## Kōmiti Whakarite Mahere / Planning Committee

### OPEN ATTACHMENTS

ADDITIONAL ATTACHMENTS UNDER SEPARATE COVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TABLE OF CONTENTS</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Summary of Planning Committee information items and briefings - 2 July 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Auckland Monthly Housing Update June 2020</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Supporting Growth Programme – Update on north transport projects</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Auckland Unitary Plan – Judicial Review proceeding – Franco Belgiorno-Nettis</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Access for Everyone pilot to begin in Queen Street</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Auckland Council’s submission on the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track consenting) Bill</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Auckland Plan update and Annual Monitoring Report</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Auckland Council’s final submission on the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The attachments contained within this document are for consideration and should not be construed as Council policy unless and until adopted. Should Councillors require further information relating to any reports, please contact the relevant manager, Chairperson or Deputy Chairperson.
Auckland Monthly Housing Update
June 2020
# Table of contents

1. Summary ................................................................................................................................. 4
2. Highlights ................................................................................................................................. 5
3. Dwellings consented .................................................................................................................. 6
4. Dwellings consented by type .................................................................................................... 7
5. Dwellings consented on Kāinga Ora or Tāmaki Regeneration Company owned land owned land ................................................................................................................................. 8
6. Dwellings consented by Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries ................................................. 9
7. Dwellings consented along the rapid transport network .......................................................... 10
8. Dwellings with CCCs issued (completions) .............................................................................. 12
9. Residential parcels created ...................................................................................................... 13
10. Residential parcels by Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries .............................................. 14
11. Permanent and long-term migration ...................................................................................... 15
12. Median residential sales price .............................................................................................. 16
13. Residential property buyer classification ............................................................................. 17
14. Public housing in Auckland .................................................................................................. 18
15. Notes on data and analysis .................................................................................................... 19
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

- 894 dwellings were consented in April 2020.
- In the year ending April 2020, 14,783 dwellings were consented in the region.
- 51 per cent of new dwellings consented in April 2020 were houses, 15 per cent were apartments and 34 per cent were townhouses, flats, units, retirement village units, or other types of attached dwellings.
- 24 dwellings were consented on Kāinga Ora or Tāmaki Regeneration Company owned land in April 2020.
- 821 dwellings consented in April 2020 were inside the RUB. Over the past 12 months, 94 per cent of new dwellings consented were inside the RUB.
- 14 per cent of dwellings consented were inside the 1,500m walking catchments of the rapid transport network in April 2020.
- 910 dwellings were 'completed' by having a Code Compliance Certificate (CCC) issued in April 2020.
- In the year ending April 2020, 14,650 dwellings had a CCC issued.
- 730 new residential parcels under 5,000m² were created in May 2020.
- In the past 12 months, 7,757 new residential parcels under 5,000m² were created – an average of 646 each month.
- In May 2020, 717 new residential parcels of all sizes were created inside the RUB.
- Long-term arrivals in March 2020 were 2,689.
- 26 per cent of residential properties sold in Auckland were purchased by first home owners in April 2020.
- 803 public housing applications have been housed in the March quarter 2020.
3. Dwellings consented

In April 2020, 894 dwelling consents were issued, which saw 14,783 consents issued for the past 12 months.

<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></td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Of all the dwellings consented in April 2020, 460 were houses, 133 were apartments, and 301 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 April 2020, 24 dwellings (three per cent of total dwellings consented) were consented on Kāinga Ora (KO) or Tāmaki Regeneration Company (TRC) owned land. These included 15 apartment units, 6 houses and 3 townhouses, flats, and other attached dwelling types.

<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>Number of KO/TRC dwellings</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total dwellings</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consented</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 April 2020, 636 dwellings consented were inside 2010 MUL and a total of 821 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>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>840</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2010 MUL and RUB</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside RUB</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Dwellings consented along the rapid transport network

In April 2020, 127 dwellings (14 per cent of total dwellings consented) were consented inside the rapid transport network’s (RTN) 1500m walking catchments. In the last 12 months, 4,105 dwellings were consented inside the 1500m RTN walking catchments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Apr 19</th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>Apr 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings consented inside the 1500m RTN walking catchments</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total dwellings consented</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-month rolling total inside RTN walking catchments</td>
<td>3,659</td>
<td>4,177</td>
<td>4,131</td>
<td>4,208</td>
<td>4,105</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>

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)

460 dwelling units had received CCCs in April 2020. 90 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>Apr 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>Apr 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Auckland Council
9. Residential parcels created

In May 2020, the total number of residential parcels under 5000m² created was 730.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel size category</th>
<th>May 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>Apr 20</th>
<th>May20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1000 m²</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 m² to 1999 m²</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 m² to 2999 m²</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 m² to 3999 m²</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 m² to 4999 m²</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of residential parcels &lt; 5000m²</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

641 of new residential parcels of all sizes created in May 2020 were inside 2010 MUL and a total of 717 new residential parcels were inside the RUB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>May '19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>Apr 20</th>
<th>May 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside 2010 MUL</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2010 MUL and RUB</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside RUB</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residential parcels created by Auckland Plan monitoring boundaries

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

Long-term arrival number in March 2020 was 2,889. 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>Mar 19</th>
<th>Dec 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrivals</td>
<td>3,883</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>5,059</td>
<td>4,996</td>
<td>2,889</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>

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

The median residential sales price from REINZ in April 2020 was $925,000. The District Valuation Roll (DVR) median sales price in March 2020 was $897,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</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>REINZ</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$872,000</td>
<td>$885,000</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVR sales¹</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$820,000</td>
<td>$870,000</td>
<td>$897,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Graph showing median residential sale price]

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>Apr 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>Apr 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First home buyer</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mover</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-property owner</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New to market</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</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>

![Residential property buyer classification chart](image)

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 March quarter 2020, 803 public housing applications have been housed with Kāinga Ora or with a Community Housing Provider.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>March quarter 2019</th>
<th>June quarter 2019</th>
<th>September quarter 2019</th>
<th>December quarter 2019</th>
<th>March quarter 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public housing stock</td>
<td>31,452</td>
<td>32,184</td>
<td>32,326</td>
<td>32,872</td>
<td>33,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public housing register -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing register (top row)</td>
<td>4,846</td>
<td>4,846</td>
<td>5,257</td>
<td>5,455</td>
<td>6,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and transfer register (bottom</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>1,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>row)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public housing register -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applications housed</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>803</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 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)
Memo

To: Auckland Council Planning Committee
From: Angelene Burn, North Engagement Manager, Supporting Growth Programme
Date: 28 May 2020
Subject: Update on north transport projects

Kia ora

The purpose of this memo is to provide a progress update on route protection plans for future transport projects in the north Auckland areas of Orewa, Wainui, Silverdale and Dairy Flat as part of the Supporting Growth Programme.

Regarding the timing of this update, we acknowledge this is a difficult and uncertain time for all of us as we adjust to new ways of living to reduce the risk of Covid-19.

We’re continuing to progress transport projects in these areas as infrastructure will play a critical role in the economic recovery of New Zealand.

About the Supporting Growth Programme

The Supporting Growth Programme is a collaboration between Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport to plan transport investment in Auckland’s future urban zoned areas over the next 30 years.

In July 2019, we released the Supporting Growth Indicative Strategic Transport Network for Warkworth, north and north west Auckland. Since then we have carried out technical investigations and received valuable feedback and insights from our programme partners, stakeholders and the local community to help shape the transport network and projects we should consider for north Auckland.

We note that our team has provided you with an update on north west Auckland projects and an update on Warkworth will be provided in the coming months.

Transport projects in the north

We are investigating a large transport network with a variety of transport options such as public transport, walking and cycling links and road upgrades and have split the projects into two phases:

Phase 1 projects focus on key north/south transport corridors and networks that will connect future residential, employment, leisure and recreation areas, including:
- a new rapid public transport corridor from Albany to Milford, through the future growth area at Dairy Flat
- upgrades to SH1 between Albany and Silverdale
- new walking and cycling paths along SH1 and the new rapid public transport corridor
- new SH1 interchanges at Redvale (Penlink) and at Wilks Road, and an upgrade to the existing Silverdale interchange.

**Phase 2** projects will involve the investigation and assessment of other key roads and walking and cycling paths that make up the remaining transport network in the north.

A copy of the north network map is at Appendix 1.

**Timeframes and next steps**

From now until late 2020, we will be developing Detailed Business Cases (DBCs) for Phase 1 projects. This will involve carrying out investigations and assessments to improve our understanding of the area and develop more detailed route options. Once we have these options, we’ll be asking for community and stakeholder feedback.

Between mid to late 2021, we’ll have identified our preferred route and informed landowners of impact, if any, to their property. We’ll also finalise and lodge our DBCs for approval with Waka Kotahi and Auckland Transport. At this time, we’ll also start the process of developing DBCs for Phase 2 projects which are expected to be finalised in 2022.

**Communication with landowners, developers, stakeholders and the community**

Community and stakeholder engagement is an integral part of our programme and to date has provided us insights into the community’s values and visions for their future transport options.

We first engaged with the community and stakeholders in August 2018 to ask for ideas and options for the future transport network in the north. We:

- held two open days attended by 127 people
- sent 30,000 flyers to local households
- held 22 partner, stakeholder and community meetings
- had 3,200 views on our webpage
- received 171 written responses.

In June 2019, we informed around 500 landowners that their land is within a study area for a future transport project, although this will not necessarily mean that their property will be impacted.

We’ll be writing again to these potentially impacted landowners with an update on our progress. In addition, we’ll be writing to landowners we have recently identified within our expanded study areas for these projects. These potentially impacted landowners are located:

- south of Bawden Road to Oteha Valley Road; along the SH1 between Wilks Road and Silverdale Interchange; and between north of Silverdale Interchange and south of Grand Drive
- between the new Dairy Flat rapid public transport corridor and Dairy Flat Road.

A copy of the letter is at Appendix 2.

We will also provide an update to our key partners and stakeholders, including Manawhenua, Auckland Council, KiwiRail, NZ Defence Force, Ministry of Education, Kainga Ora, Watercare, other utility providers, developers and community members in our project database.
Recommendation/Action

For information purposes only.

If you would like a phone briefing regarding this update, please don’t hesitate to contact Angelene Burn, Engagement Manager on 021 195 6917 or angelene.burn@supportinggrowth.nz.

Further information

For 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 call our free phone number 0800 Grow ARL (0800 4769 235) or email info@supportinggrowth.nz.

APPENDIX:

Appendix 1: North network map

Appendix 2: Landowner letter
The project shown on this map has been identified by an industry business case and will require further technical investigation before it is considered as viable. This requirement is confirmed it is due to be prioritised for funding for delivery over the next 10-20 years.
28 May 2020

Property address: XXXXX
Record of title number: XXXXX
SG reference number: XXXXX

Dear Sir/Madam

North transport projects

Supporting Growth is a collaboration between Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport. We’re identifying and protecting the land needed for future transport connections in Orewa, Wainui, Silverdale and Dairy Flat.

We hope this letter finds you safe and well as we 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 north and what it may mean for you.

We’ve been carrying out technical investigations and received valuable feedback and insights from our stakeholders and the community to help shape the transport options we should consider for north Auckland.

Your property at has been identified as being within the study area for XXXXX. 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 project. We’d like to let you know the process for the development of this project, and how and when you’ll hear from us and the long-term timeframes.

What’s happening now

We’re currently focusing on key north/south transport corridors and networks that will connect future residential, employment, leisure and recreation areas. The projects we’re considering include:
- a new rapid public transport corridor from Albany to Milldale, through the future growth area at Dairy Flat
- upgrades to SH1 between Albany and Silverdale
- new walking and cycling paths along SH1 and the new rapid public transport corridor
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- New SH1 interchanges at Redvale (Penlink) and at Wilks Road, and an upgrade to the existing Silverdale interchange.

