible as they would partially offset postponements and payments triggered on development.

51. In addition, Auckland Council presently has a range of voluntary targeted rates, which allow individual ratepayers to spread the cost of connecting to council networks or making energy efficiency upgrades to their homes over time. A current area of focus is the opportunity to provide financial support to ratepayers who want to connect to the reticulated water supply network, as climate change begins to impact households which are currently reliant on rainwater tanks. A national-level financing approach aligned to the IFF model may be an efficient way to support these ratepayers.

52. Auckland Council staff have begun work with staff at other ‘high-growth’ councils and the Local Government Funding Agency, to investigate these kinds of opportunities and determine how they might complement or build on the IFF model. The council recommends that the government supports further investigation of these opportunities and makes any adjustments necessary to enable the legislation to support a broader range of applications.
53. Cameron Partners, who have been advising the high-growth councils, will make a more detailed submission on these opportunities.

Community engagement and elected member leadership

54. Where the council makes a decision to propose the establishment of a levy, it will be required to consult with affected landowners or take into account their views if already known. However, third parties may also propose a levy and the bill does not provide a statutory requirement for consultation with affected landowners. Instead, these matters appear to be part of the factors that the responsible minister would be required to consider.

55. Territorial authorities are required to consult on all changes to their rating policies. They undertake extensive consultation with ratepayers when changes to rating policy are proposed and in particular, for rates that will apply in defined geographic areas.

56. Local government elected representatives, both councillors and local board members, have close ties to the community and an understanding of local issues and regional growth challenges. The involvement and support of local elected members in decision making processes is likely to facilitate the effective implementation of new funding models. The most recent geographically defined targeted rate adopted by Auckland Council (Rodney Local Board Transport Targeted Rate) was successfully championed by local board members.

57. While flexibility in the approach to consultation and engagement may be desirable, where a third party proposes a levy, the council encourages the government to promote the value of fostering local elected member leadership and require community engagement to support effective decision making.
## Attachment A: Infrastructure Funding and Finance Bill clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Responsible infrastructure authority</td>
<td>Should provide for Auckland Transport to be a responsible infrastructure authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eligible infrastructure</td>
<td>Consideration should also be given to including waste and resource recovery infrastructure such as community recycling centres within the definition of eligible infrastructure. The acquisitions of reserves under the Reserves Act 1977 should also be included in the bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (3) (b)</td>
<td>Environmental resilience infrastructure.</td>
<td>The current wording in the bill could limit the infrastructure to reversal of damage to already degraded environments, with improvements made to the minimum acceptable condition.  We suggest that definition of environmental resilience infrastructure is broadened to include <em>environmental protection, restoration and enhancement</em>. The suggested amendment would more fully recognise opportunities to create and maintain healthy natural environments, and to use growth to deliver environmental improvements rather than just avoiding harm. This reflects the strategic direction of the Auckland Plan 2050 and the wording of the Resource Management Act 1991.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Eligible costs</td>
<td>It would be helpful to be explicit that land acquisitions are eligible costs as a key part of infrastructure investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Content of levy</td>
<td>We suggest that risk management should be included in the levy proposal. We further suggest that the risk owners should also be clearly defined should there be the need to apply the Receivership Act 1993.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 21</td>
<td>Endorsements</td>
<td>The legislation should require a positive endorsement from the responsible levy authority before a recommendation can be made to the minister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Recommendation report</td>
<td>For completeness, could provide that the recommendation report includes the asset and levy endorsements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27(S)</td>
<td>Responsible Minister may recommend levy order</td>
<td>Amend wording to clarify that both of the limits on creditor rights provided in section 138 automatically apply to any levy order unless the Minister makes a recommendation to the contrary. This would effectively reverse the default arrangement provided for in S27(5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Consultation with ministers</td>
<td>This clause does not stipulate what should be consulted on. We suggest that it be reworded to specify the content listed in clause 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Content of levy order</td>
<td>For completeness, could provide that the levy order includes the asset and levy endorsements outlined in S20 and S21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Leivable land categories</td>
<td>Categories of leivable land used by the SPV should be consistent with the categories and interpretations in use by the levy authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Rating information</td>
<td>We suggest that the bill should require alignment in the rating treatment of protected Māori land. Further discussion is included in paragraph 44 of the council’s submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Levy administration</td>
<td>Clause 55 states that the levy authority (the council) must take all reasonable steps to administer the levy, which includes the recovery of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 (2)(a)</td>
<td>Unpaid levies. This seems to be in contradiction of section 57 (2) (a) which permits a council to notify an SPV that it will not recover unpaid levies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Penalties for unpaid levy</td>
<td>The legislation should make it clear who retains the penalty revenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Remission policy</td>
<td>The council and the SPV must agree on the terms of the SPV’s Remission Policy. Although the bill does not require consultation on this process, we note that the LGA requires territorial authorities to consult on rates remissions and postponement policies. We recommend that the intent of the remissions policy this is clarified, and, if they are to be mandatory, a mechanism for how the policy is to be finalised if the parties fail to agree is included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Vesting agreement</td>
<td>Provision for relevant infrastructure authority to require that specified conditions for the infrastructure be included in the vesting agreement (clause 20(4)). However, it is not made clear that the SPV must accept those conditions as part of the vesting agreement, particularly if the vesting agreement is not concluded until a later date (than the asset endorsement). Other considerations for vesting are discussed in paragraph 26 of the council’s submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Excess levy</td>
<td>The ability of the responsible levy authority to retain any amount of excess levy that is less than the excess levy threshold may be perceived by the affected beneficiaries or by the public generally as unjust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-94</td>
<td>Development contributions and financial contributions</td>
<td>These sections relate specifically to development contributions and financial contributions, however, the bill does not make provisions for the treatment of targeted rates which may have been collected for infrastructure in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-94</td>
<td>Return of contributions</td>
<td>These sections do not provide a timeframe within which an SPV should make a direction to return any contributions. This means that a territorial authority cannot determine when refunds or returns should be made to the current ratepayer. The timeframe should be specified in the bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Notice requirement</td>
<td>This clause provides for a responsible SPV to give notice prior to breaking up any road or public land to the person who has jurisdiction over that land. We propose this be removed as it is already provided for elsewhere. For example, the National Code of Practice for Utility Operators’ Access to Transport Corridors provides this for roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Financial statements</td>
<td>Section 105 requires an SPV to prepare its financial statements within four months of the levy year-end, however, this is inconsistent with the LGA, which requires that financial statements are prepared within three months of year end. We believe there should be consistency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Charge over any asset</td>
<td>Section 131 seems to imply that an SPV can grant a security charge over physical assets. The LGA does not allow local authorities to grant a security charge over physical assets (only revenue), and we believe the IFF Bill should be consistent with this. Further, we note that the term “asset” is not defined in the IFF bill and, in the interest of avoiding confusion, suggest that it is defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Limit on usual rules for transactions and dispositions at under value</td>
<td>Limits on creditors need to be extended in the case of unfinished assets controlled by an SPV which have not yet been vested in the relevant infrastructure authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other act</td>
<td>Rates Rebate Act 1973</td>
<td>The council suggests that the SPV levy should be included in the scope of the Rates Rebate Scheme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment B: Local Board views

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board's Submission:
Infrastructure funding and financing bill (IFFB)

LOCAL BOARD POSITION

1. The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board support in principle the Infrastructure funding and financing bill. As the Bill’s outcome resonates throughout the local board’s local board plan (2017) in particular, Facilities to meet diverse needs, outcome.

IN ADDITION, THE MANGERE-OTAHUHU LOCAL BOARD:

2. Supports the IFFB to access budgets towards accelerating infrastructure development to meet the communities current and future needs.

3. Supports the levy procedure and special purpose vehicle (SPV) tool to cover infrastructure costs.

4. Supports engagement to include local boards as levies are charged on rates notices, that will ultimately impact on communities in the local board areas where these projects will be delivered.

5. Support local boards collaborating with the project provider to assist in ensuring that local context is considered at the project planning phase.

6. Support the IFFB’s ‘the recommender’, whose role is to provide independent advice to the Minister for Urban Development on a levy proposal and whether to recommend the use of a levy. The IFFB intends for the recommender to safeguard the interests of levy payers through the provision of that advice.

7. Support that the IFFB establishes ‘the monitor’, to ensure that SPVs comply with the relevant acts and levy orders to safeguard for the Crown and levy payers once a levy order has been made. It also allows:

   - the monitor to recommend that the Crown step in to manage the SPV until any significant problems are resolved
- consider and determine any objection by a person subject to the levy as to the accuracy of the levy assessed to that person.

8. Support a local authority endorsement mechanism to safeguard the legitimate interests of the local authority in which the assets will vest in. As the proposal for a levy must receive an asset endorsement and a levy endorsement before the Minister recommends it to the Governor-General.
Memorandum

18 February 2020

To: Chris Makoare, Chairperson – Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board; Debbie Burrows, Deputy Chairperson – Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board; Nina Siers, Relationship Manager – Maungakiekie-Tāmaki and Puketapapa Local Boards

cc: Christie McFadyen, Senior Local Board Advisor – Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board; Andrew Duncan, Manager Financial Policy

Subject: Urgent decision request of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board

From: Mal Ahmu, Local Board Advisor – Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board

Purpose

1. To initially seek the local board relationship manager’s authorisation to commence the urgent decision-making process and if granted, seek formal approval from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles) to use the process to make an urgent decision.

2. The decision required, and the supporting report, are attached to this memo. The urgent decision being sought needs to be authorised by the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles) by signing this memo. Both this memo and the report will be reported as an information item at the next business meeting if the urgent decision-making process proceeds.

Reason for the urgency

3. There is an opportunity for Auckland Council to make a submission to Central Government regarding the Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill

4. Submissions are due on 9 March 2020. The Planning Committee will be considering the draft Auckland Council submission at its 5 March 2020 meeting. To meet these timeframes local board feedback is due on 19 February 2020.

5. An urgent decision is required as the next Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board business meeting is on 25 February 2020.

6. All formal local board feedback will also be attached verbatim to the final Auckland Council submission.

7. The urgent decision will be reported to the full local board during the next scheduled meeting on 24 March 2020.

Decision sought from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles)

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

   a) provide feedback on the Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill.

Context

8. In August 2019, council approved a submission to the New Zealand Productivity Commission’s Local government funding and financing: draft report. The regional council submission supported the continuation of the development of Special Purpose Vehicles
(SPVs) to allow capital to be raised off the council’s balance sheet for investment in infrastructure and noted that legislation would be required to provide a funding stream through SPVs.

9. The Maungakielie-Tāmaki Local Board provided formal feedback on the New Zealand Productivity Commission’s Local government funding and financing: draft report, this was attached verbatim to the regional submission and endorsed in principle the proposed new tool of Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs) to support high growth councils approaching their debt limits to continue to invest in development of greenfield areas only.

10. The Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill proposes that finance is raised for infrastructure projects (or bundles of projects) through a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV). The SPV will be a stand-alone entity that will support urban development projects to begin sooner than council funding for infrastructure allows.

11. Key points of the proposed Bill:
   - SPVs will be independent from local authorities
   - this tool will help to make the cost of new infrastructure more transparent and will spread the costs by way of a levy so the cost falls primarily on the landowners who benefit, including over time and across generations.
   - the levy would be in place until the infrastructure is paid off by those who are expected to benefit. When a property is sold, the new owner would pay the levy. This levy would be collected by councils via their normal rates collection mechanisms on behalf of the SPV
   - all infrastructure assets built using the tool would transfer to the relevant public body, who will be responsible for the ongoing operation and maintenance of the new assets. Prior to an agreement on an SPV proposal, endorsement will be sought from the council

Authorisation of the urgent decision-making process

Signed by Nina Siers
Relationship Manager, Maungakielie-Tāmaki Local Board Date: 18/02/2020

Approval to use the urgent decision-making process

Chris Makoare
Chairperson, Maungakielie-Tāmaki Local Board Date: 18/02/2020
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Resolution/s

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

a) note that the local board area has a significant level of urban development planned and currently in progress and that this Bill could have potential impacts on the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki community

b) note that the local board provided feedback on the New Zealand Productivity Commission’s Local government funding and financing: draft report and supported in principle the use of Special Purpose Vehicles in greenfield developments only (MT/2019/126)

c) endorse in principle the proposed new tool of Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs) to support high growth councils approaching their debt limits to continue to invest in development of greenfield areas only.

d) recommend that public consultation be mandatory if a Special Purpose Vehicle is used for projects involving existing homeowners, so that the community have the opportunity to share their views on a potential levy that could affect them.
Urgent Decision Memo

To: Manoj Ragupathy, Relationship Manager Papakura & Manurewa Local Board
cc: Papakura Local Board Chair and Members
From: Paula Brooke - Democracy Advisor

Subject: Urgent decision - Papakura Local Board input into Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill

Purpose

To endorse the Papakura Local Board’s feedback on the Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill.

Reason for the urgency:

- Local Board feedback is required by 19 February 2020 to be appended to the Auckland Council submission, which is before 26 February 2020, being the next scheduled meeting of the Papakura Local Board.

Decision sought from the chair and deputy chair (or any person acting in these roles)

That the Papakura Local Board:

a) endorse the following Papakura Local Board input into the central government’s Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill:

i) The Papakura Local Board supports the intent of the Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill to provide a tool to raise additional capital for infrastructure.

ii) The board believe the Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill should be more explicit in how it relates to the Urban Development Bill and clearly stipulate one levy for one site.

iii) The board is concerned about a possibility of two or more levies applying to one site, ie: one raised as a special purpose vehicle for infrastructure leading up to a development area and another under the Urban Development Bill for the infrastructure within a development. Potentially a ratepayer would be paying two or more levies. This would add considerably to the day to day costs of living.

iv) The board support council being able to collect the levy and believe council should be able to claim the administrative costs for this service.

v) The board has a concern that the first purchasers may understand the purpose of the charge, however, over time subsequent purchasers may not necessarily understand. This could create a political risk for future elected members.
vi) The board believe council endorsement must be required for asset specifications.

vii) The board express concern at a local authority’s ability to manage future operational expenditure should special purpose vehicles become more common.

About the Papakura Local Board

1. Papakura Local Board is one of 21 local boards which are part of the Auckland Council co-governance model. The board has responsibility for local decision making while the Governing Body has the regional decision making focus.

2. The board’s population, as at the 2018 census, was 57,836. The population is ethnically diverse with 49.1% European, 26.8% Māori, 23.4% Asian and 16.9% Pacific peoples. Since the 2013 census there has been a significant growth in the Asian population. Papakura still has the largest Māori population per capita. The median age in Papakura is 32 years, with 23.6% of the population being aged between 0 and 14 years.

Background

3. The Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill is a new way of funding and financing local infrastructure by providing a tool that is independent of local authorities.

4. The tool will enable urban development projects to begin sooner than council funding for infrastructure allows, by enabling finance for infrastructure projects (or bundles of projects) to be raised through a stand-alone entity, a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV). This tool will also help to make the cost of new infrastructure more transparent and will spread the costs by way of a levy so the cost falls primarily on the landowners who benefit, including over time and across generations.

5. The levy would be in place until the infrastructure is paid off by those who are expected to benefit. When a property is sold, the new owner would pay the levy. This levy would be collected by councils via their normal rates collection mechanisms on behalf of the SPV.

6. All infrastructure assets built using the tool would transfer to the relevant public body. In most circumstances this will be a council, who will be responsible for the ongoing operation and maintenance of the new assets. Prior to an agreement on an SPV proposal, endorsement will be sought from the council.

7. This tool will work alongside other related central government initiatives such as the Urban Development Bill.

8. Public submissions are open until 5th March 2020, however, the council has been granted an extension until 9th March to allow the Planning Committee to consider the draft submission.

9. Local Board input is required by Wednesday 19 February to be appended to the Auckland Council submission.
Authorisation of the urgent decision-making process

Signed by Manoj Ragupathy
Relationship Manager Papakura & Manurewa Ward

Date

Brent Catchpole
Chairperson, Papakura Local Board

Date

Jan Robinson
Deputy Chairperson, Papakura Local Board

Date
Puketapapa Local Board

Please note below the formal feedback from the Puketapapa Local Board at their 20 February 2020 Business meeting for your action.

16 Auckland Council’s submission to the Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill

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

Resolution number PKTPP/2020/10

MOVED by Chairperson H Doig, seconded by Deputy Chairperson J Fairey:
That the Puketapapa Local Board:

a) note Auckland Council’s draft submission to the Infrastructure Funding and Financing Bill.

b) thank Ben Moimoi for his attendance.