We’ve included a map to show you the indicative locations of the projects we’re considering.

What’s next

From now until late 2020: We are carrying out investigations and assessments to help improve our knowledge of the area and develop more detailed route options for these projects so we can select 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 for this work, we’ll be in touch with you first to seek your approval. We’d also like to know how you use the land and if there are any special characteristics or features of the land you can tell us about. We’ll contact you closer to the time to discuss this.

Once we have our route options, we’ll be asking for community and stakeholder feedback on them.

Mid to late 2021: At this point, we’ll have identified our preferred route and will be able to tell you whether or not your land will be directly affected.

Mid-2021 to 2022: Investigations and assessments will begin for other key roads and walking and cycling paths that make up the remaining transport network in the north.

Other projects in the north area

Waka Kotahi and Auckland Transport also have other projects in the north of Auckland. This includes Penlink and safety projects at Dairy Flat Highway. For more information on Penlink visit nzta.govt.nz/planning-and-investment/nz-upgrade or the Dairy Flat safety improvements visit at.govt.nz/projects-roadworks/dairy-flat-highway-safety-improvements/.

Keeping you informed

For information on our 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 Angeline Burn, Engagement Manager for north on 021 195 6917 or angeline.burn@supportinggrowth.nz. You can also call our free phone number 0800 GROW AKL (0800 4769 255) or email info@supportinggrowth.nz.
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
Memo

2 June 2020

To: Planning Committee members; Aidan Bennett, QSM (Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Chairperson); George Wood, CNZM (Devonport Local Board Deputy Chairperson)

From: Corina Faesenkloet, Principal Solicitor

Subject: Auckland Unitary Plan – Judicial Review proceeding – Franco Belgiono-Nettis

1. Attached is the recent High Court decision dated 15 May 2020 in relation to the interim relief hearing on 12 May 2020 concerning the Franco Belgiono-Nettis judicial review proceedings that were filed in December 2019.

2. Earlier in the year, Mr Belgiono-Nettis obtained temporary interim relief from the High Court that prevented the Council from treating as operative the height and zoning provisions in the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) for the Lake Road block and the Promenade block in Takapuna when performing its functions under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), including when processing and assessing applications for resource consent.

3. This temporary interim relief overrode section 86F of the RMA, which otherwise imposed a mandatory statutory duty on the Council to treat the AUP provisions as operative, and the equivalent provisions of the former North Shore District Plan (NSDP) as inoperative. The effect of the temporary interim relief was that the Council was required to process resource consent applications for sites in the Lake Road and Promenade blocks by reference to the provisions of both the legacy NSDP and the AUP.

4. There was an interim relief hearing on 12 May 2020 in relation to the following interim relief sought:

   [a] An order preventing the Auckland Council (Council) from notifying as operative the height and zoning provisions in the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) in respect of the Blocks; and

   [b] an order preventing the Council from treating the affected AUP rules as operative, pending the hearing of his claims in June 2020.

5. As recorded in the decision, the Council consented to the first order. However, the Council opposed the second order on the basis that it could not treat the affected AUP rules as inoperative because of the effect of s 86F of the RMA.

6. During the brief hearing on 12 May 2020, the High Court Judge encouraged the parties to explore the possibility of some form of agreed interim relief, which would preserve Mr Belgiono-Nettis’ position in substance, while not affecting the ordinary operation of s 86F of the RMA. The hearing was adjourned to enable discussions to take place. An agreement was reached by the Council and
Mr Belgiorno-Nettis, which the High Court has approved in its decision. The key elements of the agreement are as follows:

a. The Council has agreed to provide copies of all resource consent applications in the Lake Road block and the Promenade block in Takapuna to Mr Belgiorno-Nettis (note, the Council has not been directed to notify Franco Belgiorno-Nettis, just to provide him with copies of the applications).

b. The Council can process resource consent applications in the normal way by reference to the AUP only, except that the Council will not determine applications until after the substantive judicial review is heard. Processing timeframes under the RMA will be paused at the point at which the Council must cease processing.

c. Notably, there are a number of exceptions, which enable decisions to be made on certain resource consent applications involving a change of use only and/or involving development below certain height thresholds (equivalent to the height limits sought by Mr Belgiorno-Nettis in his submissions on the relevant parts of the proposed AUP).

7. Reflecting the agreement reached, orders were made by the High Court by consent between the parties as follows:

[7] Accordingly, I make the following orders:

[a] The Council is to provide Mr Belgiorno-Nettis (through his legal representatives) a copy of any resource consent applications received relating to land within the Blocks, as defined in the proceedings, within 3 working days of lodgement.

[b] Subject always to the exceptions stated below in [c], the Council may process any new resource consent application, or existing application at the date of these orders, by reference to the provisions of the AUP (Operative in Part) only, and without reference to the provisions of the former North Shore District Plan (NSDP). However, the Council may only process any such application up to the point of preparing draft notification and substantive decisions, and it may not make a notification decision or substantive decision in respect of the application while these orders remain in force. The processing timeframes under the RMA shall be paused from the point at which the Council ceases processing in terms of this order [b].

[c] The Council may process and determine any application for resource consent specified below under the RMA in the usual way by reference to the provisions of the AUP only, and without reference to the provisions of the NSDP. The order at [b] shall not apply to any of the following applications (however the order at [a] will apply):

[i] Applications for resource consent involving a change in use and involving no development; and/or

[ii] Applications for resource consent involving any development at or below the following heights:
● The Terrace Housing and Apartment Building-zoned land within the Promenade Block — 12 metres;

● Within the Lake Road Block:
  - “The Mixed Use zoned land” west of Lake Road — 16.5 metres;
  - “The Mixed Use zoned land” east of Lake Road — 12 metres;
  - “The Mixed Housing Urban zoned land” east of Lake Road — 9 metres.

[d] Leave is reserved to any party to apply to the Court at any time to vary or cancel these orders. It is expressly recorded that the Council may apply for the orders to be varied or cancelled at the substantive hearing set down on 29 and 30 June 2020. If no party applies to vary or cancel the orders, they shall expire on the determination of the proceedings by this Court.

[e] Costs shall lie where they fall.

8. The agreed orders improve on the previous temporary interim relief in two notable respects. First, they do not affect the operation of s 86F of the RMA and enable the ordinary operation of that provision. The Council is not required to consider the inoperative provisions of the NSDP. Secondly, they have been tailored to allow for the processing and granting of certain applications for resource consent while the judicial review proceedings are being resolved.

9. The orders clearly state that it is expressly recorded that the Council may apply for the orders to be varied or cancelled at the substantive hearing set down on 29 and 30 June 2020.

10. The substantive hearing for the judicial review proceedings will take place in the High Court on 29/30 June 2020.
IN THE HIGH COURT OF NEW ZEALAND
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[1] Mr Belgiorno-Nettis was a submitter on the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (PAUP). He sought, among other things, to prevent intensive developments at specified locations in Takapuna, including the Promenade Block and the Lake Road Block (the Blocks). His submissions were not accepted by the Independent Hearings Panel (IHP). He appealed and judicially reviewed the IHP’s decision. He lost in this Court but was partially successful in the Court of Appeal. That Court found the IHP had not complied with its duty to give reasons. The IHP was then directed to give its reasons. It did so in two decisions, respectively dated 14 and 19 October 2019. Mr Belgiorno-Nettis remained dissatisfied. He now claims that the IHP has erred in several ways,\(^1\) and seeks to judicially review the IHP’s decisions relating to his submissions. He also sought interim relief as follows:

[a] An order preventing the Auckland Council (Council) from notifying as operative the height and zoning provisions in the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) in respect of the Blocks; and

[b] an order preventing the Council from treating the affected AUP rules as operative, pending the hearing of his claims in June 2020.

[2] The Council consented to the first order. However, it says it could not treat the affected rules as inoperative because of the effect of s 86F of the Resource Management Act (RMA), which states:

86F When rules in proposed plans must be treated as operative

(1) A rule in a proposed plan must be treated as operative (and any previous rule as inoperative) if the time for making submissions or lodging appeals on the rule has expired and, in relation to the rule,—

(a) no submissions in opposition have been made or appeals have been lodged; or

(b) all submissions in opposition and appeals have been determined; or

\(^1\) See Schedule A at the foot of this judgment.
(c) all submissions in opposition have been withdrawn and all appeals withdrawn or dismissed.

(2) However, until the decisions have been given under clause 10(4) of Schedule 1 on all submissions, subsection (1) does not apply to the rules in a proposed plan that was given limited notification.

[3] “Interim interim” orders were granted by Palmer J preserving Mr Belgioirn-Nettis’ position, pending the determination of his application for interim orders. That application then came before me.

[4] While hearing argument on this issue, the parties mooted a potential alternative approach which did not involve derogation from s 86F. I then adjourned the matter and afforded the parties the opportunity to discuss this potential alternative further. After the adjournment, Mr Allan provided an outline of what that alternative proposal might look like. In short, it envisaged the Council processing applications affected by the impugned rules in the normal way, except that the Council would not determine the applications (including any notification decision) until after the trial of the substantive application. At that point, the need for interim relief would then be revisited. It would also require that the RMA processing timeframes be imposed by an order of the Court. Specified exceptions to the interim orders were also noted. Those exceptions were, in summary, to enable decisions to be made in relation to applications for activities that would not or did not exceed the limits sought by Mr Belgioirn-Nettis in his submissions on the relevant parts of the PAUP.

[5] Mr Stewart indicated an agreement ought to be reached and that he would be taking further instructions that afternoon. One potential area of disagreement related to the period of any interim order. The applicant preferred the orders remain until a decision is made. I indicated my preference that it be approached on the basis that both parties be granted leave to seek a revisiting of the orders when the matter is heard substantively. On that basis, I adjourned the hearing to enable Mr Stewart to take instructions. He then did so, indicating that agreement was likely.
[6] The parties reached an agreement and then filed consent orders for my approval. The orders broadly accord with Mr Ward’s outline as noted above. I am content to make those orders for the following reasons:

[a] Mr Belgiorno-Nettis’ claims raise serious issues to be tried.

[b] However, it is not necessary to make orders directly affecting the operation of s 86F in order to preserve, in substance, Mr Belgiorno-Nettis’ position pending the hearing of his claims.

[c] The orders as sought enable the ordinary operation of s 86F, and the AUP rules, up until the making of a substantive decision that might bear on the utility of any relief that could be granted in these proceedings.

[d] The proposed orders are tailored to allow the processing of applications for consent, the granting of which would not be inconsistent with the relief Mr Belgiorno-Nettis sought in relation to the AUP.

[e] Taken together, the orders represent a proper balance between the policy of the Local Government (Auckland Transitional Provisions) Act 2010 (LGATPA) to enable the efficient promulgation of the AUP, the right of the public to be able to rely on the operative provisions of the AUP, and Mr Belgiorno-Nettis’ right to his day in Court and any vindication that might flow from that.

[7] Accordingly, I make the following orders:

[a] The Council is to provide Mr Belgiorno-Nettis (through his legal representatives) a copy of any resource consent applications received relating to land within the Blocks, as defined in the proceedings, within 3 working days of lodgement.

[b] Subject always to the exceptions stated below in [c], the Council may process any new resource consent application, or existing application
at the date of these orders, by reference to the provisions of the AUP (Operative in Part) only, and without reference to the provisions of the
former North Shore District Plan (NSDP). However, the Council may
only process any such application up to the point of preparing draft
notification and substantive decisions, and it may not make a
notification decision or substantive decision in respect of the
application while these orders remain in force. The processing
timeframes under the RMA shall be paused from the point at which the
Council ceases processing in terms of this order [b].

[c] The Council may process and determine any application for resource
consent specified below under the RMA in the usual way by reference
to the provisions of the AUP only, and without reference to the
provisions of the NSDP. The order at [b] shall not apply to any of the
following applications (however the order at [a] will apply):

[i] Applications for resource consent involving a change in use and
    involving no development; and/or

[ii] Applications for resource consent involving any development
    at or below the following heights:

    • The Terrace Housing and Apartment Building-zoned
      land within the Promenade Block — 12 metres;

    • Within the Lake Road Block:

    ▪ “The Mixed Use zoned land” west of Lake Road
      — 16.5 metres;

    ▪ “The Mixed Use zoned land” east of Lake Road
      — 12 metres;

    ▪ “The Mixed Housing Urban zoned land” east of
      Lake Road — 9 metres.
[d] Leave is reserved to any party to apply to the Court at any time to vary or cancel these orders. It is expressly recorded that the Council may apply for the orders to be varied or cancelled at the substantive hearing set down on 29 and 30 June 2020. If no party applies to vary or cancel the orders, they shall expire on the determination of the proceedings by this Court.

[e] Costs shall lie where they fall.

[8] Counsel for the Plaintiff record that the proposed interim orders are without prejudice to position of the Plaintiff to be advanced at the substantive hearing.
Schedule A

Mr Belgiorno-Nettis’ claims (to be tried) are as follows:

(a) The IHP erred by stating that prior decision making at the regional policy statement level or submissions which raised general concerns about intensification and building height in Takapuna would necessitate the rejection of individual submissions by Mr Belgiorno-Nettis (and others) in relation to the Blocks, which also negated materially relevant considerations.

(b) The IHP made a material mistake of fact by mischaracterising Mr Belgiorno-Nettis’ position, namely, in holding that his “general submissions raising concerns about intensification and building height in Takapuna at a general strategic or growth management level were accordingly not recommended to be accepted” and that “prior strategic recommendations for the regional policy statement necessarily resulted in the recommendation of rejection of individual submissions [of Mr Belgiorno-Nettis and others] which ran counter to that strategy”.

(c) The IHP gave inadequate reasons, which breached s 144 of the LGATPA and/or the common law, including in so far as the IHP:

(i) Failed to state the evidence or expert evidence relied upon;

(ii) did not make them with reference to any particular evidence;

(iii) omitted to state reasons for preferring one witness or expert over another; and

(iv) failed completely to mention the competing evidential positions.

(d) The promulgation of the new reasons breached the principle of natural justice because the persons deciding the new reasons had not listened
to or heard all of the evidence Mr Belgioirno-Nettis provided or relied upon.

c) The IHP failed or omitted to have regard to relevant considerations in relation to what was actually built or the environment as it existed.

d) The IHP came to a conclusion without evidence, or one it could not reasonably have come to on the evidence.

g) For the reasons just mentioned, the Council’s decision to accept the IHP’s recommendation was flawed.
Memorandum

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

Subject: Access for Everyone pilot to begin in Queen Street

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 Access for Everyone (A4E) pilot for the Waitematā/Queen Street Valley will begin next month, signalling the start of pedestrian priority for the heart of Auckland.

Summary

2. As part of the refreshed City Centre Masterplan (CCMP), a Queen Street valley pilot was agreed to take place by March 2021.

3. Auckland Transport and Auckland Council agreed to use a co-design process for the Queen Street pilot, working closely with users and stakeholders to introduce, adjust and improve interventions quickly.

4. Following the COVID-19 pandemic, temporary changes were made to Queen Street. These changes will be used as a basis for further testing starting in July 2020 effectively bringing the pilot forward.

Context

5. On 5 March 2020, Planning Committee resolved (PLA/2020/17) to adopt Auckland’s refreshed CCMP, the visionary plan to guide the city centre’s development for the next 20 years. At the centre of the CCMP is Access for Everyone (A4E), which will work towards the removal of non-essential car traffic from Queen Street. It prioritises pedestrians and frees up road space for public transport, deliveries, emergency services and for people with limited mobility.

6. Planning Committee resolution PLA/2020/17c supported commencement of a Queen Street pilot by March 2021 to coincide with the closure of Victoria and Albert Street intersection for City Rail Link construction.

7. The environment created by COVID-19 urgently required Auckland Transport (AT) to install emergency measures in Queen Street in for physical distancing during May 2020. These interventions included bus stop boarders, extra footway space and new road markings. All of them create extra space for pedestrians.

8. With these measures now installed, AT can now study them to determine the extent to which they are making Queen Street more attractive and easier to use, thus bringing elements of the Queen Street pilot forward by several months.

9. While COVID-19 remains a potential threat, there is a need to maintain our ability to react rapidly if physical distancing may once again be required.
Discussion

10. A4E represents a longstanding desire to improve Queen Street and provide more and better-quality space for shoppers, residents, visitors and workers. It is also a system for coordinating construction access.

11. Further changes to Queen Street will need to be made in order to prioritise bus movements through Auckland city centre during CRL construction in 2021-22. By bringing work on the Queen Street pilot forward, different systems for prioritising public transport and pedestrians can be tested and optimised.

12. Auckland is currently facing severe budgetary pressures – it will reflect better on council’s efficiencies if the recently-installed Queen Street changes are developed, tested and adapted, as opposed to removed and potentially reinstalled later.

13. Such measures are popular with the public. Respondents overwhelmingly supported the principles of a pedestrian priority Queen Street, with 82 per cent supporting the A4E concept. In May 2020, research into Aucklanders’ attitudes to pilot programmes found that 73 per cent support this type of initiative and more than half of people surveyed believe that these initiatives are more relevant since the pandemic began.

14. Co-design has successfully been used in High Street. This has delivered quick improvements to the street, improving conditions for shoppers, businesses and residents. This process and changes have been well-received; in June 2020, the High Street co-design won a 2020 WSP Golden Foot Award from Living Streets Aotearoa.

Next steps

15. Alterations to the temporary interventions will continue as necessary over the next fortnight. Pilot work proper will begin next month, with a series of co-design workshops. It will be led by Auckland Council, with support from Auckland Transport and the New Zealand Transport Agency.

16. A co-design process will adapt the existing Queen Street emergency measures, reflecting user needs and feedback. Being a pilot, it will continue to use temporary materials. It will also test a range of activities to help people better use the space. The co-design will be shaped by a reference group of key partners who represent the Queen Street community. Engagement will also take place with individual businesses, residents and street users.

17. Further surveys will be undertaken throughout the duration of the pilot, to gauge people’s perceptions and attitudes towards the improvements. By focussing on people’s perceptions of Queen Street, it will work to find the best layout and promote Queen Street as being ‘open for business’.

18. Funding for the Queen Street pilot is being sought from NZTA’s Innovating Streets contestable fund. This was established in September 2019 to support trials of temporary treatments to improve street environments and provide more space for people. Funding is also being provided by the Auckland City Centre Advisory Board’s targeted rate.

19. Communication is key for successful pilot projects, with clear definition of intent and purpose; people need to understand why changes are being made. Council and AT will work in partnership across the pilot programme team to deliver the strategic and project communications. They will be jointly accountable for delivery of communications.
21 June 2020

Committee Secretariat
Environment Committee
By email: en@parliament.govt.nz

Auckland Council’s submission on the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track consenting) Bill

Please find attached Auckland Council’s submission on the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track consenting) Bill. This submission includes the input from Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs) Auckland Transport (AT), Watercare Services Limited (Watercare) and Panuku Development Auckland. It is acknowledged that AT have made a separate submission. We have requested to speak to our submission.

This submission is endorsed by the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Planning Committee, Chair of the Regulatory Committee and Chair of the Independent Māori Statutory Board with delegation on behalf of the Planning Committee. Six local boards have provided feedback to the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track consenting) Bill, and these are appended to the Council’s submission.

Please contact Anna Jennings (anna.jennings@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz), Principal Advisor Urban Growth and Housing, if you have any queries regarding Auckland Council's submission.

Yours sincerely

Councillor Chris Darby
Chair of the Planning Committee

Councillor Josephine Bartley
Deputy Chair of the Planning Committee

Councillor Linda Cooper
Chair of the Regulatory Committee

Chairman David Taipari
Chairman of the Independent Māori Statutory Board
Submission to the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track consenting) Bill

Auckland Council 21 June 2020
# Mihimihi

| Ka mihi ake ai ki ngā maunga here kōrero, | I greet the mountains, repository of all that has been said of this place, |
| ki ngā pari whakarongo tai, | there I greet the cliffs that have heard the ebb and flow of the tides of time, |
| ki ngā awa tuku kiri o ōna manawhenua, | and the rivers that cleansed the forebears of all who came those born of this land |
| ōna mana ā-īwi taketake mai, taulwi atu. | and the newcomers among us all. |
| Tāmaki – makau a te rau, murau a te tini, wenerau a te mano. | Auckland – beloved of hundreds, famed among the multitude, envy of thousands. |
| Kāhore tō rite i te ao. | You are unique in the world. |
Kāinga Orate tāpae tangata o te Kaunihera o Tāmaki Makaurau
Auckland Council Submission 21 June 2020

Auckland Council Submission on the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track consenting) Bill

Submission on the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track consenting) Bill to the Environment Select Committee

Introduction

1. Auckland Council thanks the Government through the Select Committee for the opportunity to provide a submission on the COVID-19 (Fast track consenting) Bill.

2. This submission is endorsed by the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Planning Committee, Chair of the Regulatory Committee and the Chair of the Independent Māori Statutory Board with delegation on behalf of the Governing Body. The Independent Māori Statutory Board has provided its independent advice to develop the Council’s submission and it supports the submission, particularly the changes proposed to ensure the process for listed and referred projects provide for meaningful iwi input and the meeting of Te Tiriti o Waitangi principles.

3. This submission includes the input from Council Controlled Organisations (CCOs) Auckland Transport, Watercare Services Limited and Panuku Development Auckland. In addition to collaborating on the technical detail with Auckland Council on this submission Auckland Transport is making an independent submission.

4. In accordance with Auckland Council’s unique governance model our local boards have also provided their feedback. These are attached in Attachment A.

5. New Zealand is facing unprecedented economic and social impacts as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Auckland Council is broadly supportive of the intent of the Bill to urgently promote employment growth and to support New Zealand’s recovery from the economic and social impacts of COVID19 and to support the certainty of ongoing investment across New Zealand while continuing to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

6. Auckland Council’s submission focusses on a request to include the application to take and use up to 200,000 m³/day (net) of water from the Waikato River for the purposes of municipal water supply for Auckland. The drought situation in Auckland is critical and the impact of average or lower-than-average rainfall for winter and spring is likely to result in the drought continuing through the 2020/21 summer. This application is absolutely fundamental to Auckland’s and New Zealand’s economic and social future and will achieve the purpose of the Bill by creating hundreds of jobs during construction. Council requests that it be listed in Schedule 2. The balance of council’s submission consists of high level feedback and a number of suggested amendments to improve the quality of the proposed fast track consenting process. All amendments and additions are set out in Attachment B.
Tāmaki Makaurau context

7. Auckland Council is a unitary authority and is the largest council in New Zealand in terms of population and it is also the most complex in terms of the range of functions it is required to undertake. The Auckland region covers a wide range of land uses from dense urban to rural productive and conservation islands.

8. Auckland Council is unique in having an Independent Māori Statutory Board in order to assist council to make decisions, perform functions, and exercise powers. The Schedule of Issues of Significance and The Māori Plan for Tāmaki Makaurau provide a framework for these to be considered.