CARRIED
Memorandum

11 March 2020

To: Planning Committee and Local Board members
Cc: Environment and Climate Change Committee members

Chief Executive, Independent Māori Statutory Board

Subject: Preparing Auckland Council’s submission on central government’s proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality and an opportunity for input

From: Dave Allen Manager Natural Environment Strategy
Jess Gerry Analyst Strategy, Natural Environment Strategy

Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research department, Chief Planning Office

Contact information: jessica.gerry@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose

1. To overview central government’s proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality (NESAQ), highlight how the Auckland Council group will submit on these proposals and to give an opportunity for succinct input from elected members.

Summary

2. Central government have publicly released their proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality (NESAQ).

3. The proposed amendments to the NESAQ aim to better regulate fine particulate material that can adversely affect human health and to better target controllable sources of air pollution.

4. The amendments specifically relate to the standards regarding particulate matter concentrations within airsheds, emissions standards for domestic fuel burners and the emission of mercury.

5. Opportunities for input to the council group submission are tight, with the submission closing date of 24 April 2020. A proposed draft submission outlining the key submission points will be presented to the Planning Committee on 2 April 2020 for approval. Given the timing of the consultation period, it is not anticipated that the submission will be fully complete at that time.

6. Council staff will seek a resolution of the Planning Committee on 2 April 2020, such that the council group submission will be considered and signed off by the Planning Committee Chair and Deputy Chair, the Environment and Climate Change Committee Chair and Deputy Chair and a member of the Independent Māori Statutory Board, with the proposed final submission likely being provided to them by no later than Monday 20 April 2020.

Context

7. On 25 February 2020, the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) began consultation on a review of the NESAQ. The NESAQ was introduced in 2004 and last amended in 2011, and sets standards for ambient air quality, woodburner emissions, and rules prohibiting certain activities with significant discharges of toxic pollutants.

8. Broadly, the proposed amendments to the NESAQ aim to better regulate fine particulate matter (PM) that can adversely affect human health and to better target controllable sources of air pollution. Central government is proposing amendments to the particulate matter standards, domestic fuel burner standards and the introduction of standards for mercury emissions.
9. Central government has recognised that the mauri and hau of our air can be compromised in many ways, particularly through the release of contaminants. The proposed amendments to the NESAQ are seeking to protect and enhance the mauri and hau of our air through the exercise of kaitaikitanga.

**Discussion**

**Particulate matter standards – proposals and implications**

10. The NESAQ currently limits PM contaminants in our air. PM is a collective term for particles suspended in the air that are small enough to be inhaled. PM can be generated from both human activities and natural sources.

11. PM is often classified according to its size because size determines how it interacts with the environment and the human body. While PM$_{10}$ has a diameter of 10 micrometres (µm) or less, PM$_{2.5}$ has a diameter of less than 2.5µm and is a subset of the PM$_{10}$ range. Generally, finer particles have the potential to cause more acute health problems.

12. A growing body of international evidence has shown that PM$_{2.5}$ has significant health impacts. These particles can penetrate deep into the lungs, can enter the bloodstream and cause a range of health impacts, from asthma to more chronic respiratory disease.

13. For the purpose of determining an exceedance against the standard, PM concentrations are measured in µg/m$^3$ (micrograms per cubic metre).

14. Since the implementation of NESAQ, the lack of a PM$_{2.5}$ standard has been discussed through various avenues, and it is accepted by many (including OECD Environmental Performance Review and the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment) that a PM$_{2.5}$ standard is a sensible regulatory threshold.

15. Amendments to particulate matter (PM) standards within the NESAQ include:
   - implementation of a daily (24hr) average PM$_{2.5}$ standard of 25 µg/m$^3$ (three or less exceedances allowed in a 12-month period)
   - implementation of an annual average PM$_{2.5}$ standard of 10 µg/m$^3$
   - retention of the PM$_{10}$ standard and requirement to monitor for coarse particles
   - requirement to publicly notify any exceedances of PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ standards
   - replacing the current PM$_{10}$ standard with PM$_{2.5}$ standards as the primary measure for managing air quality, and
   - changes to the way airsheds are determined to be polluted and subsequent mitigation requirements are triggered.

16. In short, these will mean that in addition to having a daily standard for PM$_{10}$, PM concentrations will also be managed through a maximum daily average concentration of PM$_{2.5}$ and an annual average concentration of PM$_{2.5}$. Rather than being triggered by PM$_{10}$ exceedances, existing mitigation measures will instead be triggered by the exceedance of PM$_{2.5}$ standards. All exceedances of these standards will have to be publicly notified.

17. Both the 24hr average PM$_{2.5}$ standard of 25 µg m$^{-3}$, and the annual average PM$_{2.5}$ standard of 10 µg m$^{-3}$ are considered reasonable standards to implement. This is supported by the fact that both are currently included:
   - in the World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines; and,
   - are the Ambient Air Quality Targets within the Auckland Unitary Plan. The implementation of a PM$_{2.5}$ standard gives Auckland Council a target to manage airsheds$^1$ towards, and endorses the Unitary Plan’s approach of setting standards for PM$_{2.5}$.

---

$^1$ A NESAQ airshed is a defined geographic area for air quality management which extends upwards from ground level, with no upper limit.
18. In preparation for the review of the NESAQ, council technical staff reviewed historic PM$_{2.5}$ data collected as part of Auckland Council’s ambient air quality monitoring program, to assess the ability of the Auckland Urban Airshed to comply with new PM$_{2.5}$ standards$^2$. An internally reviewed report has been completed, the findings of which will guide Auckland Council group’s submission on the proposed changes.

19. The internal report suggests that:
   - the 24hr PM$_{2.5}$ standard of 25 µg m$^3$ could be met by the Auckland Urban Airshed$^3$. Given that compliance has only been achieved since 2015, some allowable breaches may be required; and
   - annual PM$_{2.5}$ standard of 10 µg m$^3$ could be met by the Auckland Urban Airshed, having been compliant since 2009.

20. At present, when the PM$_{10}$ standard is breached, the following mitigation requirements are triggered:
   - prohibiting of discharges from open fires installed after the threshold breach threshold (regulation 24A)
   - declining new resource consent applications for discharges in polluted airsheds (regulation 17).

21. Central government is proposing that this be altered such that these mitigation requirements instead be triggered by a breach of the daily or annual PM$_{2.5}$ standards.

**Domestic fuel burner standards – proposals and implications**

22. Central government is also proposing amendments to more stringently manage domestic solid-fuel burners. Specifically the emission standard for new solid-fuel burners is proposed to be reduced to no more than 1.0g/kg (down from 1.5g/kg) and it is proposed that regulations pertaining to emissions limits and thermal efficiency be expanded to include all types of new, domestic solid-fuel burners (including coal burners, multi-fuel burners, pellet burners, open fires, cookers, and water boilers).

23. Since the release of the NESAQ in 2011, wood burner technology has improved. Central government are proposing stricter emissions standards for all new burners and consider that this will continue to drive innovation to further reduce emissions. Solid-fuel burners currently available in New Zealand would meet the proposed new standard.

**Mercury emission standards – implication and compliance**

24. New Zealand signed the Minamata Convention on Mercury in 2013. In order to ratify this Convention, one of the three main steps needed is to set controls on emissions to air from mercury. As such, central government is proposing that the NESAQ will:
   - prohibit the use of mercury in particular listed industrial processes. These have not been carried out in New Zealand, and they are not likely to be as technology has improved and alternative mercury-free processes are available, and
   - require applications for specified, new activities involving emissions of mercury to air, to consider international best practice guidance. This only applies to new or substantially modified sources and few point sources fall within these source categories (except coal-fired industrial boilers). It is highly unlikely there will be many resource consent applications to operate a new facility for particular industrial processes.

---

$^2$ Note that this analysis is limited to current and former monitoring sites and their associated data. Any new sites commissioned (particularly those in areas with significant solid fuel use for home heating) may impact the respective airshed’s ability to comply with a PM$_{2.5}$ NESAQ.

$^3$ Auckland Urban Airshed is the geographic extent of the urban area of Auckland, the remainder of the region is covered by the Rural Airshed.
Next steps

25. The Auckland Plan Strategy and Research department is coordinating the preparation of the Auckland Council group submission. Key steps include:

- information memos forwarded to elected members, mana whenua and CCO’s following the 25 February 2020 public release of the consultation document, advising of the opportunity to provide succinct input into the council group submission process. Any feedback will need to be provided by 27 March 2020, to enable staff to inform the discussion at the Planning Committee on 2 April.

- specialist staff to review the proposals and potential implications and bring together an initial council group view.

- an agenda report outlining the key submission points, to be presented to the Planning Committee on 2 April 2020. Given the timing of the consultation period, relative to the nearest Planning Committee meeting date, it is not anticipated that the submission will be complete at this time. At that meeting a delegation to the Planning Committee Chair and Deputy Chair, the Environment and Climate Change Committee Chair and Deputy Chair, and a member of the Independent Maori Statutory Board will be sought to finalise the submission.

- finalise a council group submission for consideration by the delegated members of the Planning Committee (no later than Monday 20 April 2020).

26. Following the close of the consultation period, central government staff will consider the submissions received. It is understood that advice is scheduled to be put to Cabinet for decision in late 2020, following the general election.
Memorandum 19 March 2020

To: Planning Committee members, Local Board Chairs and Members

Subject: Council submission to the Accessible Streets Regulatory Package

From: Alastair Cribbens, Principal Transport Advisor, Growth, Transport & Infrastructure Strategy

Purpose
1. To highlight the release of Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency’s Accessible Streets Regulatory Package and outline the next steps.

Summary
- The Associate Minister of Transport is proposing a collection of rule changes known as the Accessible Streets Regulatory Package.
- These rules are intended to:
  - make footpaths, shared paths, cycle lanes and cycle paths safer and more accessible
  - accommodate the increasing use of micro-mobility devices like e-scooters on streets and footpaths
  - encourage active modes of transport and support the creation of more liveable and vibrant towns and cities
  - make social and economic opportunities more accessible, and
  - make buses and active transport such as walking and cycling safer and more efficient.
- The package will clarify the types of vehicles and devices that are allowed on footpaths, shared paths, cycle paths and cycle lanes, and how they can use these spaces. This will include a 15km/h speed limit on the footpath and a requirement for all other footpath users to give way to pedestrians.
- The proposed rules also clarify how road controlling authorities may regulate pedestrians, devices and spaces like the footpath; and propose changes to the priority given to a range of road users to remove barriers to walking, device use and cycling.
- Submissions on the package close on 22 April 2020.
- Council intends to make a submission. A paper with further information on the review, our proposed process for responding to the package and key themes in the submission will be considered at the Planning Committee meeting on 2 April.
Context

2. The Accessible Streets Regulatory Package aims to achieve a shift in government support for:
   - making footpaths, shared paths, cycle lanes and cycle paths safer and more accessible
   - accommodating the increasing use of micro-mobility devices like e-scooters on streets and footpaths
   - encouraging active modes of transport and supporting the creation of more liveable and vibrant towns and cities
   - making social and economic opportunities more accessible
   - making buses and active transport such as walking and cycling safer and more efficient.

3. These changes are intended to help give effect to the 2018/19-2027/28 Government Policy Statement on Land Transport which seeks to, amongst other things, prioritise:
   - accessible and affordable transport
   - safety
   - liveable cities.

4. The package consists of nine proposals:
   - Proposal 1: Change and re-name the types of device that are used on footpaths, shared paths, cycle paths and cycle lanes
   - Proposal 2: Establish a national framework for the use of footpaths
   - Proposal 3: Establish a national framework for the use of shared paths and cycle paths
   - Proposal 4: Enable transport devices to use cycle lanes and cycle paths
   - Proposal 5: Introduce lighting and reflector requirements for powered transport devices at night
   - Proposal 6: Remove barriers to walking, transport device use and cycling through rule changes
   - Proposal 7: Mandate a minimum overtaking gap for motor vehicles passing cycles, transport devices, horses, pedestrians and people using mobility devices on the road
   - Proposal 8: Clarify how road controlling authorities can restrict parking on berm
   - Proposal 9: Give buses priority when exiting bus stops

5. Waka Kotahi released its consultation documents on the 9th of March. They can be accessed via this link.

Discussion

6. From our initial review of the package some of the main areas that may be of interest to the council, councillors, IMSB members and local board members include:
   a. Proposal 2 – This proposal would allow bikes and e-bikes as well as unpowered (push scooters, skateboards etc) and all legal powered (e-scooters and YikeBikes) transport devices to be used on footpaths. New rules would be introduced for their use on footpaths including the need to give way to all pedestrians and a speed limit of 15km/h. This proposal also raises the alternative option of only allowing cyclists on footpaths up to the age of 16.
   b. Proposals 2 and 3 – Propose allowing road controlling authorities the ability to set speed limits for bikes and transport devices on footpaths, shared paths and cycle paths and make it easier for them to restrict the use of bikes and transport devices on footpaths.
c. Proposal 6 – The proposal seeks to give priority to footpath, shared path and cycle path users over traffic turning into and out of side streets where markings are installed, as shown in the diagram to the right.

d. Proposal 8 – Proposes changes to clarify how road controlling authorities can restrict parking on berms.

7. While the above summarises some of package's main themes, we recommend that you review the consultation documents using the link above as they set out a more detailed discussion of the proposals.

8. For clarity, the proposals do not:

   a. change the Land Transport Act 1998 or legalise the use of any other powered transport devices (beyond the already legal e-scooters and YikeBikes)

   b. propose to amend the current rules around wearing helmets for either transport devices or bikes.

Next steps


10. Auckland Transport are preparing a separate submission. We are working closely with Auckland Transport to ensure our submissions are as aligned as possible.

11. A paper with further information on the package and our proposed process for responding is being prepared for the Planning Committee meeting on 2 April. This is likely to focus on seeking guidance on key themes in the package. An update is likely to be provided on the day describing key themes and an emerging recommended position.

12. In the meantime, we welcome any initial questions or feedback from elected members ahead of this meeting (alastair.cribbens@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz).

13. Local Board views for appending to the submission are requested by Friday, 17 April 2020.
Memorandum  
1 May 2020

To: Planning Committee, Independent Māori Statutory Board, all local boards

Subject: City Centre Masterplan refresh complete

From: George Weeks

Contact information: george.weeks@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose
1. To inform Planning Committee, the Independent Māori Statutory Board and local boards that the refreshed Auckland City Centre Masterplan is now available online and is ready to use.

Summary
2. On 5 March 2020, Planning Committee resolved (PLA/2020/17) to adopt the refreshed City Centre Masterplan (CCMP). This resolution also noted that the CCMP was to be digitised and made available online from April 2020. This has now been done.

3. The CCMP is available via this link: https://www.aucklandccmp.co.nz/

Context
4. Development of the CCMP refresh has been underway since March 2017, led by Auckland Council’s Auckland Design Office, working alongside Auckland Transport (AT) and Panuku. This core working group has engaged extensively with subject matter experts, businesses, residents, iwi, membership organisations and elected representatives.

5. At a Planning Committee meeting on 27 November 2018, elected members gave unanimous support to the CCMP refresh as a light-touch digital document, integrating the Waterfront Plan into the CCMP and incorporating rolling updates. (PLA/2018/121).

6. At a Planning Committee meeting on 2 July 2019, staff were instructed (PLA/2019/62) to undertake targeted and public engagement on the CCMP refresh, reporting back to Planning Committee in early 2020.

7. AT provided a detailed submission on the CCMP’s Access for Everyone (A4E) concept, noting its alignment with AT’s existing mode shift plan and acknowledging that “a greater modal balance in the way people travel across the region” would be fundamental in achieving the CCMP’s goals.

8. A Planning Committee workshop took place on 19 February 2020. Engagement results were circulated and the findings discussed. Elected members were able to ask questions of the CCMP refresh team and subject matter experts involved in its development.

9. On 5 March 2020, Planning Committee resolved (PLA/2020/17) to adopt the refreshed CCMP. This resolution also noted that the CCMP was to be digitised and made available online from April 2020. This happened on Wednesday 29 April and the CCMP refresh is now complete.

---

1 https://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/Open/2020/03/PLA_20200305_MIN_9579.PDF
Discussion

10. The previous 2012 CCMP was a printed document, available online. The refreshed CCMP is a fully digital document, designed to be viewed on computers and mobile devices.

11. The refreshed CCMP is fully up to date with statutory documents, including the Auckland Plan, the Auckland Unitary Plan and the Auckland Climate Action Framework. The CCMP is thus the non-statutory area-based plan for delivering the Auckland Plan Outcomes in the city centre.

12. The CCMP website was designed to be easily-accessible, attractive, distinctive and detailed. The website was produced and supported by council staff in Digital, ICT, Design and Comms, working with Council, AT and Panuku staff. Support was also provided by external consultants.

13. The CCMP links back to other websites, including Progress Auckland which covers live development projects transforming the city centre and waterfront.