9. The Auckland Plan 2050 identifies that to achieve the Auckland our residents and visitors want, we must address the three most important challenges of high population growth, ensuring prosperity is shared amongst all Aucklanders, and arresting and reversing environmental degradation. Auckland’s success is dependent on how well Auckland’s prosperity is shared and in doing so avoiding gentrification that does not benefit those most in need.

10. In the Auckland Council context, mana whenua means the indigenous people (Māori) who have historic and territorial rights over the land. Forming about 15 per cent of Auckland’s Māori population, it refers to Māori who whakapapa to (have genealogical links with) Tāmaki Makaurau iwi and hapū. Mana whenua interests are represented by 19 iwi (tribal) authorities in Tāmaki Makaurau, Auckland.

11. Auckland Council has a commitment to a treaty-based partnership with Māori. In practice, these commitments are delivered through working together to achieve better outcomes for Māori, lifting economic, social and cultural wellbeing and recognising the link between Māori and whenua through whakapapa, strengthening our effectiveness for Māori and optimising post-treaty settlement opportunities to benefit Māori and all Aucklanders.

12. Auckland Council has an established relationship with the Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum. The Forum are a collective body of Mana Whenua entities in Tāmaki Makaurau with a mandate to provide direction on issues of regional interest.

13. In June 2019, Auckland Council formally declared a Climate Emergency, recognising the importance of and urgency required to address climate change for the benefit of current and future generations. Auckland Council consulted on a region-wide climate action framework, Te Tāruke-a-Tāwhiri last year which is about to be launched.

14. Auckland is currently experiencing a severe drought. Stage one water restrictions are now in place. This places limitations on residential and commercial water use. Since the start of the year, the region has received significantly less rainfall than normal. This is having an impact on our water supply.

15. Auckland Council is currently consulting on the Emergency Budget. The COVID-19 pandemic has significantly impacted Auckland. Our people, communities and businesses have all been affected by the health-related restrictions, border closure and resulting economic impacts. It is estimated that the Auckland Council group will experience a shortfall of revenue more than half a billion dollars in the coming financial year. This will impact on Auckland Council’s ability to deliver existing services and invest in much needed infrastructure, housing and the environment.
High level feedback

Opportunity: Water supply consent

16. As a result of the drought, Auckland’s water supply situation is growing increasingly serious. As at 19 June 2020, total water storage was approximately 44 per cent of capacity. This is lower than the average for this time of year when storage is usually at approximately 77 per cent of capacity. Since the start of 2020, Auckland has received less than half of the usual rainfall. The forecast for spring is for lower-than-average rainfall.

17. Watercare Services Limited (Watercare), a council-controlled organisation, has taken measures to source additional supplies of water within the Auckland region as well as to manage demand. On 16 May 2020, mandatory water restrictions came into force across the whole of the Auckland region. Such water restrictions have not been imposed in Auckland since the drought of 1993/1994. Auckland uses water sustainably with its per capita household consumption the second-lowest of all New Zealand regions.

18. While the COVID situation has created global uncertainty for the short and medium future, in the long-term the council is expecting Auckland’s population to continue to increase. Over the next 35 years, the Auckland population serviced by the metropolitan water system is expected to increase by approximately 800,000 from 1.41 million to 2.2 million. This will create significant additional demands for water – and that means investment will be needed for new water sources, water treatment capacity and networks.

19. In December 2013, Watercare lodged a comprehensive application with the Waikato Regional Council to take an additional 200,000 m³/day (net) of water from the Waikato River for municipal water supply for Auckland. The project will include infrastructure and operational requirements. Examples include construction of a new intake, raw water pipeline and advanced water treatment plant, and modifications to the existing water transmission system like the construction of a booster pumping station.

20. Seven years later, the application has not been considered and is still number 106 in a queue of applications. This application is critical to Auckland’s and New Zealand’s economic and social future but it may be further years before it is even considered. The current Resource Management Act is inadequate in not allowing the Waikato Regional Council to prioritise processing of applications according to their importance.

21. In relation to the purpose of the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consent) Bill, the implementation of the consent is estimated to result in the following employment figures:
   - 200-300 new jobs in the first 12-month phase;
   - 150 new jobs in the following 18-month phase;
   - 8 full-time equivalent operational and maintenance roles at completion and into the future.

22. The greater economic impact, however, relates to the fundamental role that water plays in Auckland’s construction, industrial, business, recreation and residential sectors. Should Auckland’s water supply continue to be restricted through drought or other circumstances, the social and economic impacts for the region and for the country are likely to run into the hundreds of millions of dollars and thousands of jobs.
23. 70% of water use is for residential purposes. Of the remaining 30%, the biggest users are food and beverage manufacturing, materials manufacturing and education, sports and recreation (predominantly irrigation of fields and turfs).

24. Council’s Chief Economist has undertaken an initial investigation of the economic implications of Auckland’s ongoing droughts and consequent water restrictions. The findings are preliminary and conservative and are useful to understand the likely impacts of this situation continuing into the future:

- An estimated 750 to 1,000 employees are already affected across Auckland by the current level of water restrictions. This does not imply that they will all lose their jobs, but that the viability of the businesses that employ them may be severely compromised. It is likely there will be job losses.

- Conservatively, 6,000 employees in Auckland could be affected by more severe water restrictions than the restrictions currently in place. A less conservative (but not extreme view), would be that 14,000 employees could be affected by tighter water restrictions including reduced production in major water-using businesses.

- Households will lose the amenity of being able to use water for all of their normal needs.

25. A reliable and sufficient supply of water is essential in supporting the certainty of ongoing investment in the Auckland region. It is critical that this application is considered quickly. Under the current resource management allocation regime of “first in first served” its consideration will be years away. The implications of not acting now will be hugely damaging. Auckland Council and Watercare want to ensure that the application is robustly considered against the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 and that the relevant iwi and local authority have a critical role in the process. The Bill as drafted provides for the local iwi and the local authority to provide comment on the application and both parties will also have representation on the expert panel. Our submission recommends extending the timeframe from 10 days to 20 days (refer to paragraphs 41 and 42 below).

26. Therefore, given the regional and national importance of a reliable water supply for Auckland, the proposed process which will ensure the key involvement of the relevant iwi and local authority, and the need for a timely decision to avoid adverse social and economic effects for Auckland and New Zealand, Auckland Council considers that the application for additional water take from the Waikato for the purposes of municipal water supply should be a listed project in Schedule 2.

**Opportunity: Economic and social recovery**

27. Auckland Council is broadly supportive of the intent of the Bill to urgently promote employment growth and to support New Zealand’s recovery from the economic and social impacts of COVID-19. Auckland Council can see some benefits for parts of the Auckland Council family to use these proposed fast track processes.

28. Auckland Council supports the naming of the 16 listed projects to be fast tracked around the country to help create jobs and boost the economy following the COVID-19 pandemic. Six of the projects are in Auckland, and include projects to create high-density housing near Unitec, upgrades to the Britomart Station, electrification of the Papakura to Pukekohe rail line, development of Papakura housing, the Papakura to Drury State Highway 1 Improvements, and the Northern Pathway with the “Skypath” walking and cycling connection across
Auckland Harbour. These projects will create over 700 jobs in Auckland and will help boost our local economy, as well as creating important transport connections and new housing.

**Opportunity: Te Tiriti o Waitangi**

29. The council is aware of concerns raised by the Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum in relation to the Bill. Based on the limited engagement that has been able to take place, input from council specialists and the independent advice from the Independent Maori Statutory Board, amendments that give greater recognition to the Government’s obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi are proposed in Attachment B. These views are not a replacement or substitute for central government engagement with mana whenua and mataawakā or intended to represent their position on issues. The council strongly encourages the Government to carefully consider any submissions from Maori entities and groups, and engage with Māori more broadly before finalising the Bill.

30. Te Tiriti o Waitangi provisions must ensure Māori as a Treaty partner are involved not only in the fast-track consenting process, but more importantly in the wider economic recovery. Auckland Council is aware of the strong interest from iwi in initiatives to stimulate the economy post COVID-19. These interests range from building cultural resilience, to supporting whānau facing financial pressures as a result of the economic downturn, to leveraging development opportunities to deliver positive outcomes for Māori. Māori are over represented in low socio-economic statistics pre-COVID and this will be exacerbated under the current situation facing the nation. Conversely, the urgency for economic recovery cannot diminish the need to consider impacts on Māori cultural values.

31. The Bill attempts to address this through the provisions and in principle this approach is supported. The Bill places additional demand on the resources of iwi and further consideration is needed on how iwi can be best supported to enable their full participation. And while responsibility of monitoring consents remains with councils, there is an opportunity to consider iwi involvement in monitoring through the legislation.

32. Due to the highly compressed time constraints with the submission period, the Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Forum were unable to provide comment to Auckland Council and have indicated they will be making their own submission. The Forum have identified concerns regarding the reduction in public participation under the Bill, and specifically the lack of engagement with iwi by the Minister for the Environment when deciding on applications for referral. Auckland Council encourages the submission from the Forum to be given particular regard.

**Issue: Decision making and managing adverse environmental impacts**

**Listed and referred projects**

33. It is essential that decisions made on the projects listed in the Bill and any project referred to the Minister for the Environment for consideration, are carefully assessed against an appropriate range of matters. Failure to do so will potentially result in projects being approved that have significant, long-lasting environmental and cultural impacts. The council supports the current range of considerations. However, it strongly believes that additional considerations should be added at the various decision-making stages. Those additional matters are briefly discussed below and are set out in detail Attachment B. In terms of this
issue and the Minister’s overall accountability, the council is particularly concerned that for
referred projects, the Minister has the discretion not to consider the matters currently listed in
the Bill. The Minister should be required to carefully consider those matters before making a
decision to accept a proposal as eligible for the fast-track consenting process.

34. In light of the extensive process that local government must go through to develop its
strategies and plans (evidence-based, public submission, subject to scrutiny from Experts
Panels and the Courts), it is critical that the Bill includes plans and proposed plans as key
decision making considerations for the panel. This is particularly the case with a process that
has less public participation rights than an ordinary resource consent application or notice of
requirement.

35. The Bill includes plans and proposed plans as matters for consideration for the panel, for
both listed and referred projects. This is strongly supported.

36. However, Schedule 6, Clause 32 sets out the grounds on which resource consents and
designations may be declined for listed projects. The grounds for declining are much
narrower than the considerations for resource consent applications and notices of
requirement under Schedule 6, Clause 29 and 31. There appears to be little justification for
considering a specified list of matters if they cannot then form the basis for decline of the
application. As a minimum, the following additional grounds for declining are recommended;
the proposal will not achieve the purpose of the Bill, and the proposal will result in significant
adverse effects.

Resource consents and notices of requirement

37. Decisions made on resource consents can have far reaching consequences for a district and
region. The consequences can either be positive or negative for the wider community and
environment depending on whether decisions made on the development were based on
evidence and have been scrutinised carefully, or not. The local knowledge and evidence that
usually sits within a local authority is a critical input into that process.

38. The Bill removes Council’s ordinary decision making powers on resource consent
applications and designations under the RMA. However, the Bill enables council input into
the decision making process on multiple levels, which is welcomed and supported. In
particular, the Bill’s requirement for one council representative to sit on the Expert Panel is
essential, to ensure council expertise and knowledge formally informs the decision making
process.

39. Another concern is the lack of explicit consideration in the Bill’s decision making framework
of infrastructure provision and capacity. While the broad considerations under Clause 20
subclause 3 of the Bill could include infrastructure considerations, the Bill would benefit
significantly by including infrastructure capacity as an explicit consideration.