14. The CCMP website is set out under the following headings:
   - **Homepage**: welcomes people to the website
   - **About the City Centre Masterplan**: high-level purpose of the plan, including Mihi, vision, geography, climate change response, contact details and downloads
   - **Explore the City Centre Masterplan Area**: eight detailed clickable maps to show the components of the plan
   - **Transformational moves**: eight moves to coordinate interventions in specific areas of the city centre
   - **Opportunities**: 15 proposals and interventions to deliver the CCMP
   - **Access for Everyone (A4E)**: Coordinated response to city centre transport needs
   - **Outcomes**: ten components that support the overall strategic direction for the city centre and waterfront
   - **Downloadable resources**: maps, diagrams, Māori outcomes, detailed street explainers, policy mapping and consultation documents available for download

Next steps

15. The 2020 CCMP website replaces the 2012 CCMP.

16. External publicity will be progressed and will be informed by the Head of Communications (City Centre & Urban Growth).

17. All submitters on the CCMP consultation to be informed of CCMP completion via e-mail.

18. A series of webinars is to be undertaken for internal audiences to inform council and CCOs of the new CCMP.

Implementation

19. In addition to its basis in the Auckland Plan, the outcomes, moves and opportunities of the CCMP represent significant political and public consultation and buy-in. Public and private proposals will thus be expected to be consistent with the agreed 20-year vision for the city centre and waterfront.

20. The CCMP is a coordinated vision and all city centre projects or proposals should align with this vision. It is expected that project briefs and evaluation criteria align with the CCMP transformational moves. This will ensure that individual projects are coordinated with other city centre interventions and will deliver multiple CCMP outcomes.
21. A4E envisages a new network strategy for city centre roads and streets. Projects and initiatives must align with A4E principles to enable delivery of the CCMP moves, outcomes, opportunities and vision.

22. The CCMP introduces new opportunities while coordinating existing and planned city centre works. Implementation of the CCMP will in the first instance occur via existing works. Implementation strategies for components of the CCMP will be developed across the Council whanau and external organisations on a case-by-case basis.

23. AT is coordinating a comprehensive investigation into implementing A4E, including identifying the optimal programme of projects and supporting workstreams. This will also identify funding, phasing and the opportunity to develop pilot projects as part of a transition plan. It builds on preliminary A4E work already carried out to inform the CCMP.

24. Waterfront updates will take place later this year. The work currently underway to update planning for Wynyard Point will be discussed with Planning Committee later this year. This will form an update to the Wynyard Precinct of the Waterfront Plan and a precursor to a plan change.
Memo

To: MPs and Auckland Council Planning Committee
From: Supporting Growth Alliance
Date: 13 May 2020
Subject: Update on Supporting Growth Programme - public engagement for growth areas in southern Auckland

Kia ora

This memo provides information about public engagement in southern Auckland between 18 May and 12 June 2020 to seek feedback on transport proposals.

Prior to the Covid-19 Level 4 alert, the Supporting Growth team provided updates on the programme to councillors and elected members. This outlined:
• our proposed preferred options for future transport upgrades/corridors
• how to best inform and engage your communities on our plans and the rationale for this.

More recently, we have re-engaged with ward councillors and the Franklin and Papakura Local Boards to better understand current community sentiment and issues that might arise with online only engagement. Thank you for your time and valuable input at these briefings and meetings. Your questions and recommendations have helped to shape our proposals and how we will engage with local communities.

The current Covid-19 situation is unprecedented, and we understand the priority for everyone is to stay safe and take care of each other. However, in partnership with Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport, we are continuing to progress these projects as infrastructure will play a critical role in the economic recovery of New Zealand.

Our public engagement will now take place online and by phone with landowners and community stakeholders. We anticipate members of your local community will ask you questions. To support these conversations please see the supporting information in the attached information pack, which contains:

1. Background context – Supporting Growth Programme in southern Auckland
2. Recent landowner engagement in southern Auckland
3. Next steps: public engagement
4. Further information
5. FAQs and talking points
6. Project information – maps, project descriptions and explanations of our preferred options, and feedback forms

These are extraordinary times for New Zealand, thank you for your support to help us plan necessary future infrastructure for the country.

Feedback is open from 18 May until 12 June via the Supporting Growth website and our Social Pinpoint page (live 14 May).
Information Pack – Supporting Growth Programme

To: MPs and Auckland Council Planning Committee

From: Supporting Growth Alliance

Date: 13 May 2020

Subject: Supporting Growth Programme – additional information for public engagement in southern Auckland

Purpose:
This information pack provides additional information about our plans for public engagement in southern Auckland between 18 May and 12 June 2020. We hope these help you with conversations with your local community.

Contents:
1. Background context – Supporting Growth Programme in southern Auckland
2. Recent landowner engagement in southern Auckland
3. Next steps: public engagement
4. Further information
5. FAQs and talking points
6. Appendices

1. Background context - Supporting Growth Programme in southern Auckland:
The south is growing fast, and new urban areas are planned for development over the next 30 years for Takanini, Opāheke, Drury, Paerata and Pukekohe.

The Supporting Growth Programme, a collaboration between Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport, is leading the strategic planning to create the future transport network to support these growing communities. We are now identifying and protecting the land that will be needed for new and improved future transport connections for these areas.

Options for public transport, rail, road and walking and cycling have been proposed and some priority projects are being accelerated, as outlined in the government’s NZ Upgrade Programme.

In southern Auckland this includes the new Mill Road corridor, rail upgrades including two new train stations at Drury Central and Drury West and improvements on State Highway 1 between Papakura and Drury to provide safer, more reliable and accessible travel choices.

Between 18 May and 12 June 2020, we’re encouraging landowner and public feedback to help shape these future projects for Auckland’s southern communities. This will focus on strategic (Mill Road) and rail (upgrades and stations) project proposals.
Well-designed transport connections and travel choices are vital to create great places to live, work and visit as our population grows over the next 30 years.

2. Recent landowner engagement in southern Auckland
In December 2019 and January 2020, we sent letters to landowners to seek their feedback on the preferred options for four projects within the Drury and Opāheke areas – the new Opāheke north-south connection and upgrade to Waihoehoe Road, upgrading Bremner and Norrie Road (east), upgrading Jesmond Road, Auranga Road 1 and Bremner Road and also an upgrade to a section of State Highway 22.

Key feedback themes include:
- Landowners appreciated being contacted at this stage in the process when the preferred option is not set yet.
- Landowners want to know what a town centre would look like in the future in Drury.
- Business owners in the area are very keen for exact details about the potential designation boundary. They want to know how the proposal will impact on their property so they can plan for the future of their business site, especially on Bremner and Norrie Roads.
- Many property owners continue to request certainty about what’s being proposed and how it impacts them.

We have sought approval from various landowners within the project areas to undertake ecological surveys, site walkovers and drone surveys. The team are currently undertaking these surveys where we have written approvals.

3. Next steps: Landowner and community engagement 18 May to 12 June 2020

Background:
Our previous engagement and communication with communities and stakeholders in the southern Auckland area provides a strong foundation for the next engagement phase. We have completed investigations into some projects in the south and want to protect the land we’ll need for future development.

Community engagement will play a key role in the next steps of our planning for all projects.

Alignment with our partners, engagement with our key stakeholders – who include utility providers, developers, government organisations and advocacy groups – is also important. We are actively engaging with all groups to seek their feedback and input.

Why continue with landowner and community engagement now?
The current Covid-19 situation is unprecedented, and we understand the priority for everyone is to stay safe and take care of each other. However, in partnership with Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport, we are continuing to progress these projects as infrastructure will play a critical role in the economic recovery of New Zealand.
Landowner engagement and community feedback is important to us to help refine our preferred options and other investigations before we progress to route protection.

We understand these are extraordinary times for New Zealand, and we believe community feedback will help us plan necessary future infrastructure for the country.

We'll continue to update landowners and the community as we progress and to close the loop on their feedback.

**Purpose of engagement - Drury and Opāheke areas:**

We want to close the loop with landowners that were contacted during December 2019 to January 2020 and share the feedback themes and information we received.

Landowners within the areas surrounding local Drury road projects will receive a letter from us dated 6 May 2020. The letter acknowledges their feedback from the December 2019 to January 2020 engagement period and invites them to discuss the following projects:

- Upgrade to Bremner Road
- Upgrade to Jesmond Road
- Upgrade to State Highway 22
- New Opāheke north-south connection
- Upgrade to Waihoehoe Road.

We’d like to discuss the draft designation boundary and what this potentially means for their property. It’s an opportunity to go over timelines for the next stage of the work, ask any questions and to find out more about the route protection process before it gets underway.

We have asked landowners to book a call or online meeting with us between 18 May and 12 June 2020. Landowners can book a phone call with us online: [https://sgasouth.gettimely.com/book](https://sgasouth.gettimely.com/book) or call us on 0800 GROW AKL (0800 4769 255) to arrange a suitable time.

Following this, we intend to start the route protection (eg designation) process to protect the land needed for each project.

**Purpose of engagement - strategic and rail projects:**

Landowners within strategic and rail project areas will receive a letter dated 6 May 2020. Letters contain project information and maps relevant to the landowner’s surrounding area and invites them for their feedback.

Feedback and insights from local communities on our preferred options will help us understand if we have missed any key considerations or issues. We want a better understanding of the
potential impacts of specific corridors and will collate information to use for the next step of development.

We will share our preferred options and seek their feedback on:
- Mill Road – Takanini, Papakura and Drury sections
- Pukekohe Expressway and connections to State Highway 22
- Pukekohe Urban Arterial (north-east section)
- Rail upgrades and proposed new train stations at Drury Central, Drury West and Paerata
- Separate walking and cycling paths along Opāheke Road, Ponga Road and Waihoehoe Road.

Depending on New Zealand’s Covid-19 status and if appropriate, we hope to schedule meetings with landowners to show draft designation from late July for strategic projects. Dates for discussions with landowners about rail projects are yet to be confirmed.

**Encouraging landowner and community feedback between 18 May and 12 June 2020:**
As community leaders, we invite you to help play a key role in the next phase of our public engagement.

Where appropriate, please actively share across your networks that community feedback is open via the [Supporting Growth website](#) until 12 June 2020.

We will be advertising in local community papers (Franklin Country News, Manukau Courier and Papakura Courier), on radio stations (Radio Waatea, 531pi and Humm FM), via digital marketing and on social media to encourage people to have their say.

The community can find out more about transport projects in southern Auckland via these channels:

- [supportinggrowth.govt.nz](#)
- Join the conversation on our [Social Pinpoint page](#) (live 14 May)
- Supporting Growth Programme, PO Box 105218, Auckland 1143
- [info@sUPPORTINGGROWTH.NZ](#)
- 0800 GROW AKL (4769 255)

We also encourage landowners to call one of our Engagement Managers (Laura Christian 027 607 2533 or Manini Hallikeri 021 538 269) or 0800 GROW AKL if they have any questions.
4. Further Information
Past memos and briefing packs provide a full history of engagement with local boards.

An overview of all information relating to southern Auckland:
www.supportinggrowth.govt.nz/growth-areas/south/

5. FAQs and talking points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Growth Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What is the Supporting Growth Programme?

- The Supporting Growth Programme is a collaboration between Auckland Transport, Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency, KiwiRail, Auckland Council and manawhenua.
- The programme is planning the future transport networks that will be developed over the next few decades, in line with Auckland Council’s land use planning. This information will be provided to stakeholders and the community.
- The transport networks are in Warkworth, north Auckland, northwest Auckland and southern Auckland.

Why are you doing this now?

- Identifying and designating land for future transport networks will help provide certainty for the regulatory authorities, industry, developers, residents, landowners and the community.
- Protecting routes now is important to help plan and integrate the significant transport infrastructure required for new housing and urban area development.
- Over the next 30 years, an additional 120,000 people are expected to live in future communities in Takaanini, Opāheke, Drury, Paerata and Pukekohe.
- Route protection now will allow new and establishing communities to plan with more certainty. They can move to an area knowing there will be public transport options and transport choices for them in the future.

How do these plans contribute to climate change/reduce emissions?

- The Indicative Strategic Transport Network, our view of what Auckland’s future transport network may look like, was released in July 2019. It outlined a shared vision and set of strategic transport network plans to support future communities.
- These network plans recognise that the way people move around their communities and across our city needs to change.
- Extending the public transport network and offering sustainable travel choices is at the heart of every project for each area – Warkworth, north Auckland, northwest Auckland and southern Auckland – to encourage a significant shift to public transport and active modes.
- The proposals for the southern growth areas have the potential to see an increase in public transport usage by 35 percent from southern communities.
We believe a well-designed transport network supports public transport and walkability and cycling and must be attractive, safe to use and with facilities (e.g. kiss and ride, park and ride) that to help people get to where they need to go.

Investment is in place for rail upgrades including electrification to provide additional train services to give people more sustainable travel choices which will help reduce emissions, ease congestion and improve road safety.

Our priority is to identify and protect the land for these transport projects. This will enable as much flexibility as possible in our planning for a range of public transport and active modes.

We are working closely with Auckland Council to evolve our response to climate change at each stage of our planning.

Southern Auckland projects

What are you doing in southern Auckland?

- Around 190,000 people live in southern Auckland, and in the next 30 years, an additional 120,000 people are expected to live in future communities in Takanini, Opāheke, Drury, Paerata and Pukekohe. A good transport system will be needed for these areas.

- We are seeking community feedback until 12 June 2020 on a range of transport proposals, rail upgrades and road improvements that will transform southern Auckland. Projects include:
  - Mill Road – a new connection from Manukau to Drury South
  - Pukekohe Expressway and connections to State Highway 22
  - Pukekohe Urban Arterial
  - Rail – supporting urban and economic growth
  - Separate walking and cycling paths along Opāheke Road, Ponga Road and Walhoeheoe Road.

- For more information visit supportinggrowth.govt.nz

What are the benefits of these projects?

- A well-designed transport network gives future communities lots of travel options to choose from. This will allow residents and visitors to walk, ride, bike, scooter, or take the bus or train to go to work, connect with family and friends and move around their community.

- More safety and efficiency for local roads and state highways, new public transport services, rail upgrades and new walking and cycling paths to connect current and new communities to train stations, town centres and green spaces.

- Better access and connectivity to public transport by extending the electrified rail network from Papakura to Pukekohe so passengers don’t have to change trains at Papakura to travel south to Pukekohe.

- New train stations at Drury Central, Drury West and Paerata as well as bus connections will also make it easier for residents in southern Auckland to travel by public transport to the city centre.
How can I have my say?

- There are many ways you can provide us your feedback:
  - Complete a survey online: [supportinggrowth.govt.nz/have-your-say/south](http://supportinggrowth.govt.nz/have-your-say/south)
  - Join the conversation on our Social Pinpoint page (live 14 May)
  - Download and submit a feedback form by post to: Supporting Growth Programme, PO Box 105218, Auckland 1143
  - Contact us at [info@supportinggrowth.nz](mailto:info@supportinggrowth.nz)
  - Call 0800 GROW AKL (4769 255)
  - For more information visit: [supportinggrowth.govt.nz](http://supportinggrowth.govt.nz)
- You’ll have the opportunity to provide your feedback to us by 12 June 2020.
- Community feedback is important to help us refine our preferred option/s and to check we haven’t missed anything important.
- We will continue to update you as we progress and will come back to you to close the loop on your feedback.

Why are you continuing to engage with the public when we are in Covid-19 lockdown?

- The current situation with Covid-19 is unprecedented and we appreciate that the priority for everyone is to stay safe and take care of each other.
- We have carefully considered when and how best to proceed with engaging with the community and landowners during this time and have decided to continue in line with the government’s direction to proceed with transport projects.
- In partnership with Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport, we are continuing to progress these projects as infrastructure will play a critical role in the economic recovery of New Zealand.
- In response to Covid-19 Level 4 alert, we cancelled our face-to-face engagement including our community information days and pop-up events.
- Instead, we are encouraging landowners to book a phone call or online meeting with us to discuss the draft designation boundary and what it potentially means for their property.
- We are also encouraging the wider community to provide feedback online, via post and email or to call us on 0800 GROW AKL.

What happens next?

- Community and landowner feedback will help us to refine our preferred options.
- We will also carry out further investigations and continue our engagement with landowners before we progress to route protection.
- We will give the community regular updates as we progress.

When will anything be built?

- The focus of this programme over the next few years is on the strategic planning and land protection for Auckland’s future transport network.
- Construction will be timed to align with Auckland Council’s release of land suitable for urban development in 10, 20 and 30 years’ time.
However, as part of the government’s NZ Upgrade Programme we know some priority projects in southern Auckland are now funded and have indicative timeframes.

This includes:

- Mill Road – new connection from Manukau to Drury South (staged construction starts late 2022, with opening in stages from 2025/26)
- Papakura to Drury South – improvements to support growth (construction awarded mid-2020, construction starts late 2020, construction due for completion late 2025)
- Auckland rail – supporting urban and economic growth (electrification of the rail network from Papakura to Pukekohe: construction starts late 2020 and construction of two new stations at Drury starts 2023).

Why is Mill Road important?

- Mill Road will provide a safer, more reliable and accessible transport corridor to support residential and employment growth in southern Auckland.
- Key benefits include:
  - A local road from Manukau to the fast-growing town centres of Papakura and Drury, will be widened to four lanes and incorporated into the state highway system
  - Provides for regional and local trips, improving local access to future and existing urban areas
  - Maintains reliability for freight and inter-regional travel on SH1 by providing alternative options
  - Supports public transport routes and reduces congestion
  - Adds resilience to the strategic road network
  - Provides access to and between industrial land in Papakura and Drury South.

What will it cost?

- The overall programme will include more than 70 future transport projects within the four areas of Warkworth, north Auckland, northwest Auckland and southern Auckland. This will mean a significant transformation for the southern Auckland region over the next 30 years.
- Early estimates indicate the investment required for the programme is between $10-$15 billion. This will continue to be assessed as further requirements are investigated.
- Following the government’s NZ Upgrade Programme announcement on 29 January 2020, $3.48 billion has been committed to Auckland to support the transformation of our transport system to manage growth.
- In southern Auckland, $2.4 billion will be invested in roads and rail to unlock growth and future proof against congestion by building essential transport infrastructure first. This includes:
  - $1.4 billion to build Mill Road
  - $371 million to extend the electrified rail network to Pukekohe
  - $247 million for two new railway stations, a park and ride facility, and a bus and rail interchange at Drury.
**Attachment H**

**Item 13**

- $423 million to improve State Highway 1 between Papakura and Drury South.

**Paerata will have a park and ride, but the Drury stations won't?**
- We are looking at how the new proposed stations will operate together.
- The Drury Central station in the long term will be integrated within the town centre once it is developed. When it is initially developed it is likely it will include a park and ride, the scale and nature of it may change over time.
- Paerata Station will draw a large catchment from the west and to the south. These areas currently do not have good public transport connections, so it is likely to have a park and ride.

**Property Impacts**

**When will property impacts be known?**
- For landowners in the Drury area, we will be talking to property owners between 18 May and 12 June 2020. This timeframe gives us the ability to analyse feedback from engagement in December and January and to factor in any additional technical investigations which need to be carried out.
- In response to Covid-19 Level 4 alert, we cancelled our face-to-face community information days and pop-up events. Instead, we are encouraging landowners to book a phone call or online meeting with us to discuss the draft designation boundary and what this potentially means for their property.
- Landowners within the strategic and rail project areas will be invited to provide feedback on our preferred options between 18 May and 12 June 2020.
- Feedback will then be reviewed before completing any further technical investigations. We intend to be able to talk to property owners about potential impacts in July 2020.
- We are also asking and encouraging the wider community to provide feedback online, via post and email or to call us on 0800 GROW AKL.

**What is the land acquisition process and how long does it take?**
- We need to undertake detailed investigations and further refine what an upgrade might include, and/or narrow down study areas before we can understand the final impacts on any individual properties.
- Part of these investigations include meeting with property owners to understand how you use your property and any specific issues you think we need to be aware of.
- Once a designation is in place, property owners can continue to use, own, buy or sell their designated land for many years, right up until the requiring authority needs the land for construction. At that point, the requiring authority will contact property owners to begin purchase negotiations under the Public Works Act 1981.
- The majority of the Supporting Growth Programme’s designations are for projects that will not have funding for construction for another 10 to 30 years.
- The timeline for purchasing the land required is usually within a few years of the expected construction date.
Find out more in the [Property Owner Information](#) sheet and [Route Protection Information](#) sheet.

For landowner queries relating to a specific property, please direct to one of our Supporting Growth Engagement Managers:

- **Laura Christian:**
  Engagement Manager – Supporting Growth Alliance
  Phone: 027 607 2533
  Email: [laura.christian@supportinggrowth.nz](mailto:laura.christian@supportinggrowth.nz)

- **Manini Hallikeri:**
  Engagement Manager – Supporting Growth Alliance
  Phone: 021 538 269
  Email: [manini.hallikeri@supportinggrowth.nz](mailto:manini.hallikeri@supportinggrowth.nz)

- All landowner queries about specific properties will be directed to the relevant property team at Auckland Transport or Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency.

- Landowners can also call 0800 GROW AKL if they have any questions.

### NZ Upgrade Programme

**What does the NZ Upgrade Programme mean for southern Auckland?**

- NZ Upgrade transport investments recently announced by the government include an investment of $2.4 billion in roads and rail to unlock growth in southern Auckland. This will also support a new town at Drury, as well as further development at Paerata, Pukekohe and Karaka.

- This includes:
  - $1.4 billion to build Mill Road
  - $371 million to extend the electrified rail network to Pukekohe
  - $247 million for two new railway stations, a park and ride facility, and a bus and rail interchange at Drury
  - $423 million to improve State Highway 1 between Papakura and Drury South.

- Future planning for transport infrastructure will take place alongside housing development to create well-designed future communities, providing connections to public transport, walkways and cycleways.

**What are the expected delivery timeframes for these projects?**

- We are working with the construction industry on delivering the package, with delivery of projects from 2023 through to the end of this decade.
When does construction work start on these projects?
- Work to deliver these projects will be carried out from mid this year with stage two safety improvements on State Highway 58. It is also expected that by the end of this year work will have begun on the Papakura to Drury South improvements to support growth, two of the three Auckland rail projects and the rail upgrades to the north of Wellington.

Will delivering these projects be quicker, based on the growth levels in areas, such as Auckland?
- Our focus is on delivering these projects as quickly as possible to ensure these communities have access to safer and better transport services as they grow. We will be exploring with the construction industry the possibility of delivering some projects with 24/7 construction hours.
- This would need to be done in consultation with the communities that would be affected by this work. This programme brings forward the delivery timeframe for many of these projects.
- For more information on NZ Upgrade transport investments in southern Auckland and the timing of construction:
  - NZ Upgrade Programme - Auckland Package Rail
  - NZ Upgrade Programme – Auckland Package Mill Road
  - NZ Upgrade Programme – Auckland Package Papakura to Drury South

Project contact details
- [www.supportinggrowth.govt.nz/have-your-say/south](http://www.supportinggrowth.govt.nz/have-your-say/south)
- Supporting Growth Social Pinpoint page (live 14 May)
- 0800 GROW AKL (4769 255)
- info@supportinggrowth.nz

6. APPENDICIES:

Attachments 1-5: Projects:
- [Mill Road – Takanini, Papakura and Drury sections](#)
- [Pukenaho Expressway and connections to State Highway 22](#)
- Pukenaho Urban Arterial
- Rail upgrades and new stations at Drury Central, Drury West and Paerata
- Drury local road upgrades including safe, separated walking and cycling paths along Opāheke Road, Ponga Road and Waihoehoe Road.

Attachment 6: [Projects transforming the south](#)

Attachment 7: [Supporting Growth Alliance brochure](#)
Memorandum

To: Planning Committee
All local board members

CC: Megan Tyler – Chief of Strategy
Craig Hobbs – Director Regulatory Services
Ian Smallburn – General Manager Resource Consents

Subject: Covid-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Bill

From: John Duguid – General Manager Plans and Places
Ian Smallburn – General Manager Resource Consents

Contact information: John.duguid@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz or lan.smallburn@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose
1. The purpose of this memo is to advise members of the Planning Committee and local board members about the Government’s Covid-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Bill.

Summary
2. The Government has announced a major element of its COVID-19 rebuild plan with a law change that will fast track eligible development and infrastructure projects under the Resource Management Act.

3. The fast-track process is designed as a short-term intervention to help with economic recovery from COVID-19 and the legislation will be repealed in two years. Existing Treaty of Waitangi settlements will be upheld, as will sustainable management and existing RMA national direction.

4. Some large-scale Government-led projects, including those in the NZTA’s National Land Transport Programme, will be named in the legislation to go through the fast-track consent process. Some works by Government agencies will be able to start “as of right” (presumably without any form of resource consent). A number of “shovel-ready” projects identified by the Infrastructure Industry Reference Group are also likely to be accelerated under the fast-track consenting process.

5. The Minister for the Environment will determine which projects will enter the fast-track resource consenting process for public and private-led projects, with reference to criteria, and with projects named through Orders in Council. Designations for public assets and infrastructure can also be part of this fast-track process. The resource consent applications for these projects will be processed by an Expert Consenting Panel. Once a project is referred to the Panel there is a high level of certainty the resource consent will be granted.

6. The changes were approved by Cabinet last week and new legislation is expected to be passed in June. The bill has not yet been released.

7. The bill itself is on a fast-track process. As it travels through the legislative process, select committee hearings will be held and submissions will be invited on the new fast track consenting process. We expect this will occur in the next few weeks. A report and draft submission will be prepared for the Planning Committee or Emergency Committee as soon as the bill is released.
Context

8. The Government has announced a major element of its COVID-19 rebuild plan with a law change that will fast track eligible development and infrastructure projects under the Resource Management Act. The Government considers that the sorts of projects that would benefit from quicker consenting include roading, walking and cycling, rail, housing, sediment removal from silted rivers and estuaries, new wetland construction, flood management works, and projects to prevent landfill erosion. The changes were approved by Cabinet last week and new legislation is expected to be passed in June.

9. Minister for the Environment David Parker has stated that:

“We are acting quickly to get the economy moving again and our people working. Part 2 of the RMA will still be applied. Projects are being advanced in time, but environmental safeguards remain. We went hard and early to beat the virus and now we’re doing the same to get the economy moving too. The success of our health response gives us a head start on the world to get our economy moving again and this fast-tracking process will allow our economic recovery to accelerate. The consenting and approval processes that are used in normal circumstances don’t provide the speed and certainty we need now in response to the economic fallout from COVID-19. The new processes will get projects started sooner and people into jobs faster.

Investment in infrastructure is central to the Government’s economic plan to keep New Zealanders in jobs. We have already signalled major projects as part of the $12 billion New Zealand Upgrade project. Ideas from district and regional councils as well as NGOs and the private sector will be considered. Job-rich projects like new infrastructure, housing, and environmental restoration are crucial to the Government’s plan to stimulate the economy and help us recover from the damage caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Projects that help alleviate housing challenges, encourage active transport and enhance the environment are prioritised under the proposal.”

10. Some large-scale Government-led projects, including those in the NZTA’s National Land Transport Programme, will be named in the legislation to go through the fast-track consent process. Some works by Government agencies will be able to start “as of right” (presumably without any form of resource consent).

11. A number of “shovel-ready” projects identified by the Infrastructure Industry Reference Group are also likely to be accelerated under the fast-track consenting process.

12. The fast-track process is designed as a short-term intervention to help with economic recovery from COVID-19 and the legislation will be repealed in two years. Existing Treaty of Waitangi settlements will be upheld, as will sustainable management and existing RMA national direction.

13. The Minister for the Environment will determine which projects will enter the fast-track resource consenting process for public and private-led projects, with reference to criteria, and with projects named through Orders in Council. Designations for public assets and infrastructure can also be part of this fast-track process. The resource consent applications for these projects will be processed by an Expert Consenting Panel. Once a project is referred to the Panel there is a high level of certainty the resource consent will be granted.

14. The Expert Consenting Panels will be chaired by a current or retired Environmental Court Judge or senior lawyer. Each Panel will have a person nominated by the relevant local councils and a person nominated by the relevant iwi authorities. The Panels will have expertise in resource management, technical project advice, environmental protection, tikanga Māori and mātauranga Māori.

15. The Expert Consenting Panels will issue decisions within 25 working days after receiving comments on the application. This may be increased to 50 days for large scale projects. Appeal rights will be limited to points of law and/or judicial review to the High Court, with one further right of appeal to the Court of Appeal.
Discussion

16. The following initial comments are made based on what is known:

- The criteria for “eligible development” should be robust. Only projects that can demonstrate on a preliminary review, their ability to achieve positive economic, environmental and social outcomes, should be eligible. We have not seen the criteria yet.

- Existing Treaty settlements should be upheld. The Government has indicated this will be the case.

- The Expert Consenting Panels should have the appropriate depth and breadth of expertise relative to the project they are considering. The Government has indicated this will be the case.

- Councils and Mana Whenua should be able to make nominations for people to be appointed to the Expert Consenting Panels. The Government has indicated this will be the case.

- Strong environmental and social safeguards should be in place for the detailed assessment of projects. The Government has indicated this will be the case. However, a broad assessment against the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act is likely to be inadequate. Council plans (such as the Auckland Unitary Plan) reflect local circumstances, are the result of significant community involvement, and should be given weight in the overall assessment process. It is not clear whether this will be the case.

- Council’s and affected parties/members of the public should be able to make formal comments on projects being considered by the Expert Consenting Panels. The Government has indicated this will be the case, although the opportunities for public involvement are not clear.

- The Expert Consenting Panels should be required to respond to comments received and provide clear reasons for their decisions. It is not clear whether this will be the case.

Next Steps

17. The bill itself is on a fast-track process. As it travels through the legislative process, select committee hearings will be held and submissions will be invited on the new fast track consenting process. We expect this will occur in the next few weeks. A report and draft submission will be prepared for the Planning Committee or Emergency Committee as soon as the bill is released.

Attachments

Link to Cabinet Paper:
Memorandum

To: Planning Committee
From: Daniel Newcombe - Auckland Transport
Date: 26 May 2020
Subject: Access for Everyone – update

Purpose
1. This memo is to advise the committee of progress in the planning for the future implementation of the Access for Everyone (A4E) concept.

Discussion
2. The A4E concept, as part of the City Centre Masterplan, was adopted by the Planning Committee at its March 2020 meeting (PLA/2020/17) and it was agreed that the next step was for AT to undertake comprehensive investigations into the optimal implementation and supporting workstreams.

3. This will take the form of a Programme Business Case (PBC) into the issue, the scope of which has now been drafted by Auckland Transport (AT) and will shortly be released for tender by specialist transportation consultancies. Completing a PBC enables AT to seek future funding from the NZ Transport Agency.

4. The PBC commits AT to investigating the options for achieving the desired city centre outcomes (as identified in the CCMP and other strategic documents) and identify an optimal programme for implementation, including optimal timing of investments. The identified projects would then proceed as necessary to subsequent stages of more detailed investigation. The PBC is also likely to identify improvements to a range of ongoing workstreams (e.g. parking management, network optimisation, safety, travel behaviour change, etc.).

5. The primary outcomes sought by the PBC will be for an A4E implementation programme which:
   - enhances urban realm through greater space for people within the city centre street network
   - provides better access and reliability to the city centre through public transport
   - has safer streets for walking and cycling
   - improves air quality (in the form of a Zero Emissions Area within the Queen St valley – e.g. use of electrical buses).

6. Expected secondary outcomes include greater economic activity in the city centre and healthier city centre residents.

7. The scope of work for the PBC includes:
   7.1 Confirmation of the Strategic Case
   7.2 Developing the Programme, including workshops with stakeholders (internal, NZTA, Council and external, including iw).
      a. Identify potential programmes, including developing alternatives, and assessing against project objectives and other relevant criteria
      b. Identify issues, risks and mitigations, dependencies and challenges.
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7.3 Preferred Programme identification
   c. Assess options against relevant criteria and engaging with stakeholders
   d. Identify optimal phasing/staging (internal and external dependencies) of the preferred programme

7.4 Sensitivity analysis of various post-Covid 19 scenarios.

8. The PBC will include data gathered from emerging Queen Street pilot, and is also expected to include:
   • Legal analysis and recommendations from examples of legislative mechanisms used for innovative street treatments/closures/restrictions (using AT and NZTA existing legal advice)
   • How an access management regime can be implemented
   • Advice on pilots or trials to test concepts
   • Engagement recommendations in terms of meeting legal requirements
   • Traffic modelling – network options, mode share options, traffic volume options, pricing options, parking options
   • Possible stages or dependencies on other projects
   • Supporting programme identification.

Next Steps

9. Based on initial investigations undertaken in 2019, items in support of A4E have been submitted for funding in the development of the Regional Land Transport Programme 2021-31. This puts in place indicative future funding items that the PBC can then provide the basis for.

10. As the PBC develops, progress will be reported to the committee. It is anticipated that the PBC will take six to nine months to complete.
Memorandum

To: Planning Committee
From: Daniel Newcombe - Auckland Transport
Date: 26 May 2020
Subject: Queen Street Access for Everyone pilot – project update

Purpose

1. This memo is to advise the committee of planning for a pilot of Access for Everyone (A4E) principles on Queen Street, and the relationship with the emergency works in response to Covid-19.