40. This viewpoint is informed by Auckland Council’s experience with the Housing Accords and
Special Housing Areas Act 2013 (HASHAA). It is noted that even with explicit infrastructure
considerations under HASHAA, Special Housing Areas with significant infrastructure
deficiencies were gazetted. This left Auckland Council with some pronounced funding
challenges, as urgent funding often had to be diverted from one planned project to an
unplanned SHA project. It is concerning that the potential for a similar issue could arise
under the Bill, especially for referred housing projects. This concern is heightened by the
financial challenges that council faces in the wake the COVID-19 pandemic.
**Issue: Timeframes**

41. The proposed 10 working day timeframe in which the relevant local authority must indicate whether they think the Panel should accept the application is insufficient to review the project assessment report and respond in a meaningful way. The Bill should recognise the governance requirements of any local authority (i.e., political sign off would be required which involves a formal meeting of the Council), the specialist input required from across a local authority and infrastructure providers and the complexity of urban development.

42. While Auckland Council acknowledges the important fast-tracking intent of the Bill, it is strongly recommended that the response times be increased to 20 working days (in Clause 21(4) and Schedule 6 Clause 18) to enable a local authority to respond effectively, without losing sight of the fast-tracking intent of the Bill. At the start of the process when the Minister receives an application this would allow for any issues to be identified upfront and potentially lead to a smoother consenting process. Therefore, overall efficiencies and time savings could be increased, not reduced.

**Issue: Public participation**

43. Public participation is a very important part of any resource management process. As well as raising public awareness and potentially support, it enables the benefits and any adverse impacts to be better understood and addressed by applicants and decision-makers. Schedule 6, Clause 17 sets out that public and limited notification are not permitted and that a panel must not give public or limited notification of a consent application or notice of requirement. To counterbalance this there is a requirement within 10 days of the EPA receiving consent applications for the panel to invite written comments from parties listed in subclauses (4) to (7) including relevant local authority and iwi authorities. There is also provision in Clause 17 subclauses (5) and (7) where a panel may invite written comments from any other person the panel considers appropriate.

44. It is acknowledged that within the Bill the need for public participation is balanced with the fast track nature of the process. However, this relies heavily on the knowledge, expertise and information available to the panel members to identify ‘any other person the panel considers appropriate’. A key mitigation for Auckland Council is in having a representative on the panel who will be able to guide the decision of the panel particularly in regards to those latter subclauses of other persons who the panel considers relevant. However, this does not fully satisfy the ability for other members of the public to comment on the application which would happen under normal public or limited notification. A potential remedy to this is to enable the panel to invite additional written comments from any person recommended by the relevant local authority.

**Issue: Cost recovery**

45. The Bill sets out a number of areas where local authorities are required to support the Panel, including the appointment of a council officer to the Panel. Auckland Council is ready, willing and able to support the panel. However, it can only do so if any work local authorities do for the panel in relation to the fast track consenting process (including monitoring consents and designations granted/approved by the panel) is fully cost recoverable. This principle is entirely consistent with the principles that apply under the RMA.
46. The ability to cost recover is even more important given the tight budgetary constraints that a number of local authorities are under as a result of the impacts of COVID-19. Specific recommended changes are set out in Attachment B for Clause 35 (Monitoring and Enforcement) and several within Schedule 5 (Local Authority Support).

**Issue: Impact on Auckland Council’s infrastructure provision**

47. Auckland Council’s Infrastructure Strategy outlines significant infrastructure issues facing Auckland over the next 30 years including the sequencing and coordination of infrastructure. The Strategy outlines how council will manage its infrastructure considering factors such as infrastructure renewals, growth in the demand for services, levels of service provision, public health and environmental outcomes and resilience and risks relating to natural hazards.

48. Network planning is complex. Aligning multiple outcomes, including infrastructure, has been taken into account in producing the Auckland Plan 2050 Development Strategy. Therefore, the timing and scale of development must be considered particularly where it falls out of sequence with the Development Strategy. As such any proposal needs to include an assessment of the impacts and capacity of existing infrastructure and the impact on the wider surrounding network. The implications of a project on Council’s consequential infrastructure spend also needs to be addressed. This is even more important given Auckland Council’s budgetary constraints as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, as outlined in the current Emergency Budget consultation, that will restrict investment on infrastructure.

49. Clause 20 sets out the information to be included in an application for referral. The list of information in subclause 3 does not include an assessment of the impact of the application on the existing infrastructure and/or capacity of that infrastructure. While this will only be relevant for some applications that may have significant impacts on bulk infrastructure provision depending on the scale and location, it is recommended that the subclause is amended to include ‘an assessment of impacts and capacity of existing infrastructure where relevant’.

50. Within Schedule 6, Clause 27 sets out the consideration of consent applications for listed projects and Clause 29 sets out consideration of consent applications for referred projects. Although a broad range of considerations are listed, within which infrastructure provisions and capacity could be considered, infrastructure is not explicitly set out as a matter for consideration. This creates a risk that infrastructure provision and capacity will not be given due consideration. It is recommended that ‘infrastructure capacity’ is set out as a consideration for both listed and referred projects. It is recommended that changes are made to Clauses 9, 11 and 12 within Schedule 6.

**Issue: Permitted activities**

51. While the idea of enabling certain upgrade works in road and rail corridors as permitted activities is supported in principle, there are a number of issues and questions in terms of how the Bill is currently drafted.

52. It is not clear if the new permitted activity rules last for 15 years, which would appear excessive given cumulative effects on the environment and this being a COVID response bill; or whether this relates to on-going activities e.g. discharges, once a minor upgrade has been undertaken, noting the words “continue to be carried out” and the commentary in the...
Explanatory Note imply this to be the case. The referencing to “in connection with a project to which this Act applies” is also unclear.

53. Further, some of the permitted activity standards for these permitted activities are poorly defined or unclear. This may create enforcement and monitoring issues, as well as lead to undesirable adverse effects on the environment. This is of particular concern given that these effects may relate to the coastal marine area and watercourses.

**Issue: Construction waste**

54. Significant environmental and social outcomes can be generated by reducing waste to landfill, including those associated with climate change and local resilience. By prioritising waste reduction in “fast tracked” projects, Central Government can help industry and local authorities meet the objectives of the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 and the Zero Carbon Act 2019. Approximately 50 per cent of the waste Auckland sends to landfills is construction and demolition waste. The Bill should therefore consider the waste impacts of infrastructure projects accelerated through this process.

55. Relief sought - Auckland Council advocates for waste minimisation to be incorporated in the design, construction and deconstruction of buildings and infrastructure and for this to be a legislative requirement of the environmental management safeguards in the proposed legislation.
Attachment A – Local Board Submissions
Albert-Eden Local Board feedback on the
Covid-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Bill Friday 19th June

Preliminary comments:
The Albert-Eden Local Board is skeptical about the need to subvert the existing RMA consenting process, given that the Minister for the Environment has had the ability since 2009 to "call-in" certain nationally significant projects and refer them to a Board of Inquiry for decision.

However, in light of the severe economic down-turn caused by the Covid Crisis, we concede that some significant projects have the potential to stimulate the economy and thus may merit even faster decision-making by way of limited exception to the usual process. Thus, we reluctantly support this Bill in principle provided that it is used sparingly and for a limited time, and with appropriate safe-guards to ensure wise-decision making to approve structures that will be around for many decades, if not centuries.

Our key submission is that any project referred to the Fast-Tracking process must be subject to review by a Panel with appropriate expertise. We are pleased to see that the original proposal for direct approval by legislation or Ministerial approval has been modified to ensure that all projects are to be considered by a Panel who will make recommendations to the Minister for the Environment. However, certain aspects of the process need to be improved to ensure that far-reaching decisions are not made by a very small group without benefit of the knowledge of subject-matter experts and the affected communities.

Another key point is that the most time-consuming part of the decision-making process is not the actual approval (in practice almost all Resource Consent Applications are approved), but rather in crafting numerous conditions of consent – which can run to hundreds for larger projects. Thus, the Panel and those making the final decision need adequate time to carefully consider the issues and options before them. Although many hanker for the quickest possible processing time – the reality is that sub-optimal decisions may prove costlier (in both time and dollars) in the long run.

Specific Comments on the Bill now out for consultation:

Panels and Panel Size
1. We strongly support the principle that all applications be referred to an independent panel with an appropriate mix of expertise. Under the RMA process a panel of quasi-judicial decision makers are supposed to impartially consider the arguments and evidence of the applicant alongside public submissions, and specifically enjoined not to consider facts drawn from their own memory or experience which have not been not explicitly presented to them in evidence. But under the proposed process an expert panel will consider the applicant’s evidence alongside a very limited set of submissions from invited parties. Therefore, it is imperative that the panel will include a range of appropriate expertise to properly evaluate all aspects of the application.

2. It is not credible that a 4-person panel will have such a range of expertise (given that 3 members of each panel are specified as a Judge in the chair plus an Iwi representative and a Council representative) as there will only be one slot for a
subject-matter expert). Therefore, we recommend a larger panel of at least 6 members – and more for larger projects.

3. We note that the Bill refers to iwi, and in the Auckland context it is most appropriate for the representative to have mana whenua status for the area the project is based in.

4. Those six (or more) members must consist of a mana whenua and council representative. It is particularly important to have a mana whenua representative (or more than one) on the panel as appeal rights are limited. In the context of the Auckland region the council representative should be a local board member, with appropriate experience, that is from the area the project is based in, to provide local knowledge, expertise and oversight.

Submissions Process:

5. Clause 17 (1) explicitly prevents the panel from giving public or limited notification, although clauses 17 (2) – (5) do allow for a range of parties to be invited to make comment. While acknowledging the government’s desire to speed up the process, the Board requests that active consideration be given to a form of Limited Notification. This would allow immediately affected neighbours of the proposed project to make submissions within a short timeframe.

6. We would also advocate that parties with “a greater than average interest” be allowed to participate in the process – e.g. relevant local groups (environmental, historical, cultural, etc.) who can demonstrate an actual interest in the project.

Draft Conditions and Comments from Submitters:

7. Clause 34 requires that, prior to making its final decision, the Panel shall provide a copy of its draft conditions to the applicant and those invited to submit. The Panel will be required to “have regard to” any comments on potential improvements to the conditions. However, this deliberately excludes the general public, including many with a likely interest. We suggest that the draft decision and conditions are made public and anybody with an interest given an opportunity to comment within the allowed time frame. Such comments would be restricted to potential amendments to the conditions, not the actual decision to approve the consent. Although invited submitters may have considerable insight into likely impacts, those who live nearby will have important local knowledge to inform the final decision.

Climate Change:

8. The Climate Change Commission advocates that a climate change lens be applied to economic measures, noting that an economic stimulus package can either speed up or stall progress towards climate goals. The Board supports this principle and trusts that it will be incorporated into this Bill.

9. Climate change mitigation, adaptation and other environmental outcomes should be explicitly included as criteria for public benefit in s19.

10. In addition, s19 should be re-worded from ‘may consider’ to ‘must consider’. Climate and environmental impact assessment shouldn’t be optional, and projects should have to have a good claim to public benefit (for at least one of the reasons set out in this section) in order to be fast-tracked.

**Date:** 19 Jun 2020

**Form to be sent to:** Anna Jennings, Principal Advisor, Urban Growth and Housing  
Carol Stewart, LBSD Senior Policy Advisor

**Recipient:** Planning Committee

**Feedback deadline:** 19 Jun 2020, 5:00pm

**Kaipātiki Local Board Feedback:**

The Kaipātiki Local Board is grateful for the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed COVID-19 Recovery Bill.

Concerns that the Kaipātiki Local Board have relating to COVID-19 Recovery Bill:

- Bypassing mandatory climate impacts assessment,
- Ensuring communities have the right and opportunity to provide submissions on any fast-tracked project,
- Request that applicable Local Boards be consulted on any fast-tracked projects, as they have understanding on local circumstances,
- Removal of appeal rights, as they will be limited to points of law and/or judicial review to the High Court,
- Applicable Local Boards should be able to speak at hearings.

The Kaipātiki Local Board would like the following points to be included:

- Territorial Authorities being able to nominate appointments to the expert consenting panel, including the applicable Local Boards,
- Ensuring that environmental safeguards are preserved,
- A requirement by the expert panel to respond to comments and provide clear reasons for decisions,
- The repealing of this legislation after a two-year period.

The Kaipātiki Local Board requests the opportunity to speak to its feedback at any hearing on this matter.
Prepared on behalf of the Kaipātiki Local Board by:

Melanie Kenrick, Kaipātiki Local Board

Authorised by:

[Signature]

Name: John Gillon, Chairperson, Kaipātiki Local Board
Email: john.gillon@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Date: 19 June 2020
Manurewa Local Board feedback on Auckland Council’s submission to the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Bill

The board supports the purpose of this Bill in promoting employment growth to support the economic recovery from COVID-19 by establishing fast-track consenting and designation processes for infrastructure and development projects. The construction industry is a significant employer of Manurewa residents and we expect that many of them will benefit from projects that utilise the fast track process.

However, we believe that caution needs to be exercised to ensure that this tool is not open to abuse. We must keep in mind that each use of the fast track process represents a reduction in the rights of local residents to be heard regarding the effects of the proposal on them, their community, and their property. The criteria to determine when the social, economic and environmental benefits of using the fast track process outweigh the reduction in those rights must be strictly and judiciously applied by the Minister.

When deciding whether to refer a project for the fast track process, consideration must also be given to the potential to adversely affect other areas that are not a part of that project. For example, the Papakura to Drury State Highway 1 Improvements could have the effect of increasing traffic flows through the roading network to the north. The flow-on impact of this could lead to more congestion, particularly on residential streets, which leads in turn to increased rat-running. It is therefore important that projects that could mitigate this, such as the Mill Road Improvements project, which would provide an alternative route north, are also prioritised through the fast track process to avoid a mismatch in delivery timeframes.

The composition of the expert consenting panels, and the process that these panels follow, will be key to ensuring the fast track process is produces positive results. We support the requirement for representatives of the relevant local authorities and relevant iwi authorities to be included in the membership of panels.

We feel that it is unfortunate that circumstances have required the passage of this legislation without a longer process to allow for its consideration. While noting that the legislation will have a limited lifespan of two years, we recommend that the operation of the Act should be reviewed six to nine months after its implementation to ensure that there have been no unintended or unjust consequences.

We also note that, if this Bill is to achieve its intended economic benefits, consideration will need to be given to increased Government funding for infrastructure and development projects. Many local authorities, including Auckland Council, are facing a shortage of funding for capital works in the coming financial year due to the impact of COVID-19. The availability of a fast track consenting process will not produce economic benefits if there are no funds to carry out capital works.
This feedback is authorised in accordance with Manurewa Local Board resolution MR/2020/44 – 16 April 2020.

Joseph Allan, Chairperson
19 June 2020
On behalf of the Manurewa Local Board
Ōrākei Local Board Feedback on the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Bill

The Ōrākei Local Board submits that it has reservations with the Covid-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Bill in its current form.

1. The intent to promote economic recovery is generally supported but:
   o not at the expense of enabling planning decisions that exclude broader information from a wide range of stakeholders and the public that could be possible with a notified process.
     • It is preferable to honour basic best evidence principles and facilitate a wider range of non-applicant inputs regarding the possible range of effects through a stream-lined, shorter notification period with greater limitations on any appellate rights than what currently exist; and
   o not in a way that disproportionately favours construction projects in housing or roading as a panacea for economic recovery over other land/resource uses, be they construction or non-construction projects that can also have clear economic recovery benefits. Council should reflect on lessons learnt from the 'Think Big' mandate of the 1980s and consider if this Bill presents a similar logic, and whether every proposal will achieve the stimulus intended. And therein lies a further flaw with the Bill - it is contrary to the RMA's fundamental 'sustainable management' principle.

2. There is no measure or standard to determine what the stated purpose of economic recovery will look like.
   • If a project in isolation is to be assessed as capable of assisting economic recovery and therefore to be consented, what metrics will that be determined for that? Will it be by short-term measures, such as the numbers of construction workers employed to build it, or will the proposal’s contribution to economic recovery be assessed by long-term sustainable management measures: projected contribution to GDP over 5-10 years, projected contribution to reduction of climate change, positive impact on culture, environment, visual and natural landscape and so on.

In addition to the points above, the Ōrākei Local Board wishes to express its disappointment at the shift in approach to the selection of the shovel-ready projects, whereby some projects have been agreed for Government support, despite not having resource consent.

Ōrākei Local Board.
Feedback on:
COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Bill
19 June 2020

Context

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 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.

The Bill establishes two tracks for a project to access the fast-track consenting processes. Projects are either listed in the Bill (listed projects), or confirmed through an Order in Council (referred projects). Both of these processes use Expert Consenting Panels to consider and determine resource consents (including imposing conditions) and designations, replacing the role that local authorities play under the RMA.

The Bill also enables Waka Kotahi /New Zealand Transport Agency and Kiwirail to undertake a range of permitted works on existing infrastructure.

The Bill was introduced into the House on 16 June 2020.

Submissions to the Select Committee close on 21 June 2020.

Relevance to the Local board

Local boards are a key part of the governance of Auckland Council. Local boards have responsibilities set out in the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009, specifically:

- identifying and communicating the interests and preferences of the people in its local board area in relation to the content of the strategies, policies, plans, and bylaws of the Auckland Council

Local boards provide important local input into region-wide strategies/plans and can also represent the views of their communities to other agencies, including those of central government.

Puketāpapa Local Board feedback:

The Puketāpapa Local Board welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback on the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Bill. The local board supports, in principle, the Bill’s intent to stimulate the economy as New Zealand recovers from the significant disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic crisis. In addition, the local board provides the following comments of support and concerns regarding the Bill:

**Te Tiriti o Waitangi**

1. The Puketāpapa Local Board strongly supports the upholding of Te Tiriti o Waitangi obligations, ensuring Māori are partners in the fast-track consenting process and the overall economic recovery of our country.
2. The Puketapapa Local Board notes that the expedited timeframes of the fast-track consenting process will increase pressure on the limited resources of iwi and hapu and request the provision of appropriate support for these groups to contribute their views in a meaningful way.

3. The Puketapapa Local Board requests that iwi and hapu are engaged at the earliest opportunity and that appropriate processes are in place for identifying all iwi and hapu with interests in a given project.

Subsidiarity and the role of local authorities

4. The Puketapapa Local Board recognises the emergency nature of this Bill and notes that the loss of subsidiarity in this fast track process is not ideal and should not set a precedent for the future.

5. Given this loss of formal subsidiarity, the Puketapapa Local Board supports strong local authority input into the fast-track consenting process and notes the role of local authorities to nominate panels members, comment on applications, monitor approved projects and comment at the Order in Council stage. As the most local level of government in Auckland, local boards, in particular, should continue to be involved in decisions that affect our communities.

Expert Consenting Panels

6. The Puketapapa Local Board supports the role of local authorities to nominate panel members.

7. The Puketapapa Local Board notes its desire to see consistency and high standards maintained in all decisions made by the expert consenting panels. Continuity between panels could help to achieve these outcomes.

8. The Puketapapa Local Board notes that due to the expedited nature of the fast-track consents process, applications should be held to higher standards than those of the RMA.

Timeframes and cost recovery

9. The Puketapapa Local Board again notes the resource intensiveness of the expedited timeframes and strongly supports cost recovery and additional support for local authorities who are already under resource pressure due to the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic crisis.

10. The Puketapapa Local Board supports Auckland Council’s request for response times (in which the relevant local authority must indicate whether they think the Panel should accept the application) be increased to 20 working days (in Clause 21(4) and Schedule 6 Clause 18) to enable local authorities to respond effectively.

Climate change resilience

11. The Puketapapa Local Board urges the Ministry for the Environment to ensure strong measures are in place in the Bill to support New Zealand’s efforts to mitigate climate change and transition more quickly to a low-emissions economy, including where work on infrastructure can be carried out without consents by select agencies.

Public Participation

12. The Puketapapa Local Board notes the increased risk of appeals and the potential for associated costs under the fast-track process and hopes appropriate measures will be put in place to mitigate this risk.

13. The Puketapapa Local Board encourages panel to invite a wide range of views to comment on applications in lieu of public consultation, particularly when there are significant public interests or impacts.

End.
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18 June 2020

To: Anna Jennings, Principal Advisor Urban Growth and Housing
   anna.jennings@aucklandcouncil.gov.nz

Subject: Waitematā Local Board feedback to the Government’s COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Bill

From: Richard Northey, Waitematā Local Board Chair

Purpose

To provide Waitematā Local Board feedback to the Government’s COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Bill.

Summary

- This memo provides the Waitematā Local Board Feedback to the Government’s COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Bill.
- At its 5 May 2020 business meeting, the Waitematā Local Board resolved (Resolution number WTM/2020/77) to delegate authority to the chair to approve and submit the local board’s input into Auckland Council submissions on formal consultation from government departments, parliament, select committees, Local Government New Zealand, official agencies such as the Productivity Commission, and other councils.
- All Waitematā Local Board members have been informed and were given the opportunity to make comments.
- This feedback has been approved by the local board chair Richard Northey under delegation as per the above resolution.
- The local board feedback will be included on the next local board meeting agenda for the public record.

Waitematā Local Board feedback to the Government’s COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Bill

1. We agree that the criteria for “eligible development” for projects should include its ability to achieve positive economic, environmental and social outcomes. The view of the Waitematā Local Board is that where central government uses extraordinary powers to bypass local government processes that these decisions still align with the local government obligations to provide for the four wellbeings, also including cultural wellbeing, and to do so at least at the level being worked to by that council.

2. Auckland Council has declared a climate emergency and is currently working on several fronts to improve water conservation, improve stormwater management, restore the health of waterways and harbour, and reduce emissions by 50% by 2030 by locking in high quality low carbon lifestyles with well-designed, insulated and ventilated housing close to transport hubs, community amenities and existing town centres and investing in public and active transport.
3. Waitematā would welcome development that increases climate resiliency, and provides quality housing choices.

4. A broad assessment based on the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act is likely to be inadequate to reflect local circumstances. The board recommends that Council plans such as the Auckland Unitary Plan, and other local area development plans such as the City Centre Master Plan, Parnell plan, Uptown plan, Newmarket Laneways Plan, and Ponsonby plan are utilised to provide a guide for spatial planning as they have been well consulted on and supported by local residents.

5. Intensification done well that balances the new with the old has been considered preferable to greenfield development and should lock in less of a burden with regard to road maintenance and transport systems, community infrastructure and water infrastructure going forward.

6. The board also recommends that the procurement process for these projects prioritise good environmental and social outcomes during construction and through the whole lifecycle of the buildings.

7. recommends that the Minister of the Environment have the discretion to approve or decline a proposal based on the foreseeable impact of the development to increase or reduce carbon emissions.

8. Recommend broadening the scope of the project to include a nationwide network of waste recycling and recovery centres to reduce waste being dumped in landfill, and to transport infrastructure that lowers carbon emissions including electric trains, ferries, and active transport.

9. recommend that the funding for new projects include a meaningful contribution towards local business continuity support so as to ensure that by supporting some economic sectors they do not negatively impact other ones.

10. recommend an Auckland-wide application of the Tamaki commitment to ensure that social housing residents can have the choice to stay in their neighbourhoods during and after urban renewal projects.