Context

2. The A4E concept, as part of the City Centre Masterplan, was adopted by the Planning Committee at its March meeting and at the same time a Queen Street pilot was also requested for implementation by March 2021 [PLA/2020/18].

3. After discussions with Council teams, it was agreed that Auckland Transport (AT) will lead this pilot, for a number of reasons:
   - AT is undertaking the overarching business case into the implementation of A4E
   - the need for the pilot to maintain key transport operational requirements on Queen St (e.g. reliable bus travel, safe crossings, etc.)
   - most of the likely pilot elements (e.g. vehicle movement and parking restrictions) are the responsibility of AT
   - AT has existing funding arrangements with NZTA, which is useful for upcoming funding opportunities
   - AT has project management resource available and sufficient initial budget to commence scoping work.

4. The pilot will be overseen by a steering group consisting of Auckland Design Office, Development Programme Office, NZTA and AT staff. Initial involvement has also been sought from Heart of the City, in a similar way to the recent High Street pilot.

5. Funding is being sought from NZTA’s new Innovating Streets contestable fund, which was recently established to encourage trials of temporary street treatments to improve walking, cycling and urban amenity. An application has been made for $1million but at time of writing a decision by NZTA was not known.

6. Endorsement in principle has been sought from the Auckland City Centre Advisory Board for pilot to also be part-funded from the Targeted Rate budget item: City Centre Business Case Development Programme (Access for Everyone Concept Investigation). The expectation is that $600,000 from the 2020/2021 allocation will be needed. This funding will support the co-design and engagement process with stakeholders, as well as contribute to the actual installation and on monitoring of treatments (albeit the form and scale of these won’t be developed until the co-design process).

7. Whilst the definitive scope and objectives of the pilot are still being confirmed, it is expected to cover the extent of Queen Street between Mayoral Drive and Customs Street and require the retention of bus services currently diverted by City Rail Link works. The key intent is to trial ways of reducing traffic on Queen Street and improve the amenity for pedestrians, in a way that informs future investigations into a wider implementation of the A4E concept.
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8. The pilot will obviously build upon the recently installed physical distancing areas in response to Covid-19. These were completed as emergency works, but the pilot project team have agreed to transition the works into the pilot workstream. This will allow fuller monitoring and engagement to occur. It is expected that over time elements of the temporary treatment will be improved in various ways to respond to public feedback or business needs, including adjusting to the requirements of the emerging post-Covid-19 situation.

Image: Emergency works on Queen St in response to Covid-19 physical distancing needs.

The expectation is that the pilot will result in:

- Reduced traffic on Queen Street
- Improved space and amenity for pedestrians
- More reliable bus services
- Maintained access for business operations and disabled users.

Next Steps

9. Pending a decision from the Innovating Streets contestable fund, the Queen Street pilot co-design process will commence.

10. More details will be brought to the committee as the pilot progresses through the co-design process.
Memorandum

To: Planning Committee
Cc: Environment and Climate Change Committee; Local Boards

Subject: Auckland Council submission on the proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standard for the Outdoor Storage of Tyres

From: Dee Isaacs, Principal Planner – Plans and Places, Chief Planning Office

Purpose

1. To provide elected members with the submission response prepared by council staff on the proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standard for the Outdoor Storage of Tyres (NESOST).

Summary

2. This was the second round of consultation on the outdoor storage of tyres. Following the Ministry’s consideration of the responses to the first consultation in 2017, further views were sought on three main matters:
   - Whether responsibility for outdoor storage of tyres should sit with regional or local councils.
   - Thresholds for resource consents.
   - Exemptions for tyres used for farm silage purposes.

3. The technical nature of the responses and the submission closing date (being in the Level 4 period of the CoVid 19 response) meant that it was considered necessary for this to be a staff submission.

4. The proposed date for NES completion and gazettal is by August 2020. The NES will come in to force at least 28 days after it is gazetted.

5. When the NES becomes operative (under the Resource Management Act 1991), there is a period of six months for affected people to apply for the relevant resource consent(s).

Discussion

6. When tyres reach their end of life there is a lack of appropriate and safe disposal mechanisms for them. The proposed amendments to the NESOST seek to ensure that the risks to the environment, human health and local communities from outdoor tyre storage are appropriately managed. The Ministry for the Environment (MfE) are also seeking to support more consistent management practices across New Zealand, including filling gaps in the regulatory framework to create incentives to move tyres between regions. This will assist with the management of and re-use of stored tyres.

7. The initial proposed NESOST was consulted on in August 2017, with most respondents (including submissions from Auckland Council Landfill, Consents and Waste Solutions staff) supporting the introduction of an NES to address outdoor tyre storage. In particular the two council staff submissions supported consenting requirements for stockpiling of tyres, data sharing amongst councils, and managing the lifecycle of tyres and their entry into the waste tyre market.
8. MFE released their proposed amendments to the NESOST in February 2020. This second proposal seeks three variations to the original NESOST proposal. The proposed amendments seek to encourage improved management of the outdoor storage of tyres, in a manner that enables people and communities to provide for their economic wellbeing while avoiding and mitigating adverse effects on the environment from this activity. The technical nature of the responses and the submission closing date being during the Level 4 period of the Covid-19 response meant that it was considered necessary for this to be a staff submission, and not be reported to a Committee (at that time the Emergency Committee was the only Committee that was meeting).

9. The consultation document posed nine questions. The council staff response to each of these questions is set out in the attached submission (refer Attachment 1). The questions focussed on the following areas:
   - Whether responsibility for the NESOST should sit with regional councils rather than district councils.
   - Whether there is support for a resource consent threshold for the outdoor storage of tyres below 200 cubic metres.
   - Whether there is support for the addition of a proposed permitted activity rule, as long as certain requirements are met.
   - Whether there is support for indicative requirements for outdoor tyre storage with a minimum volume of 40 cubic metres up to either 100 or 200 cubic metres per site.
   - Whether council provides greater support for the 100 cubic metre option for setting the resource consent threshold.
   - How would the proposed options affect your organisation.
   - Whether the scope of the proposed NESOST should be extended to include indoor tyre storage.
   - Whether councils agree with the proposed exemption from the resource consent requirement for farm silage tyres.
   - Any other comments on other aspects of the proposed NES.

10. Preparation of the submission was affected by the Covid-19 response. Consequently there was no opportunity to seek input to the council staff submission from mana whenua and local boards.

11. The submission deadline was initially 8 April 2020, but was extended by MFE in response to Covid-19 response.

12. John Duguid, General Manager, Plans and Places, approved the staff comments. Council staff then submitted the comments on 11 May 2020.

Auckland Unitary Plan Provisions

13. The content which informed this submission is managed in the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in part (Plan):
   - The discharge of contaminants from the storage of tyres is addressed in Chapter E33 Industrial and Trade Activities of the Plan.
   - Other activities related to tyres can also require management by the Plan, such as:
     - Chapter E13 Clean fill, managed fills and landfills – these requirements will apply if tyres are disposed of into these facilities.
     - Chapter E14 Air Quality - this will apply when tyres are burnt (a common farming practice).
     - Chapter E30 Contaminated land – This is relevant if contaminated tyres are disposed of.

Next Steps

14. The submissions from across New Zealand will be analysed by MFE, then recommendations will be made to the Minister and Associate Minister for the Environment.
15. The Government will then make policy decisions on the NES and a Regulatory Impact Statement and an analysis under section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991 will be completed.

16. The proposed date for NES completion and gazetted is August 2020. The NES will come in to force at least 28 days after it is gazetted.

17. When the NES becomes operative (under section 20A(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991), there is a period of six months for affected persons to apply for the relevant resource consent(s).

18. These further steps will be directed by MfE, and the Committee will be informed when this occurs.

Attachments

Auckland Council Submission on the Proposed Amendments to the National Environmental Standard for the Outdoor Storage of Tyres.

14 April 2020

SUBMISSION on ‘A Proposed National Environmental Standard for Outdoor Storage of Tyres’

https://www.mfe.govt.nz/consultations/outdoor-storage-tyres

1. Do you agree with responsibility for the NES sitting with regional councils rather than district councils? Why?

There is agreement in principle that the NES specifically addresses discharges to land, water and air, which regional councils are more likely to be involved with (sections 15 and section 30 of the RMA). There are a number of requirements under both permitted and restricted discretionary status that are more akin with what would typically be addressed through district plans (size, location, proximity to site boundaries etc). If the purpose of NES is to manage discharges, rather than fire, nuisance, environmental health, then yes, regional councils are the correct agency to take on this responsibility. As a result, the subject matter experts generally reside within regional councils.

Despite this, there is also support for the proposal that there must be clear guidance on how district councils will manage certain activities that fall within their mandate; particularly in urban areas where risks to human health may be more significant than risks to the environment.

2. Do you support having a resource consent threshold for the outdoor storage of tyres below the previously proposed 200m³? Why?

Yes. We consider that leaching of contaminants from tyre stockpiles can lead to contaminated sites and that a more permissive threshold may result in long lasting effects on land and surrounding water bodies that are difficult to address and resolve in the current framework. Having a lower threshold enables councils to more effectively cost recover from the monitoring and enforcement of these activities and should result in fewer tyre storage sites that result in the creation of contaminated land.

We also consider that a lower threshold is more likely to discourage the use of the permitted activity thresholds as permitted ‘dumping’ volumes, which may result in contaminated land.

However, we consider that there should be separate (and lower) thresholds for the storage of shredded/crumbed tyres, as water moving through these types of stockpiles has a significantly higher leaching potential. We consider that a comparatively smaller stockpile of shredded/crumbed tyre is more likely to lead to long term ground contamination than larger whole tyre storage, and that the regulation should reflect this.

The rationale for these proposed thresholds is unclear, the document does not investigate to any great extent the details of the reduction.
3. Do you support the addition of a proposed permitted activity rule with requirements?  
Why/why not?
Yes. We consider that there is a need for a permitted activity rule to ensure and enforce expectations around tyre storage that may still have potential for long term ground contamination. The proposed permitted activity requirements (a) height and (b) bunded area, would require some form of monitoring (see 4 below). The definitions and wording of this permitted activity rule must be unambiguous in order to enable policy effectiveness.

However, we note that 40m3 is still likely to represent around 500 passenger tyre equivalents. We consider that storage of this volume may still have potential to have significant adverse effects, particularly in sensitive or vulnerable areas and soils. We need to ensure that the PA volume is not sufficiently large that it becomes a ‘pollute up to’ or ‘dispose up to’ volume. We are not sure that 500 tyres is sufficiently small enough.

4. Do you have any suggestions on the indicative requirements in Table 1?
We generally approve of the indicative requirements, except for the exclusion under (e) of not having to have any setbacks if impervious surfaces and bunds are provided. We do not consider that in all cases this will be sufficiently protective. With specific regard to (e), if an area is sealed and bunded, how will councils know that bundwater discharge is disposed of correctly? A level of monitoring is thus required, which puts that requirement beyond being a permitted activity. Additionally, if the banded area is covered to prevent rainwater entry will this then be considered indoors/a building (and potentially exempt from the proposed NES, notwithstanding comments later in the document)?

We also consider that better consistency could be made in the following:
- Incorporation of the Fire and Emergency Services requirements for tyre storage
- Incorporation of the setback distances already implemented in the Waikato Regional Council Guidance for storage and stockpiling of end of life tyres for local government’ (100m for freshwater and 250m for coastal areas). We do not consider that set back distances of 20m are sufficient buffers for the protection of water and sediment quality.
- Consideration of Waikato District Health Board concerns regarding the re introduction of the saltmarsh mosquito; for which tyres would provide a suitable habit (i.e. implement a larger coastal setback).
- Incorporation (at least in guidance given its relevance to district council functions) of setbacks from sensitive human receptors such as schools, hospitals, marae or rest homes.

5. Which of the options (200m³ or 100m³) for setting a resource consent threshold do you support? Why?
100m³. This is because the leaching, fire and pest risks associated with a stockpile of this size are significantly less than for a 200m³ stockpile.

With the options set out in the document, a lower threshold would be a better option for addressing and capturing a number of operators that would otherwise be addressed under the NES. A pervading question is how this threshold relates to a predetermined volume of tyres resulting in adversely affected water quality remains. If it is deemed that whichever threshold is directly related to an adverse effect on water quality, Auckland Council would incorporate that threshold as the point at which a site would no longer meet our Industrial and Trade Activities permitted activity discharge standard. That said, the lower threshold used for permitted activity under the proposed NES would seem to indicate that the threshold for this effect is 40m³.
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If Auckland Council discovered adversely affected water quality, irrespective of tyre pile size or NES thresholds, our permitted discharge standards would be considered breached and so resource consent would be required to mitigate that.

6. **How would the proposed options affect your business/organisation?**

We support the objective of ensuring a reduction in the creation of new contaminated sites; which we consider this NES would achieve.

Additional resource consent triggers are considerations within the consenting process. Arguably the higher threshold would aid in implementing our industrial and trade discharge provisions.

7. **Do you think the scope of the proposed NES should be extended to include indoor tyre storage? Why/why not?**

Yes, because of the rules that relate to fire hazards and the potential use of buildings to meet the permitted activity rules. However, this would then negate the discharge aspects, which swings the implementation back towards district councils.

Although at first glance indoor tyre storage appears less likely to have the potential to result in contaminated land; we consider that the effects of an indoor tyre fire are just as great. Indoor tyre fires may often be in built up areas and have greater effects on nearby land users. Warehouse storage of tyres may not have sprinkler systems installed, and firewater runoff via overland flow or stormwater systems has significant potential to contaminate land and sediment in both rural and urban waterways.

We also consider that having an NES which expressly excludes indoor tyre storage may simply result in the re-purposing of derelict warehouse for tyre storage; which is harder for monitoring and compliance agencies to detect.

8. **Do you agree with the proposed exemption from the resource consent requirement for farm silage tyres? Why/why not?**

No. Councils are already trying to manage the effects of farm landfills, which are largely unregulated. If farm silage tyres are exempt it may encourage the use of farms as disposal areas for end of life tyres. Waste tyres have an adverse effect on the environment, regardless of the over-arching activity they are a part of. Inappropriate use of end of life tyres on farms have included holding up culvert crossings and eroding riverbanks. We consider that the permitted activity status will allow sufficient numbers of tyres for almost all conceivable silage stacks, and that an accompanying product stewardship scheme should support farmers to be responsible with their use of end of life tyres.

9. **Do you have comments on the other aspects of the proposed NES?**

- We consider that this NES should state that the burying of tyres is a discretionary activity in order to provide consistency with RMA and regional plan requirements.
- We reinforce the critical importance of an accompanying product stewardship scheme for end of life tyres which will support and enable the effectiveness of this proposal.
- We would like the guidance document to provide best practice measures for the storage of end of life tyres in order to reduce potential for the creation of contaminated land.
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Memorandum

To: Planning Committee members

Subject: National Environmental Standard for Marine Aquaculture

From: Sietsie Bouma (Auckland Plan Strategy and Research)  
Kath Coombes (Plans and Places)  
Alan Moore & Kala Sivaguru (Regulatory Services)  
Samantha Happy (Environmental Services)

Contact information: Planning aspects: Kath.Coombes@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz  
Biosecurity aspects: Sam.Happy@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose
1. To inform members of the Planning Committee about the National Environmental Standard for Marine Aquaculture, expected to be gazetted in July or August 2020.

Summary
2. Government has a national goal for aquaculture to become a $3 billion industry by 2035. However, most coastal permits needed to operate the 1,149 existing marine farms found nationally expire at the end of 2024.

3. In the Auckland region there are currently around 80 active marine farms distributed across the Firth of Thames, Great Barrier Island, Kaipara Harbour, Mahurangi Harbour and Waiheke Island. The bulk of the consents for these active marine farms (around 60 farms) expire on 31 December 2024.

4. A National Environmental Standard for Marine Aquaculture (NES-MA) has been under development since 2016 with a purpose to address inconsistency and uncertainty in the management of existing marine farms under the RMA.

5. Auckland Council prepared a submission on the draft NES-MA in 2017 and Auckland Council staff provided an officer-level response to the exposure draft of the NES-MA in May 2020. The exposure draft was prepared following Cabinet approval of the policy directions in July 2019.

6. The NES-MA only applies to applications for replacement coastal permits for existing farms. Applications for new marine farms, farm extensions or re-alignment of farms within outstanding areas in the Auckland region will continue to be assessed under the policy framework provided by the Auckland Unitary Plan.

7. The NES-MA establishes that replacement coastal permits are a restricted discretionary activity. This is the same activity status as in the Auckland Unitary Plan. The NES-MA also requires that all marine farms have a Biosecurity Management Plan.

8. Key implications of the proposed regulations for Auckland Council are that they:
   - would limit Auckland Council’s ability to consider the full range of potential effects included in Auckland Council’s Unitary Plan. The range of potential effects that can be considered for replacement coastal permits processed under the proposed NES-MA is narrower
   - would require Auckland Council (and consent applicants) to spend significant resources associated with the development and implementation of Biosecurity Management Plans.
9. Following gazettal of the final regulations, which is expected in July or August 2020, Auckland Council will need to amend the relevant sections of the Auckland Unitary Plan to note that consents will be processed under the NES-MA, not the Unitary Plan. This is not a RMA Schedule 1 process and will not require public consultation or committee approval.

Context

A National Environmental Standard for Marine Aquaculture

10. Marine aquaculture is a significant component of New Zealand’s primary sector, employing around 3,000 people nationwide and generating $800+ million in revenue in 2018.

11. Recognising the potential for aquaculture to further enrich New Zealand’s economy the Government released ‘The New Zealand Government Aquaculture Strategy’ in September 2019. This strategy sets outcomes for a sustainable, productive, resilient, and inclusive aquaculture industry with a goal for the aquaculture industry to become a $3 billion industry by 2035.

12. Most resource consents, called coastal permits¹, needed to operate the existing 1,149 farms across the nation will expire at the end of 2024². Marine farmers must apply for a replacement coastal permit to continue their activities.

13. Current rules for considering applications for replacement coastal permits are inconsistent between regions and there is also potential for inconsistency in the robustness of environmental impact assessments. This creates uncertainty for farmers, potentially compromising the desired growth of the industry.

14. An efficient regulatory framework for applications for replacement coastal permits that encourages investment is essential for continuation of existing marine aquaculture activities.

15. Following direction from the previous Government in 2015 officials from the Ministry for Primary Industries, the Ministry for the Environment and the Department of Conservation considered options to address inconsistency and uncertainty in the management of existing marine farms under the RMA. They recommended development of a National Environmental Standard for Marine Aquaculture (NES-MA).

Process to date

16. The process for the development of the NES-MA to date is outlined below:

- **2015** – Government direction to consider options to address inconsistency and uncertainty in the management of existing marine farms under the RMA with a policy objective to “develop a more consistent and efficient regional planning framework for the management of existing marine aquaculture activities and on-farm biosecurity management, while supporting aquaculture within sustainable environmental limits”

- **2016/2017** – development of a proposed Standard with input from a newly established aquaculture reference group comprising members of the aquaculture industry, regional councils, Te Ohu Kaimoana Trustee Limited and the Environmental Defence Society

- **June to August 2017** – consultation on the proposed standard with public and all iwi authorities

- **Late 2017** – consultation with an iwi reference group convened by Te Ohu Kaimoana³ on specific provisions that recognise tangata whenua values in the coastal environment

- **April 2018** – summary of the 107 submissions released

¹ Coastal permits have two functions: they grant a right to occupy space in the coastal marine area to the exclusion of most other uses, and they establish conditions to manage the environmental effects of the farm.

² Most existing farms were authorised prior to the RMA coming into force, primarily under the Marine Farming Act 1971. An amendment to the RMA in 2004 deemed these existing leases and licences to be RMA resource consents with a term of 20 years.

³ The iwi reference group included representatives from iwi in Northland, Auckland, Waikato, Bay of Plenty, Tasman, Marlborough, Canterbury and Southland.
• **2018-2019** – refinement of the proposal to address issues raised during consultation and better align with this Government’s priorities

• **July 2019** – Cabinet approval of final policy provisions of the proposed standard

• **April/May 2020** – confidential release of an exposure draft of the regulations to key parties including some councils requesting feedback on whether the regulations are clear and unambiguous and if they will work in practice.

**Discussion**

**Marine aquaculture in the Auckland region**

17. There are 80 active marine farms in Auckland that are distributed across the Firth of Thames (19% of total number), Great Barrier Island (10%), Kaipara Harbour (5%), Mahurangi Harbour (55%) and Waiheke Island (11%).

18. Most consents for active marine farms in the Auckland region expire on 31 December 2024 (around 60 farms).

19. Green-lipped mussel and Pacific oyster farming prevail in the Auckland region. Of the 320ha used for marine aquaculture farming, 60% is used for Pacific oyster farming, 29% is used for green-lipped mussel farming and 11% is used for marine farms which contain both species. Auckland has no finfish farms in the coastal marine area.

20. The Auckland region is not the largest regional aquaculture producer in New Zealand, but produces around a third of the total production of New Zealand Pacific oysters and a minor portion of the total production of New Zealand green-lipped mussels.

21. In 2009 the aquaculture industry contributed $72 million of output to Auckland’s economy. This figure includes aquaculture farming and processing.

22. Auckland Council recently (in 2019) granted coastal permits for three large mussel farms in the Firth of Thames (644ha, 128ha and 131ha) and is currently progressing applications for a new 221ha mussel farm east of Ponui Island and an application for an oyster farm extension offshore of Clevedon-Kawakawa Road.

**Approach to Aquaculture within the Auckland Unitary Plan**

23. The Auckland Unitary Plan policy framework (chapter F2.15) requires that new aquaculture be located and designed to avoid adverse effects on various listed values, and provides for the continued operation of established aquaculture where the adverse effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated. The Plan does not include zones or areas for aquaculture.

24. The policy approach is directive in terms of avoiding adverse effects on the values of identified areas (mapped as ‘overlays’), for both new aquaculture and for re-consenting established aquaculture areas. The values identified by the overlays reflect the matters of national importance in section 6 of the Resource Management Act (RMA), and give effect to policies 2, 11, 13, 15 and 17 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS). The overlays are identified as follows:

   a) D9 Significant Ecological Areas Overlay – Marine 1 and 2
   b) D17 Historic Heritage Overlay
   c) D21 Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua Overlay
   d) D11 Outstanding Natural Character and High Natural Character overlays, and
   e) D10 Outstanding Natural Features Overlay; and Outstanding Natural Landscapes Overlay.

---

25. The rules relating to aquaculture are primarily within Table F2.19.19 of the Auckland Unitary Plan. Generally, the council’s approach to aquaculture is to have a more restrictive activity status within the overlays than other areas. For re-consenting an established aquaculture activity, the activity status is restricted discretionary both within overlays and in other areas.

26. All aquaculture activities in the Auckland Unitary Plan are subject to the standard RMA test for public notification.

Auckland Council’s submission on the proposed NES-MA in 2017

27. The Planning Committee approved Auckland Council’s draft submission on the proposed NES-MA at its 1 August 2017 meeting. In summary the submission:

- supported the objective of the proposed standard to achieve efficient and consistent re-consenting of existing marine farms nationally and for a coordinated and effective framework to manage biosecurity risks from marine farms
- supported the restricted discretionary activity classification for re-consenting activities
- sought application of the standard Resource Management Act (RMA) tests for notification
- sought expansion of the matters of discretion to include for example considerations related to high natural character areas, significant ecological areas, water quality, mana whenua values and ecology of the wider area
- advocated for a Domestic Marine Pathway Management Plan to manage the risk of inter-regional vector movements that the on-farm Biosecurity Management Plans would not adequately address
- noted concerns with implementation of the Biosecurity Management Plans, including the lack of capability in both industry and regional councils to support effective implementation and the delayed timeframe for requiring Biosecurity Management Plans to be in place.

Exposure draft of the NES-MA and Auckland Council’s officer-level response in May 2020

28. Following refinement of the proposed Standard post consultation in 2017 Cabinet approved the policy directions in July 2019. In summary the Standard:

- makes applications for replacement consents for existing marine farms a restricted discretionary activity, including opportunities for small-scale re-alignments and changes in approved species sought to be farmed, provided the area has not been identified as inappropriate for aquaculture in a regional coastal plan
- specifies matters of discretion, which address environmental effects of aquaculture
- precludes public or limited notification for most replacement consent applications, except of affected tangata whenua, and where special circumstances and other RMA notification exceptions apply (sections 95A and 95B). Councils follow the normal statutory tests under the RMA to determine whether to notify replacement consent applications that include realignment, species changes that require changes in surface structures and/or involve finfish, and any applications in areas that the councils have determined to be inappropriate for aquaculture
- requires pre-application consultation by the applicant to identify and consider tangata whenua values in deciding replacement consent applications. Where this consultation does not occur, a broader matter of discretion on tangata whenua values applies and limited notification is not precluded, so that iwi can submit on the application
- clarifies that consideration of the effects of an existing marine farm on an outstanding area is limited to farms that are partially or fully within an outstanding area
- enables a change to the location of an existing marine farm by up to one third of the farm area, to address adverse environmental effects associated with the existing location. Farms larger than 10 hectares and those that use supplementary feeding (i.e. finfish farms) do not qualify for this provision
enables farms to change the species farmed. Four categories of species changes would be recognised, with specific matters of discretion to manage the effects created by the species to be added or any changes to farm structures, and notification requirements for each type of species change.

- allows councils, through their regional coastal plans, to set activity status for consent applications for existing marine farms that are more lenient than the proposed standard.
- In areas where, after 1 January 2019, regional councils have determined that aquaculture is inappropriate through their regional coastal plan, sets a discretionary activity status for replacement consent applications and allows councils to set an activity status that is more stringent.
- requires that regional councils only grant a resource consent for a marine farm (whether an existing farm or a new application) where a biosecurity management plan has been lodged and assessed by the regional council as meeting the criteria specified in the technical biosecurity document developed by Fisheries New Zealand.
- for existing consents that do not expire before 31 January 2025, requires councils to review the consent before that date to implement a biosecurity management plan.

29. Following approval of the policy directions, staff from the Ministry for Primary Industries prepared an exposure draft of the NES-MA. Key stakeholders were asked to provide feedback on the draft regulations in April 2020 in order to ensure that the regulations are clear and unambiguous and if they will work in practice.

30. Auckland Council staff provided an officer-level response (technical assessment) to the exposure draft of the NES-MA on 1 May 2020 and more detailed feedback on the biosecurity regulations including a technical reference document on 13 May 2020. A high level summary of these responses is provided in Attachment 1.

Implications for Auckland Council

31. The NES-MA only applies to applications for replacement coastal permits for existing farms. Applications for new marine farms, farm extensions or re-alignment of farms within outstanding areas in the Auckland region will continue to be assessed under Auckland Council’s Unitary Plan policy framework.

32. Key implications of the proposed regulations for Auckland Council are that they:
- would limit Auckland Council’s ability to consider the full range of potential effects included in Auckland Council’s Unitary Plan. The range of potential effects that can be considered for replacement coastal permits processed under the NES-MA is narrower.
- would require Auckland Council to spend significant resources associated with the development and implementation of Biosecurity Management Plans for both existing and new marine farms. Some costs will be charged to consent applicants, but Auckland Council would for example have to spend significant resources to:
  - assess biosecurity management plans submitted with new and replacement consent applications
  - review consents expiring after 2025 to add biosecurity management plan requirements
  - carry out ongoing monitoring and compliance activities to ensure biosecurity management plans are implemented.

Next steps

33. Following gazettal of the final regulations, which is expected in July or August 2020, Auckland Council will amend the relevant sections of the Auckland Unitary Plan to note that consents will be processed under the NES-MA, not the Unitary Plan. This is not a RMA Schedule 1 process and will not require public consultation or committee approval.
Attachments

Attachment 1. High level summary of Auckland Council’s officer-level response to the exposure draft of the NES-MA

Overarching comment

Staff expressed their view that the regulations are very complex and complicated making the regulations hard to follow and requiring quite a lot of time to understand. The regulations have sections that seem very unclear because they refer to several other parts of the regulation and there are regulations that duplicate earlier regulations so much that it is hard to identify any differences.

Interpretation and definitions

Staff suggested changes to definitions to better align with RMA terminology and requirements (e.g. definitions and meaning of benthic environment, marine farm, replacement coastal permit), definitions used in Auckland’s Unitary Plan (e.g. definitions of adaptive management and outstanding area) and definitions developed and used by subject matter experts (e.g. definition of biogenic habitat).

Pre-application consultation with tangata whenua

Staff identified the need to clarify pre-consultation requirements with tangata whenua and simplify the regulations by explaining these requirements once rather than covering and duplicating these in numerous regulations and a schedule.

Staff expressed their view that the applicant should provide more information to iwi than currently proposed by the regulations. At present this is limited to a description of the marine farming activity and the co-ordinates of the area within which that marine farming is to be undertaken.

Matters of discretion covering different types of replacement consent applications

Staff recommended:

- that the matters of discretion for all replacement consent applications should be expanded to include consideration of cumulative effects, water quality and phytoplankton density effects, existing investment and positive effects, exclusive occupation and coastal processes
- to expand the matters of discretion for an application for the realignment of an existing farm to include consideration of effects on existing uses, landscape values, visual effects, hydrodynamics and ecology
- to expand the matters of discretion for an application for a change in consented species but no change in structures to be able to consider potential ecological effects of farmed species that are broader than genetic effects on wild populations in case of farmed species escaping and impacts on biogenic habitats particularly if the farmed species was an exotic species such as the seaweed Undaria

Staff also noted that some matters of discretion are unclear and open for different interpretations and recommended that these be clarified.

Biosecurity management plans

Staff identified significant issues with the technical document related to the development and implementation of biosecurity management plans that should be addressed before that part of the regulations commences.

Staff noted that Auckland Council would have to spend significant resources associated with the development and implementation of Biosecurity Management Plans and re-iterated the need for a Domestic Marine Pathway Management Plan to address the risk of inter-regional vector movement.

Guidance to support implementation

Staff identified the following guidance to be useful to support implementation of the regulations:

- guidance on adaptive management and acceptable changes (e.g. what are environmental limits)
- guidance on the process and resource requirements for assessment of biosecurity plans
- guidance on appropriate consent duration (the Act allows for 20 to 35 years)
- guidance on the wording of notes to include in regional coastal plans
- guidance on how the NES will apply to consent applications under RMA section 124C ‘Applications by persons who are not existing holders of resource consents’ in terms of the process requirements.
Memo

To: Auckland Council Planning Committee; Henderson-Massey, Upper Harbour and Rodney Local Board members; Members of Parliament - The Hon Paula Bennett (Upper Harbour) and Chris Penk (Helensville)

From: Kara Hartshorne, North West Engagement Lead, Supporting Growth Programme

Date: 26 May 2020

Subject: Update on Supporting Growth Programme – route protection projects in northwest Auckland

Kia ora koutou

This memo provides an update on the work of the Supporting Growth Programme with regard to planning future transport infrastructure in Auckland’s northwest.

About the Supporting Growth Programme
The Supporting Growth Programme is a collaboration between Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport to plan future transport networks and protect the land that will be required to support Auckland’s urban growth over the next 30 years. This includes identifying and protecting the land needed for transport connections in Redhills, Whenuapai, Kumeū-Huapai and Riverhead.

A recap of 2019 work
In July 2019, we released an Indicative Strategic Transport Network for the northwest, following technical assessments, engagement with programme partners, stakeholders and communities. The network included the following transport connections:

- A new rapid transit corridor between Westgate and Kumeū-Huapai
- A strategic walking and cycling corridor connecting Whenuapai to Kumeū-Huapai.
- An alternative route south of Kumeū-Huapai town centre from Brigham Creek Road to Waimauku to reduce pressure on the existing State Highway 16.
- Upgraded roads in the Kumeū-Huapai and Riverhead areas to improve accessibility.
- Improvements to existing roads and new arterials in the Whenuapai and Redhills areas.

At this time, we sent letters to around 300 landowners who were within a corridor study area for one of the new transport connections, such as the Alternative State Highway Corridor (around 230 landowners). We explained this did not necessarily mean their property would be impacted, as the corridors had yet to be substantially refined.

Next steps
This week, we are mailing a letter to the same group, updating them on the status of the project that relates to their property and outlining the next steps and timeframes. We have
appreciated their patience in the interim as we have worked towards the next stages of these projects, which experienced a delay in recent months due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

These letters are attached.

As other projects within the Indicative Strategic Transport Network are progressed this year, we will write to each group of landowners in turn.

At the same time, we will continue to engage with stakeholders and partners such as Manawhenua, Auckland Council, KiwiRail, NZ Defence Force, Ministry of Education, Kainga Ora, utility providers and developers to ensure we are working together and achieving the best outcomes for the community.

Detailed next steps
During 2020, we are focused on refining the study areas and identifying a preferred route for each of these projects. This work includes investigations of the land in the area, which may mean we need to carry out site walkovers, drone flyovers and other investigations. No onsite investigation work will be carried out until after any Covid-19 restrictions are lifted.

Between mid and late 2020, we expect to have identified the preferred routes for all projects. During this period, we will ask to meet with landowners who have property within the location of these routes, seeking information on how they use the land and any special characteristics or features we should be aware of. If we have identified that a property isn’t directly affected by the preferred route, we’ll confirm this to the landowner at this time.