11. recommend where reserve lands are to be reconfigured the local board would expect and recommend the total area, amenity and accessibility of parks to be increased within the affected suburb.

12. Support the requirement to gather iwi and local authority input. Suggest that in complex projects 10 days may often be insufficient and recommend that central government and local government work together in such instances, particularly as local authorities will be managing compliance.

13. The board highlights the need to consider the local needs and priorities. A clear process needs to be put in place to ensure the ability to obtain the views of Council including Local and Community Boards, affected parties and members of the public are considered, particularly projects that have a high degree of public or community interest and those that are contentious in nature.

14. The local board is aware of existing local initiatives and local needs and priorities and welcomes the opportunity to feed into the process in the early stages and suggests that once a project is approved to continue to have close collaboration between regional and central
government agencies on projects in order to align local projects with national ones so as to have the most positive impact on our communities’ lives.

15. A good deal of power, responsibility and trust will be vested in a very small group of people. We would recommend, for checks and balances, that the panel is organised to disincentivise conflict of interests, and that where decisions are made that are contrary to the stated goals in the preamble and/or cause, or are likely to cause, more than minor damage to the environment and ecosystems that the decision be open to judicial review.
Attachment B – Clause by clause relief sought
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Subject/Topic</th>
<th>Auckland Council Submission</th>
<th>Relief sought by Auckland Council/suggested amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanatory note</td>
<td>Referred projects confirmed through Orders in Council</td>
<td>Iwi can apply for fast track consents on Treaty Settlement Land, needs to be consistent with Clause 18.</td>
<td>Amend explanatory note to be consistent with Clause 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanatory note</td>
<td>Expert consenting panel processes</td>
<td>Seek clarification – does reference to a retired Environment Judge include a retired Māori Land Judge with Environ Court warrant? The correct RMA terminology is “approved”.</td>
<td>Amend explanatory note to clarify point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7(1)</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>In paragraph (a) of the definition of “national direction” the term “issued” is used twice. The correct RMA terminology is “approved.”</td>
<td>Change references to “issued” to “approved”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17(2)</td>
<td>How Minister satisfies obligation under section 6 (Treaty of Waitangi)</td>
<td>Comments from iwi alongside the Te Arawhiti Report should be used to assist the Minister to comply with Clause 8. This Clause requires the Minister to act in a manner consistent with the principles of the Treaty and Treaty Settlement legislation when making a determination as to whether a project should be referred to a panel for the Fast Track process.</td>
<td>Add a new clause 17(2)(f) to include iwi comments to be considered alongside Te Arawhiti Report for decision-making by the Minister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18(2)(b)</td>
<td>Criteria for projects that may be referred</td>
<td>The Explanatory Note implies development of Treaty Settlement land cannot be considered under the Bill. This is clarified in Part 2 s18(2)(b) where projects on land returned under a Treaty settlement can be referred provided there is agreement in writing from the relevant landowner.</td>
<td>Ensure the Explanatory Note clarifies development of Treaty Settlement land can be applied for under the Bill provided there is written agreement from the landowner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Whether a project helps achieve the purpose of the Act</td>
<td>The wording within the first paragraph of this section states that the Minister ‘may consider’. This should be strengthened given the importance of these considerations to ‘must’ along with the removal of the words ‘at whatever level of detail’ and the words ‘any or’ after appropriate to ensure that all matters are considered.</td>
<td>Re-write the first paragraph of Clause 19 as follows: In considering, for the purpose of section 18(3), whether a project will help to achieve the purpose of this Act, the Minister may consider, at whatever level of detail the Minister considers appropriate; any or all of the following matters:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19(c) and (d)</td>
<td>Matters for consideration</td>
<td>Use of the word ‘whether’. Suggest that this is changed to ‘the extent to which’ – this triggers a greater consideration of positive outcomes associated with the proposal (especially (d)) as opposed to a situation of saying ‘yes’ an employment generation for example when in real life the employment generation is only minor.</td>
<td>Change ‘whether’ to ‘extent which’ in Clause 19(c) and (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20(3)(n)</td>
<td>Application for referral - Compliance record</td>
<td>If a project company (SPV) is established to be the applicant, then compliance or enforcement actions taken against related entities (for example principals or other corporate entities that they control) will not be captured.</td>
<td>Widen the scope of required compliance disclosure to include principals of and entities related to the applicant and those principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20(3)</td>
<td>Application for referral – Proposal and effects</td>
<td>The list of information to be included in the application as per Clause 20(3) does not include an assessment of the impact of the application on existing infrastructure and/or capacity of that infrastructure. This will only be relevant for some applications that may have significant impacts on bulk infrastructure provision depending on scale and location.</td>
<td>Amend Clause 20(3) to include the following statement: ‘An assessment of impacts and capacity of existing infrastructure where relevant’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21(2)</td>
<td>Process after Minister receives an application</td>
<td>The Minister has discretion to seek comment from anyone else, including (re. iwi) have legal and Treaty rights to partnership with the Crown and to participate in decision making, and the Bill intends a high level Treaty recognition – to act consistent with Treaty principles. The Minister should therefore be required to also invite comment from iwi authorities at this stage.</td>
<td>Amend (2) to add (c) relevant iwi authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21(4)</td>
<td>Council feedback on merits of project being considered for referral</td>
<td>10 working days is insufficient time for council to provide informed feedback, given the need for a range of inputs across council.</td>
<td>Increase to 20 working days for seeking comments from local authorities and iwi organisations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 13