In early 2021, we will submit two Detailed Business Cases to Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport for approval. Based on our current programme, we expect to be able to confirm a preferred alignment for route protection in mid-2021. This will provide the remaining landowners with certainty around whether their property, or any portion of it, is likely to be affected.

We will then begin the route protection (designation) process, which we expect may take up to two years.

Construction timing
Construction will be timed to align with Auckland Council’s release of land suitable for urban development in 10, 20 and 30 years’ time. However, the Alternative State Highway is expected to be progressed for construction in line with Auckland Council’s anticipated rezoning and land release timeframes of the wider Kumeu-Huapai future growth areas, which are planned to be ‘development ready’ by 2028-2032.

Other upgrades to improve SH16 and the wider area are being progressed in the shorter term by Waka Kotahi. This includes starting construction on the first stage of the SH16 Brigham Creek to Waimauku project to make the road safer. The first stage of construction will be on the stretch of SH16 between Huapai and Waimauku.

Accelerated road improvements
The planning of three projects within Redhills and Whenuapai are being accelerated as they have funding allocated from the Housing Infrastructure Fund. Site investigations have been
completed to enable these designs to advance, and landowner engagement, which began in 2019, will recommence shortly.

Notices of Requirement (NoR) for route protection will then be finalised for all three projects and lodged with Auckland Council in mid-2020. Resource consent applications for construction of the Trig Road, Whenuapai project will also be lodged in mid-2020. Further information about these projects is available on the Supporting Growth website.

Recommendation/Action
For information purposes only.

Further information and contact details
Local Boards - please refer to past memos and briefing packs to see a full history of engagement.

An overview of all information relating to North West Auckland can be found here: https://www.supportinggrowth.govt.nz/growth-areas/northwest/

Kara Hartshorne, North West Engagement Lead, can be contacted on 027 801 8542 or kara.hartshorne@supportinggrowth.co.nz, or call 0800 GROW AKL (4769 255)

Attachments
8 x landowner letter types
28 May 2020

Dear Sir/Madam

Proposed Alternative State Highway for North West Auckland

Property Address: «acPropertyaddress» «acPropertyaddress2»
Record of Title number: «linTitleNumber»
SG Reference Number: «scheduleIDConcat»

Supporting Growth is a collaboration between Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport. We’re identifying and protecting the land needed for transport connections in the future growth areas of Kumeū-Huapai, Redhills, Whenuapai and Riverhead.

We hope this letter finds you safe and well as we learn to adjust to new ways of living to reduce the risk of Covid-19. We acknowledge this is a difficult and uncertain time for all of us.

We’re continuing to progress transport projects in these areas as infrastructure will play a critical role in the economic recovery of New Zealand. In writing to you now, we hope to provide as much certainty as we can about the status of our work in the northwest and what it may mean for you.

One of these projects is the proposed Alternative State Highway, which would provide an alternative route to State Highway 16 (SH16) between Brigham Creek Road and Waimauku.

In June 2019, we wrote to you outlining that your property at the address above was within a study area for this proposed Alternative State Highway. This does not necessarily mean your property will be affected as the study area is much wider than the land that will be required for this new transport route.

We acknowledge the time it’s taken as we’ve moved towards the next stage of this project and thank you for your patience. We’re pleased now to be able to provide information on what is happening next and the anticipated timeframes.

Timeframes and next steps for the Alternative State Highway

From now until late 2020: For most of this year, we’re working to refine the study area and identify a preferred route for an alternative corridor to SH16 between Brigham Creek Road and Waimauku.
This work includes investigations of the land in the area, which may mean we need to carry out site walkovers, drone flyovers and other investigations. If access to your property is needed to undertake this work, we’ll be in touch with you first to seek your consent. No onsite investigation work will be carried out until after Covid-19 restrictions are lifted.

**Late 2020:** At this point, we’ll have identified a preferred route for the Alternative State Highway. If your property is directly affected by the preferred route, we’d like to meet to discuss this with you. We’d also like to find out how you use the land and any special characteristics or features of the land that we should be aware of. We’ll contact you closer to the time to arrange this meeting.

If we have identified that your property isn’t directly affected by the preferred route, we’ll confirm this to you at this time.

**Mid 2021:** Based on our current programme, we expect to be able to confirm a preferred alignment for route protection, providing you with certainty as to whether your property, or any portion of it, is likely to be affected or not.

**Route protection**

The stages outlined in this letter are focused on getting to a point where we can begin the process to legally protect the land for this future route. Route protection involves us submitting a document called a Notice of Requirement (NoR) to Auckland Council seeking to designate the land for the Alternative State Highway. We can explain more about the route protection (NoR) process and timeframes for this when/if we meet with you later this year.

**Summary of milestones**

Here’s a summary of the key steps from now until the Alternative State Highway is built:

---

**NOW - LATE 2020**

- Undertake investigations and identify a preferred route

**LATE 2020**

- Meet with landowners who are directly affected by the preferred route

**MID 2021**

- Confirm preferred alignment of the Alternative State Highway to landowners

**2021 - 2023**

- Route protection of the preferred alignment

**SECURE FUNDING**

- As well as public funds, a range of private funding sources will be investigated

**2020 - 2022**

- Construction of Alternative State Highway begins

*Timeline is indicative only and subject to change

---

**Improvements to transport connections in the short term**

In the meantime, other upgrades to improve SH16 and the wider area are being progressed by Waka Kotahi. This includes starting construction on the first stage of the SH16 Brigham Creek to Waimauku project to improve safety and efficiency for road users. The first stage of construction will be on the stretch of SH16 between Huapai and Waimauku. Further information can be found at
nzt.govt.nz/projects/sh16-brigham-creek-and-waimauku/ or email
SH16.safety.improvements@nzt.govt.nz.

Keeping you informed

For more information on this Alternative State Highway project, you can visit supportinggrowth.govt.nz.
To stay up to date with the latest information we encourage you to sign up for our email updates via our webpage. If you have any questions, please get in touch with Kara Hartshorne, Engagement Lead for North West Auckland on 027 801 8542 or kara.hartshorne@sUPPORTINGGROWTH.CO.NZ. You can also call our freephone number, 0800 GROW AKL (0800 4769 255).

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Deepak Rama
Principal Transport Planner
Transport Services – System Design
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency

Alastair Lovell
Auckland Transport Owner Interface Manager
Auckland Transport
28 May 2020

Dear Sir/Madam

Proposed Speeding Road upgrade and extension from Fred Taylor Drive to Hobsonville Road

Property Address: «acPropertyaddress»
Record of Title number: «linzTitleNumber»
SG Reference Number: «scheduleIDConcat»

Supporting Growth is a collaboration between Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport. We're identifying and protecting the land needed for transport connections in the future growth areas of Kumeū-Huapai, Redhills, Whenuapai and Riverhead.

We hope this letter finds you safe and well as we learn to adjust to new ways of living to reduce the risk of Covid-19. We acknowledge this is a difficult and uncertain time for all of us.

We’re continuing to progress transport projects in these areas as infrastructure will play a critical role in the economic recovery of New Zealand. In writing to you now, we hope to provide as much certainty as we can about the status of our work in the northwest and what it may mean for you.

One of these projects is the proposed Speeding Road upgrade and extension from Fred Taylor Drive to Hobsonville Road.

In June 2019, we wrote to you outlining that your property at the address above was within a study area for this project. This does not necessarily mean your property will be affected as the study area is much wider than the land that will be required for this new transport route.

We acknowledge the time it’s taken as we’ve moved towards the next stage of this project and thank you for your patience. We’re pleased now to be able to provide information on what is happening next and the anticipated timeframes.

**Timeframes and next steps for this project**

For much of this year, we’re working to refine the study area and identify a preferred route.
This work includes investigations of the land in the area, which may mean we need to carry out site walkovers, drone flyovers and other investigations. If access to your property is needed to undertake this work, we’ll be in touch with you first to seek your consent. No onsite investigation work will be carried out until after Covid-19 restrictions are lifted.

**From mid 2020:** In the coming months, we’ll identify a preferred route for this project. If your property is directly affected by the preferred route, we’d like to meet to discuss this with you. We’d also like to find out how you use the land and any special characteristics or features of the land that we should be aware of. We’ll contact you closer to the time to arrange this meeting.

If we have identified that your property isn’t directly affected by the preferred route, we’ll confirm this to you at this time.

**Mid 2021:** Based on our current programme, we expect to be able to confirm a preferred alignment for route protection, providing certainty as to whether your property, or any portion of it, is likely to be affected or not.

**Route protection**

The stages outlined in this letter are focused on getting to a point where we can begin the process to legally protect the land for this future route. Route protection involves us submitting a document called a Notice of Requirement (NoR) to Auckland Council seeking to designate the land for this route. We can explain more about the route protection (NoR) process and timeframes for this when/if we meet with you later this year.

**Summary of milestones**

Here’s a summary of the key steps from now:

**Improvements to transport connections in the short term**

In the meantime, other upgrades to improve State Highway 16 (SH16) and the wider area are being progressed by Waka Kotahi. This includes starting construction on the first stage of the SH16 Brigham Creek to Waimauku project to improve safety and efficiency for road users. The first stage of construction will be on the stretch of SH16 between Huapai and Waimauku. Further information can be
found at nzta.govt.nz/projects/sh16-brigham-creek-and-waimauku/ or email SH16.safety.improvements@nzta.govt.nz.

Keeping you informed

For more information on this project, you can visit supportinggrowth.govt.nz. To stay up to date with the latest information we encourage you to sign up for our email updates via our webpage. If you have any questions, please get in touch with Kara Hartshorne, Engagement Lead for North West Auckland on 027 801 8542 or kara.hartshorne@supportinggrowth.co.nz. You can also call our freephone number, 0800 GROW AKL (0800 4769 255).

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Deepak Rama
Principal Transport Planner
Transport Services – System Design
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency

Alastair Lovell
Auckland Transport Owner Interface Manager
Auckland Transport
Proposed Northside Drive extension from Nixon Road to Fred Taylor Drive

Property Address: «acPropertyAddress» «acPropertyAddress2»
Record of Title number: «inzTitleNumber»
SG Reference Number: «scheduleIDConcat»

Supporting Growth is a collaboration between Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport. We’re identifying and protecting the land needed for transport connections in the future growth areas of Kumeū-Huapai, Redhills, Whenuapai and Riverhead.

We hope this letter finds you safe and well as we learn to adjust to new ways of living to reduce the risk of Covid-19. We acknowledge this is a difficult and uncertain time for all of us.

We’re continuing to progress transport projects in these areas as infrastructure will play a critical role in the economic recovery of New Zealand. In writing to you now, we hope to provide as much certainty as we can about the status of our work in the northwest and what it may mean for you.

One of these projects is the proposed Northside Drive extension from Nixon Road to Fred Taylor Drive.

In June 2019, we wrote to you outlining that your property at the address above was within a study area for this project. This does not necessarily mean your property will be affected as the study area is much wider than the land that will be required for this new transport route.

We acknowledge the time it’s taken as we’ve moved towards the next stage of this project and thank you for your patience. We’re pleased now to be able to provide information on what is happening next and the anticipated timeframes.

Timeframes and next steps for this project

For much of this year, we’re working to refine the study area and identify a preferred route.
This work includes investigations of the land in the area, which may mean we need to carry out site walkovers, drone flyovers and other investigations. If access to your property is needed to undertake this work, we’ll be in touch with you first to seek your consent. No onsite investigation work will be carried out until after Covid-19 restrictions are lifted.

**From mid 2020**: In the coming months, we’ll have identified a preferred route for this project. If your property is directly affected by the preferred route, we’d like to meet to discuss this with you. We’d also like to find out how you use the land and any special characteristics or features of the land that we should be aware of. We’ll contact you closer to the time to arrange this meeting.

If we have identified that your property isn’t directly affected by the preferred route, we’ll confirm this to you at this time.

**Mid 2021**: Based on our current programme, we expect to be able to confirm a preferred alignment for route protection, providing certainty as to whether your property, or any portion of it, is likely to be affected or not.

**Route protection**

The stages outlined in this letter are focused on getting to a point where we can begin the process to legally protect the land for this future route. Route protection involves us submitting a document called a Notice of Requirement (NoR) to Auckland Council seeking to designate the land for this route. We can explain more about the route protection (NoR) process and timeframes for this when/if we meet with you later this year.

**Summary of milestones**

Here’s a summary of the key steps from now:

**NOW - MID 2020**
- Undertake investigations and identify a preferred route

**FROM MID 2020**
- Meet with landowners who are directly affected by the preferred route

**MID 2021**
- Confirm preferred alignment to landowners

**2021 - 2023**
- Route protection of the preferred alignment

**SECURE FUNDING**
- As well as public funds, a range of private funding sources will be investigated

**CONSTRUCTION**

*Timeline is indicative only and subject to change.

**Improvements to transport connections in the short term**

In the meantime, other upgrades to improve State Highway 16 (SH16) and the wider area are being progressed by Waka Kotahi. This includes starting construction on the first stage of the SH16 Brigham Creek to Waimauku project to improve safety and efficiency for road users. The first stage of construction will be on the stretch of SH16 between Huapai and Waimauku. Further information can be
found at nzta.govt.nz/projects/sh16-brigham-creek-and-waimauku/ or email SH16.safety.improvements@nzta.govt.nz.

**Keeping you informed**

For more information on this project, you can visit supportinggrowth.govt.nz. To stay up to date with the latest information we encourage you to sign up for our email updates via our webpage. If you have any questions, please get in touch with Kara Hartshorne, Engagement Lead for North West Auckland on 027 801 8542 or kara.hartshorne@supportinggrowth.co.nz. You can also call our freephone number, 0800 GROW AKL (0800 4769 255).

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Deepak Rama  
Principal Transport Planner  
Transport Services – System Design  
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency

Alastair Lovell  
Auckland Transport Owner Interface Manager  
Auckland Transport
Item 13

28 May 2020

Dear Sir/Madam

Mamari Road extension from Northside Drive to Spedding Road
Spedding Road upgrade and extension from Fred Taylor Drive to Hobsonville Road

Property Address: «acPropertyAddress» «acPropertyAddress2»
Record of Title number: «linTitleNumber»
SG Reference Number: «scheduleID»

Supporting Growth is a collaboration between Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport. We’re identifying and protecting the land needed for transport connections in the future growth areas of Kumeū-Huapai, Redhills,Whenuapai and Riverhead.

We hope this letter finds you safe and well as we learn to adjust to new ways of living to reduce the risk of Covid-19. We acknowledge this is a difficult and uncertain time for all of us.

We’re continuing to progress transport projects in these areas as infrastructure will play a critical role in the economic recovery of New Zealand. In writing to you now, we hope to provide as much certainty as we can about the status of our work in the northwest and what it may mean for you.

These projects include the proposed Mamari Road extension from Northside Drive to Spedding Road and the Spedding Road upgrade and extension from Fred Taylor Drive to Hobsonville Road.

In June 2019, we wrote to you outlining that your property at the address above was within a study area for these projects. This does not necessarily mean your property will be affected as the study area is much wider than the land that will be required for this new transport route.

We acknowledge the time it’s taken as we’ve moved towards the next stage of this project and thank you for your patience. We’re pleased now to be able to provide information on what is happening next and the anticipated timeframes.

Timeframes and next steps for these projects

For much of this year, we’re working to refine the study areas and identify preferred routes for each project.
This work includes investigations of the land in the area, which may mean we need to carry out site walkovers, drone flyovers and other investigations. If access to your property is needed to undertake this work, we’ll be in touch with you first to seek your consent. No onsite investigation work will be carried out until after Covid-19 restrictions are lifted.

**From mid 2020:** In the coming months, we’ll have identified preferred routes for each project. If your property is directly affected by the preferred route/s, we’d like to meet to discuss this with you. We’d also like to find out how you use the land and any special characteristics or features of the land. We’ll contact you closer to the time to arrange this meeting.

If your property isn’t directly affected by the preferred routes, we will confirm this to you at this time.

**Mid 2021:** Based on our current programme, we expect to be able to confirm a preferred alignment for route protection, providing certainty as to whether your property, or any portion of it, is likely to be affected or not.

**Route protection**

The stages outlined in this letter are focused on getting to a point where we can begin the process to legally protect the land for these future routes. Route protection involves us submitting a document called a Notice of Requirement (NoR) to Auckland Council seeking to designate the land for these routes. We can explain more about the route protection (NoR) process and timeframes for this when/if we meet with you later this year.

**Summary of milestones**

Here’s a summary of the key steps from now:

![Timeline diagram]

**Improvements to transport connections in the short term**

In the meantime, other upgrades to improve State Highway 16 (SH16) and the wider area are being progressed by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency. This includes starting construction on the first stage of the SH16 Brigham Creek to Waimauku project to improve safety and efficiency for road users. The first stage of construction will be on the stretch of SH16 between Huapai and Waimauku. Further
information can be found at nzta.govt.nz/projects/sh16-brigham-creek-and-waimauku/ or email SH16.safety.improvements@nzta.govt.nz.

Keeping you informed

For more information on these projects, you can visit supportinggrowth.govt.nz. To stay up to date with the latest information we encourage you to sign up for our email updates via our webpage. If you have any questions, please get in touch with Kara Hartshorne, Engagement Lead for North West Auckland on 027 801 8542 or kara.hartshorne@sustaininggrowth.co.nz. You can also call our freephone number, 0800 GROW AKL (0800 4769 255).

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Deepak Rama
Principal Transport Planner
Transport Services – System Design
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency

Alastair Lovell
Auckland Transport Owner Interface Manager
Auckland Transport
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28 May 2020

Dear Sir/Madam

Mamari Road extension from Northside Drive to Spedding Road
Spedding Road upgrade and extension from Fred Taylor Drive to Hobsonville Road
Alternative State Highway between Brigham Creek Road and Waimauku

Property Address: «acPropertyAddress»
Record of Title number: «linzTitleNumber»
SG Reference Number: «scheduleID»

Supporting Growth is a collaboration between Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport. We’re identifying and protecting the land needed for transport connections in the future growth areas of Kumeū-Huapai, Redhills, Whenuapai and Riverhead.

We hope this letter finds you safe and well as we learn to adjust to new ways of living to reduce the risk of Covid-19. We acknowledge this is a difficult and uncertain time for all of us.

We’re continuing to progress transport projects in these areas as infrastructure will play a critical role in the economic recovery of New Zealand. In writing to you now, we hope to provide as much certainty as we can about the status of our work in the northwest and what it may mean for you.

These projects include the proposed Mamari Road extension from Northside Drive to Spedding Road, the Spedding Road upgrade and extension from Fred Taylor Drive to Hobsonville Road, and the Alternative State Highway (providing an alternative route to State Highway 16 between Brigham Creek Road and Waimauku).

In June 2019, we wrote to you outlining that your property at the address above was within a study area for these projects. This does not necessarily mean your property will be affected as the study area is much wider than the land that will be required for this new transport route.

We acknowledge the time it’s taken as we’ve moved towards the next stage of this project and thank you for your patience. We’re pleased now to be able to provide information on what is happening next and the anticipated timeframes.
Timeframes and next steps for these projects

For much of this year, we’re working to refine the study areas and identify preferred routes for each project.

This work includes investigations of the land in the area, which may mean we need to carry out site walkovers, drone flyovers and other investigations. If access to your property is needed to undertake this work, we’ll be in touch with you first to seek your consent. No onsite investigation work will be carried out until after Covid-19 restrictions are lifted.

From mid 2020: In the coming months, we’ll identify preferred routes for each project. If your property is directly affected by the preferred route/s, we’d like to meet to discuss this with you. We’d also like to find out how you use the land and any special characteristics or features of the land. We’ll contact you closer to the time to arrange this meeting.

If your property isn’t directly affected by the preferred routes, we will confirm this to you at this time.

Mid 2021: Based on our current programme, we expect to be able to confirm a preferred alignment for route protection, providing certainty as to whether your property, or any portion of it, is likely to be affected or not.

Route protection

The stages outlined in this letter are focused on getting to a point where we can begin the process to legally protect the land for these future routes. Route protection involves us submitting a document called a Notice of Requirement (NoR) to Auckland Council seeking to designate the land for these routes. We can explain more about the route protection (NoR) process and timeframes for this when/if we meet with you later this year.

Summary of milestones

Here’s a summary of the key steps from now:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOW - MID 2020</th>
<th>FROM MID 2020</th>
<th>MID 2021</th>
<th>2021 - 2023</th>
<th>SECURE FUNDING</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undertake investigations and identify a preferred route</td>
<td>Meet with Māori owners and tangata whenua affected by the preferred route</td>
<td>Confirm preferred alignment to tangata whenua</td>
<td>Route protection of the preferred route</td>
<td>As well as public funds, a range of private funding sources will be investigated</td>
<td>Construction of State Highway 16 is expected to begin 2023-2024*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Timelines indicative and subject to change

Improvements to transport connections in the short term

In the meantime, other upgrades to improve State Highway 16 (SH16) and the wider area are being progressed by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency. This includes starting construction on the first stage of
the SH16 Brigham Creek to Waimauku project to improve safety and efficiency for road users. The first stage of construction will be on the stretch of SH16 between Huapai and Waimauku. Further information can be found at nzta.govt.nz/projects/sh16-brigham-creek-and-waimauku/ or email SH16.safety.improvements@nzta.govt.nz.

**Keeping you informed**

For more information on these projects, you can visit supportinggrowth.govt.nz. To stay up to date with the latest information we encourage you to sign up for our email updates via our webpage. If you have any questions, please get in touch with Kara Hartshorne, Engagement Lead for North West Auckland on 027 801 8542 or kara.hartshorne@supportinggrowth.co.nz. You can also call our freephone number, 0800 GROW AKL (0800 4769 255).

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Deepak Rama  
Principal Transport Planner  
Transport Services – System Design  
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency

Alastair Lovell  
Auckland Transport Owner Interface Manager  
Auckland Transport

[Signatures]
Dear Sir/Madam,

Proposed Alternative State Highway for North West Auckland

Property Address: 〈acpropertyaddress〉
Record of Title number: 〈Tiltenumber〉
SG Reference Number: 〈scheduleID〉

Supporting Growth is a collaboration between Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport. We’re identifying and protecting the land needed for transport connections in the future growth areas of Kumeū-Huapai, Redhills, Whenuapai and Riverhead.

We hope this letter finds you safe and well as we learn to adjust to new ways of living to reduce the risk of Covid-19. We acknowledge this is a difficult and uncertain time for all of us.

We’re continuing to progress transport projects in these areas as infrastructure will play a critical role in the economic recovery of New Zealand. In writing to you now, we hope to provide as much certainty as we can about the status of our work in the northwest and what it may mean for you.

One of these projects is the proposed Alternative State Highway, which would provide an alternative route to State Highway 16 (SH16) between Brigham Creek Road and Waimauku.

Your property at the address above has been identified as being within the study area for the proposed Alternative State Highway. This does not necessarily mean your property will be affected as the study area is much wider than the land that will be required for this new transport route, however we’d like to let you know the process for the development of this project, how and when you’ll hear from us and the long-term timeframes.

Timeframes and next steps for the Alternative State Highway

From now until late 2020: For most of this year, we’re working to refine the study area and identify a preferred route for an alternative to SH16 between Brigham Creek Road and Waimauku.

This work includes investigations of the land in the area, which may mean we need to carry out site walkovers, drone flyovers and other investigations. If access to your property is needed to undertake
this work, we’ll be in touch with you first to seek your consent. No onsite investigation work will be
carried out until after Covid-19 restrictions are lifted.

**Late 2020:** At this point, we’ll have identified a preferred route for the Alternative State Highway.
If your property is directly affected by the preferred route, we’d like to meet to discuss this with you.
We’d also like to find out how you use the land and any special characteristics or features of the land
that we should be aware of. We’ll contact you closer to the time to arrange this meeting.

If we have identified that your property isn’t directly affected by the preferred route, we’ll confirm this
to you at this time.

**Mid 2021:** Based on our current programme, we expect to be able to confirm a preferred alignment for
route protection, providing you with certainty as to whether your property, or any portion of it, is likely
to be affected or not.

**Route protection**

The stages outlined in this letter are focused on getting to a point where we can begin the process to
legally protect the land for this future route. Route protection involves us submitting a document called
a Notice of Requirement (NoR) to Auckland Council seeking to designate the land for the Alternative
State Highway. We can explain more about the route protection (NoR) process and timeframes for this
when/if we meet with you later this year.

**Summary of milestones**

Here’s a summary of the key steps from now until the Alternative State Highway is built:

---

**NOW - LATE 2020**
- Undertake investigations and identify a preferred route
- Preparation of Detailed Business Case for approval by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Council

**LATE 2020**
- Meet with landowners who are directly affected by the preferred route

**MID 2021**
- Confirm preferred alignment of the Alternative State Highway to landowners

**2021 - 2023**
- Route protection of the preferred alignment

**SECURE FUNDING**
- As well as public funding, a range of private funding sources will be investigated

**2028 - 2032**
- Construction of Alternative State Highway begins

*Timeline is indicative only and subject to change

---

**Improvements to transport connections in the short term**

In the meantime, other upgrades to improve SH16 and the wider area are being progressed by Waka
Kotahi NZ Transport Agency. This includes starting construction on the first stage of the SH16 Brigham
Creek to Waimauku project to improve safety and efficiency for road users. The first stage of
construction will be on the stretch of SH16 between Huapai and Waimauku. Further information can be
found at nzt.govt.nz/projects/sh16-brigham-creek-and-waimauku/ or email
SH16.safety.improvements@nzta.govt.nz.
Keeping you informed

For more information on this Alternative State Highway project, you can visit supportinggrowth.govt.nz. To stay up to date with the latest information we encourage you to sign up for our email updates via our webpage. If you have any questions, please get in touch with Kara Hartshorne, Engagement Lead for North West Auckland on 027 801 8542 or kara.hartshorne@supportinggrowth.co.nz. You can also call our freephone number, 0800 GROW AKL (0800 4769 255).

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Deepak Rama  
Principal Transport Planner  
Transport Services – System Design  
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency

Alastair Lovell  
Auckland Transport Owner Interface Manager  
Auckland Transport

New Zealand Government
Dear Sir/Madam

Spedding Road upgrade and extension from Fred Taylor Drive to Hobsonville Road

Property Address: «acPropertyAddress»
Record of Title number: «in2TitleNumber»
SG Reference Number: «scheduleIDConcat»

Supporting Growth is a collaboration between Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport. We’re identifying and protecting the land needed for transport connections in the future growth areas of Kumeū-Huapai, Redhills, Whenuapai and Riverhead.

We hope this letter finds you safe and well as we learn to adjust to new ways of living to reduce the risk of Covid-19. We acknowledge this is a difficult and uncertain time for all of us.

We’re continuing to progress transport projects in these areas as infrastructure will play a critical role in the economic recovery of New Zealand. In writing to you now, we hope to provide as much certainty as we can about the status of our work in the northwest and what it may mean for you.

These projects include the proposed Spedding Road upgrade and extension from Fred Taylor Drive to Hobsonville Road.

In June 2019, we wrote to you outlining that your property at the address above was within a study area for this project. This does not necessarily mean your property will be affected as the study area is much wider than the land that will be required for this new transport route.

We acknowledge the time it’s taken as we’ve moved towards the next stage of this project and thank you for your patience. We’re pleased now to be able to provide information on what is happening next and the anticipated timeframes.

Timeframes and next steps for these projects

From now until late 2020: For much of this year, we’re working to refine the study areas and identify preferred routes for each project.
This work includes investigations of the land in the area, which may mean we need to carry out site walkovers, drone flyovers and other investigations. If access to your property is needed to undertake this work, we’ll be in touch with you first to seek your consent. No onsite investigation work will be carried out until after Covid-19 restrictions are lifted.

**Late 2020:** At this point, we’ll have identified preferred routes for this project. If your property is directly affected by the preferred route/s, we’d like to meet to discuss this with you. We’d also like to find out how you use the land and any special characteristics or features of the land. We’ll contact you closer to the time to arrange this meeting.

If your property isn’t directly affected by the preferred route, we will confirm this to you at this time.

**Mid 2021:** Based on our current programme, we expect to be able to confirm a preferred alignment for route protection, providing certainty as to whether your property, or any portion of it, is likely to be affected or not.

**Route protection**

The stages outlined in this letter are focused on getting to a point where we can begin the process to legally protect the land for these future routes. Route protection involves us submitting a document called a Notice of Requirement (NoR) to Auckland Council seeking to designate the land for these routes. We can explain more about the route protection (NoR) process and timeframes for this when/if we meet with you later this year.

**Summary of milestones**

Here’s a summary of the key steps from now:

**NOW - LATE 2020**  
Undertake investigations and identify a preferred route

**LATE 2020**  
Meet with landowners who are directly affected by the preferred route

**MID 2021**  
Confirm preferred alignment to landowners

**2021 - 2023**  
Route protection of the preferred alignment

**SECURE FUNDING**  
As well as public funds, a range of private funding sources will be investigated

*Timeline is indicative only and subject to change

**Improvements to transport connections in the short term**

In the meantime, other upgrades to improve State Highway 16 (SH16) and the wider area are being progressed by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency. This includes starting construction on the first stage of the SH16 Brigham Creek to Waimauku project to improve safety and efficiency for road users. The first stage of construction will be on the stretch of SH16 between Huapai and Waimauku. Further information can be found at nzta.govt.nz/projects/sh16-brigham-creek-and-waimauku/ or email SH16.safety.improvements@nzta.govt.nz.
Keeping you informed

For more information on this project, you can visit supportinggrowth.govt.nz. To stay up to date with the latest information we encourage you to sign up for our email updates via our webpage. If you have any questions, please get in touch with Kara Hartshorne, Engagement Lead for North West Auckland on 027 801 8542 or kara.hartshorne@supportinggrowth.co.nz. You can also call our freephone number, 0800 GROW AKL (0800 4769255).

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Deepak Rama
Principal Transport Planner
Transport Services – System Design
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency

Alastair Lovell
Auckland Transport Owner Interface Manager
Auckland Transport

New Zealand Government
28 May 2020

Dear Sir/Madam

Proposed Northside Drive extension from Nixon Road to Fred Taylor Drive

Property Address: «acPropertyAddress»
Record of Title number: «linzTitleNumber»
SG Reference Number: «scheduleID»

Supporting Growth is a collaboration between Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport. We’re identifying and protecting the land needed for transport connections in the future growth areas of Kumeū-Huapai, Redhills, Whenuapai and Riverhead.

We hope this letter finds you safe and well as we learn to adjust to new ways of living to reduce the risk of Covid-19. We acknowledge this is a difficult and uncertain time for all of us.

We’re continuing to progress transport projects in these areas as infrastructure will play a critical role in the economic recovery of New Zealand. In writing to you now, we hope to provide as much certainty as we can about the status of our work in the northwest and what it may mean for you.

One of these projects is the proposed Northside Drive extension from Nixon Road to Fred Taylor Drive.

Your property at the address above has been identified as being within the study area for the proposed project. This does not necessarily mean your property will be affected as the study area is much wider than the land that will be required for this new transport route, however we’d like to let you know the process for the development of this project, how and when you’ll hear from us and the long-term timeframes.

Timeframes and next steps for this project

For much of this year, we’re working to refine the study area and identify a preferred route.

This work includes investigations of the land in the area, which may mean we need to carry out site walkovers, drone flyovers and other investigations. If access to your property is needed to undertake this work, we’ll be in touch with you first to seek your consent. No onsite investigation work will be carried out until after Covid-19 restrictions are lifted.
From mid 2020: In the coming months, we’ll have identified a preferred route for this project. If your property is directly affected by the preferred route, we’d like to meet to discuss this with you. We’d also like to find out how you use the land and any special characteristics or features of the land that we should be aware of. We’ll contact you closer to the time to arrange this meeting.

If we have identified that your property isn’t directly affected by the preferred route, we’ll confirm this to you at this time.

Mid 2021: Based on our current programme, we expect to be able to confirm a preferred alignment for route protection, providing certainty as to whether your property, or any portion of it, is likely to be affected or not.

Route protection

The stages outlined in this letter are focused on getting to a point where we can begin the process to legally protect the land for this future route. Route protection involves us submitting a document called a Notice of Requirement (NoR) to Auckland Council seeking to designate the land for this route. We can explain more about the route protection (NoR) process and timeframes for this when/if we meet with you later this year.

Summary of milestones

Here’s a summary of the key steps from now:

**Improvements to transport connections in the short term**

In the meantime, other upgrades to improve State Highway 16 (SH16) and the wider area are being progressed by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency. This includes starting construction on the first stage of the SH16 Brigham Creek to Waimauku project to improve safety and efficiency for road users. The first stage of construction will be on the stretch of SH16 between Huapai and Waimauku. Further information can be found at nzta.govt.nz/projects/sh16-brigham-creek-and-waimauku/ or email SH16.safety.improvements@nzta.govt.nz.

Keeping you informed
For more information on this project, you can visit supportinggrowth.govt.nz. To stay up to date with the latest information we encourage you to sign up for our email updates via our webpage. If you have any questions, please get in touch with Kara Hartshorne, Engagement Lead for North West Auckland on 027 801 8542 or kara.hartshorne@supportinggrowth.co.nz. You can also call our freephone number, 0800 GROW AKL (0800 4769 255).

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Deepak Rama
Principal Transport Planner
Transport Services – System Design
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency

Alastair Lovell
Auckland Transport Owner Interface Manager
Auckland Transport