Attachment E
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Subject/Topic</th>
<th>Auckland Council Submission</th>
<th>Relief sought by Auckland Council/suggested amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Grounds to decline an application for referral</td>
<td>Clause 21(2) (a) requires that the relevant local authority be invited to provide comments of the referral project. Clause 23 however does not enable matters associated with the relevant Plans (RPS, Regional and or District) to carry through as grounds for decline. Proposals as non-complying could well be contrary and indeed undermine the integrity of these Plans yet this matter is not listed (other than the catch-all under clause 23 (2)). Given the role of the relevant Plans in assessments and decisions under Schedule 6 clause 32 this should be a direct consideration under Clause 23 and therefore assist in reducing poor projects being brought forward for assessment.</td>
<td>Add the following clause 23(5)(h): The project is inconsistent with the relevant Plans (Regional Policy Statement, Regional or District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24(2)</td>
<td>Decision to accept application for referral</td>
<td>No timeframes have been provided in the Bill for the Minister’s decision on whether to accept an application for referral. Given the tight timeframes placed on local authorities in the Bill and the fast track intent, it is recommended that this be done within 10 working days of receiving comments back from parties outlined in Clause 21 unless further information is required.</td>
<td>Add the following words to Clause 24(2) after ‘the Minister may decide...’: within 10 working days from receipt of comments from parties listed in Section 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28(4)</td>
<td>Work on infrastructure: permitted activities</td>
<td>Clause 28(4) should state that consents cannot be surrendered to get around the ongoing need to meet existing consent conditions. This is especially important given that (provided performance standards are met) activities deemed permitted become so for a 15 year period.</td>
<td>Add the following words to Clause 28(4): ‘Consents cannot be surrendered’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Criteria for work on infrastructure</td>
<td>Clause 29 provides for NZTA and KiwiRail to undertake works on existing infrastructure as a permitted activity. Clause 29 also enables local authorities to do the same, but only provided they are added to clause 1 of Schedule 4 by an Order in Council made under Clause 34. In the Auckland context both Watercare Services Limited (Watercare) and Auckland Transport carry out functions that would often be undertaken by local authorities, but they do not fall within the Bill’s definition of local authority.</td>
<td>Amend the Bill to recognise the roles of Watercare and Auckland Transport in the Auckland context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 (4)</td>
<td>Recognise and provide for exercise of power in s181(4) of the Local Government Act 2002 in the event that local authorities obtain rights under the Bill via cl34</td>
<td>Section 181(4) of the Local Government Act 2002 allows a local authority to enter the land to inspect, alter, renew, repair, or clean any work constructed under the section without obtaining further land owner permission, the inclusion of the limitations in cl32(6)(a) and (b) undermine that power and would reduce the utility of the permitted activity status by requiring a local authority to obtain an permission additional to those it is already required to obtain.</td>
<td>Include an additional subparagraph to provide for exercise of powers under s181(4) of the Local Government Act 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Activities excluded from being permitted activities</td>
<td>The Bill identifies permitted activities, including for work on infrastructure. This section identifies activities that are excluded from being permitted. The excluded activities include activities identified in plans as being discretionary, non-complying, or prohibited, and activities which would 'occur in a place identified or listed in the relevant plan or proposed plan as a site of cultural or historical significance'. This approach is supported.</td>
<td>Retain this provision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 32     | Requirements before commencing work on infrastructure | Different Councils have different Hydrology standards to calculate what a 10% AEP and 1% AEP event is and also what allowance should be made for climate change. It will be very important that this clause requires the agencies to use the locals Councils Hydrology standards to calculate what the 10% AEP and 1% AEP is so that: | Include the following additional subclause 32(3) 3) The diversion and discharge must not result in or increase the following: (a) flooding of other properties in rainfall events up to the 10% annual exceedance probability, or 20%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Subject/Topic</th>
<th>Auckland Council Submission</th>
<th>Relief sought by Auckland Council/suggested amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Order in Council to add agencies for work on infrastructure</td>
<td>In the Auckland context both Watercare and Auckland Transport carry out functions that would often be undertaken by local authorities, but they do not fall within the Bill’s definition of local authority.</td>
<td>Amend the Bill to recognise the roles of Watercare and Auckland Transport in the Auckland context where they effectively perform specified functions of a local authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Monitoring and enforcement</td>
<td>The requirement for monitoring is drafted in an absolute and unqualified way and does not recognize a best practice targeted approach to monitoring.</td>
<td>Amend s35(1)(e) in the following, or a similar, way: “monitor activities carried out as permitted activities in reliance on this subpart, to the extent and degree considered appropriate and necessary, if the activities are located in the authority’s region or district.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 1</td>
<td>Clause 1 (1) and (2)</td>
<td>Revocation of Act and Orders in Council</td>
<td>Clause 1 (1) and (2) appear to contradict each other and require clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 1</td>
<td>Clause 2</td>
<td>How long permitted activities can be carried out</td>
<td>It is not clear if the new permitted activity rules last for 15 years, which would appear excessive given cumulative effects on the environment and this being a COVID response bill, or whether this relates to on-going activities e.g. discharges, once a minor upgrade has been undertaken, noting the words “continue to be carried out” and the commentary in the Explanatory Note imply this to be the case. The referencing to “in connection with a project to which this Act applies” is also unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 1</td>
<td>Clause 4</td>
<td>Role of EPA continues after repeal of Act</td>
<td>Given the obligation for local authorities to monitor work on infrastructure permitted activities and some of those can continue for up to 15 years, it would be helpful to make express provision for local authorities to continue to be able to charge for such monitoring activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 2</td>
<td>Listed projects</td>
<td>Auckland Council requests that Watercare’s 2013 resource consent to take 200,000 m3/day from the Waikato River is named as a listed project within Schedule 2. This would mean this consent would be considered through the fast-track process and by an expert panel.</td>
<td>Add the following text to Schedule 2 Listed Projects: Identifier: LP17 Name: Waikato River take and associated infrastructure Person or entity authorised to undertake projects: Watercare Services Limited Description: To take and use up to 200,000 m3/day (net) of water from the Waikato River for the purposes of municipal water supply for Auckland/Tamaki Makaurau. The project will include associated infrastructure and operational requirements, for example, a new intake, advanced water pipeline and modification to the water transmission system. Approximate geographical area: At or about New Zealand Transverse Mercator [2000] (“NZTM”) Map Reference 1776957E, 5672040N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 4</td>
<td>Work on infrastructure: permitted activities and standards</td>
<td>It is not clear who the agency must provide evidence of compliance to, or within what time period of completion. It would also be of assistance to the relevant monitoring local authority if there was a requirement for the agency to advise of completion of works (as there is a requirement to advise prior to works commencing).</td>
<td>Clarify who the compliance evidence must be provided to, and within what time period, and include a requirement to give notice when works are completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 5</td>
<td>Local Authority support</td>
<td>There is the potential for a local authority to be required to work for the Panel under clauses 11 and 12. However, there is no clear pathway for cost recovery by a local authority in such circumstances.</td>
<td>Make provision for a local authority required to assist a Panel to recover the actual costs of providing such assistance from the EPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause, Clause(s)</td>
<td>Subject/Topic</td>
<td>Auckland Council Submission</td>
<td>Relief sought by Auckland Council/suggested amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 5, Clause 9</td>
<td>Reimbursement of panel convenor and panel members</td>
<td>Remuneration based on the fees framework should apply to the ministerial appointed Panel Convenor (Schedule 5 (2)) and not the panel members subsequently appointed to consider a listed or referred project. The fees framework (daily rate or pro-rata) is not commensurate with the remuneration of decision makers for existing processes under the RMA. Suggest that the Ministry for the Environment survey the hourly rates paid to RMA Section 39A accredited commissioners – this will corroborate that this legislation proposes a reduced payment for decision makers.</td>
<td>Ministry for the Environment survey the hourly rates paid to RMA Section 39A accredited commissioners – this will corroborate that this legislation proposes a reduced payment for decision makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 5, Clause 11(4) and Clause 12(2)</td>
<td>Procedures of panel and Secretariat support</td>
<td>Panel appointments of technical advisors – this should be with the agreement of said department, crown entity or local authority (with the exception of the Tākanga exports). There is no associated reimbursement clause (as there is for Schedule 6 clause 7 (4)) and many local authorities will be in extreme budgetary constraints. The forced appointment of a council officer to support the expert consenting panel without reimbursement is ‘problematic’.</td>
<td>Amend Bill to provide for cost recovery of council officer appointed to as a technical advisor to a Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 6, Clause 5</td>
<td>Withdrawal of consent application or notice of requirement</td>
<td>As currently drafted, it appears that only an entire application or notice of requirement may be withdrawn. For the sake of clarity and to improve flexibility of the consenting process it would be useful if it was made clear that a partial withdrawal is also permissible.</td>
<td>Amend drafting to allow either all or a part of an application for a resource consent or a notice of requirement to be withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 6, Clause 6</td>
<td>When processing of consent applications or notices of requirement may be suspended</td>
<td>As currently drafted, it is arguable that by failing to pay a fee an applicant could, effectively, put an application on hold indefinitely. It may be advisable to include an absolute time within which fees must be paid before the application must be returned to the applicant</td>
<td>Include a hard-cut off time within which fees must be paid, with failure to pay resulting in an application being returned to the applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 6, Clause 9 and 11</td>
<td>Information required in consent applications</td>
<td>Currently there is no express requirement for applicants to identify existing infrastructure relevant to their proposed works, the capacity of that infrastructure, the impact of the works on that infrastructure, and any infrastructure provision or upgrade that they are proposing to provide. Infrastructure capacity is commonly a limiting factor in development and can result in consequential infrastructure spend for local authorities.</td>
<td>Require all applicants to provide relevant information on infrastructure including existing infrastructure, capacity of that infrastructure, impact of the proposed works on existing infrastructure, and any new or upgraded infrastructure that they propose to provide. This could be addressed in either both, or one of clauses 9 and/or 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 6, Clause 12</td>
<td>Information required in application for subdivision or reclamation</td>
<td>When considering applications for subdivision the provision of infrastructure, including but not limited to, road, and three waters is important. Such information is currently not required to be provided.</td>
<td>Include a requirement to provide information on location and provision of infrastructure needed to service a subdivision (including but not limited to road and three waters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 6, Clause 16</td>
<td>Applications relating to land in coastal marine area</td>
<td>Subclause (3) appears to apply district plan zoning of land abutting a reclamation to the reclaimed land. That will not be helpful to applicants if the abuting land is a road or esplanade reserve, as it may well be. It is unclear whether this is a deliberate limitation or not.</td>
<td>Consider whether the current drafting gives effect to the policy intent or has unintended consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 6, Clause 18</td>
<td>General provisions relating to</td>
<td>The Bill provides only 10 working days for invited parties to provide written comments on an application. That is not sufficient time for Auckland Council to be able to provide comprehensive and well considered commentary.</td>
<td>Amend the 10 working day time limit for comments to 20 working days, with subsequent consequential amendment to other related timeframes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>Subject/Topic</td>
<td>Auckland Council Submission</td>
<td>Relief sought by Auckland Council/suggested amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 6, Clause 19</td>
<td>Hearing not required</td>
<td>There should be criteria and guidelines for when a hearing should be required. These might include where a threshold of potential effects might result, where clear off site effects may affect parties not within or adjacent to a project area, or where the applicant has failed to properly engage with potentially affected parties or properly assess effects. There should also be a requirement to hold hearings for Iwi in the fast-track resource consent process. Korero is often maintained in oratory, Iwi should have the option to be heard in alignment with the principle of Active Protection.</td>
<td>Require criteria and guidelines for when a hearing should be required. This should include a requirement to hold hearings for Iwi in the fast-track resource consent process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 6, Clause 27</td>
<td>Panel decision-making considerations for listed projects</td>
<td>Although a broad range of considerations are listed, within which infrastructure provision and capacity could be considered, infrastructure is not explicitly set out as a matter for consideration. This creates a risk that infrastructure provision and capacity will not be given the consideration it deserves</td>
<td>Explicitly set out infrastructure capacity as a consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 6, Clause 29</td>
<td>Panel decision-making considerations for referred projects</td>
<td>Although a broad range of considerations are listed, within which infrastructure provisions and capacity could be considered, infrastructure is not explicitly set out as a matter for consideration. This creates a risk that infrastructure provisions and capability will not be given the consideration it deserves</td>
<td>Explicitly set out infrastructure capacity as a consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 6, Clause 27</td>
<td>Panel decision-making considerations for listed projects</td>
<td>Schedule 6, clause 9(5) requires consent applications to include a Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) prepared by the relevant Iwi or hapu, however a CIA is not listed as one of the matters the panel must have regard to for listed projects</td>
<td>Explicitly set out Cultural Impact Assessments as a matter to which a panel must have regard under Clause 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 6, Clause 29</td>
<td>Panel decision-making considerations for referred projects</td>
<td>Schedule 6, clause 9(5) requires consent applications to include a Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) prepared by the relevant Iwi or hapu, however a CIA is not listed as one of the matters the panel must have regard to for referred projects.</td>
<td>Explicitly set out Cultural Impact Assessments as a matter to which a panel must have regard under Clause 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 6, Clause 29(7)</td>
<td>Other matters relevant to decisions of panel on referred projects</td>
<td>Cl 29(7) states: A panel may grant a resource consent on the basis that the activity concerned is a controlled, restricted discretionary, or non-complying activity, regardless of what type of activity the application was expressed to be for. As drafted, this appears to mean the Panel cannot grant an application for a discretionary activity. This appears to be an unintended omission</td>
<td>Amend Cl. 29(7) to include reference to discretionary activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 6, Clause 32</td>
<td>Grounds on which resource consents and designations may be declined for listed projects</td>
<td>Grounds for decline are narrow—and much narrower than the considerations for resource consent applications and designations under Schedule 6, cl. 29 and 31. There appears to be little justification for considering a specified list of matters if they cannot then form the basis for decline of the application The current approach appears illogical / unbalanced. The broader range of considerations are rendered pointless if they cannot be grounds for potentially declining an application This approach appears to be based upon an assumption that all RMA Part 2 matters are adequately covered by existing National Policy Statements. That is not the case It is also noted that the matters contained in cl 32 is not exhaustive, as cl29(8) allows a consent application to be declined on the basis of insufficient information</td>
<td>Amend the clause so that, at a minimum, grounds for declining an application include that the proposal will not achieve the purpose of the Bill, and that significant adverse effects will arise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>Subject/Topic</td>
<td>Auckland Council Submission</td>
<td>Relief sought by Auckland Council/suggested amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 6, Clause 40</td>
<td>Variation of conditions</td>
<td>Clause 40 of Schedule 6 does not specify who should be responsible for applications under Section 127 of Resource Management Act</td>
<td>Add Clause 40(5): To avoid doubt, the local authority has responsibility to grant any variation to change or cancellation of consent conditions under Section 127 of the Resource Management Act 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 6, Clause 42</td>
<td>Appeal rights</td>
<td>Consider aligning appeal rights with the Board of Inquiry.</td>
<td>Consider aligning appeal rights with the Board of Inquiry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum  
23 June 2020

To: Planning Committee

Subject: Auckland Plan update and Annual Monitoring Report

From: Jacques Victor – General Manager, Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research

Contact information: Denise O’Shaughnessy - Manager Strategic Advice, Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research
Email: Denise.OShaughnessy@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose
1. To update the Planning Committee on events related to the Auckland Plan 2050 and report the Auckland Plan 2050 Annual Monitoring Report July 2020.

Summary
2. The Auckland Plan 2050 was adopted in June 2018 and sets the long-term strategic direction for Auckland.

3. Reporting on progress against the Auckland Plan 2050 is done in three ways:
   a) Updates on new information relevant to the Auckland Plan 2050 (of which this is the fourth).
   b) Annual monitoring reports – the Annual Monitoring Report July 2020 is summarised in this memo and the full report is Attachment A.
   c) Three yearly progress reports – the first Three Yearly Progress Report was reported to the Planning Committee in March 2020 and provides detailed analysis of progress against the plan’s outcomes using a range of measures and additional data.

4. This Auckland Plan 2050 update covers:
   - Possible impacts on the Auckland Plan outcomes from COVID-19
   - Reforms and initiatives from central government that indicate the plan is providing a strong strategic direction for advocacy for Auckland Plan outcomes, including in the areas of COVID-19 response and Budget 2020.

5. The Auckland Plan 2050 Annual Monitoring Report July 2020 uses 33 measures to measure general progress and trends across the six outcomes. The report shows that:
   - 10 measures have positive trends
   - 3 measures have negative trends
   - 11 measures have no significant change
   - 9 measures have insufficient data to establish a clear trend, or the measure is being reviewed/developed. This includes four of the Environment and Cultural Heritage measures, which will be reconsidered following the finalisation of the State of the Environment Report this financial year.
6. The Annual Monitoring Report July 2020 mainly uses data from 2019 or earlier, therefore the impacts of Covid-19 are not captured in the report. These impacts will start to be measured in the next Annual Monitoring Report (July 2021).

Context
8. The legislation for the Auckland Plan sets out the requirements for implementing the plan. It must:
   - enable coherent and co-ordinated decision making by Auckland Council and other parties to determine the future location and timing of critical infrastructure, services, and investment within Auckland
   - provide a basis for aligning the implementation plans, regulatory plans, and funding programmes of the Auckland Council
   - identify policies, priorities, land allocations and programmes and investments to implement the strategic direction and specify how resources will be provided to implement the strategic direction.

Update to the Auckland Plan 2050
9. This memo is the fourth update and covers changes that impact on Auckland’s context or any new data or information that may have an impact on the plan and its implementation. The content from this update will be made available on the ‘what’s new’ section of the digital plan website. Any developments or events that could have a significant impact on the plan would be brought to committee as they arise.
10. COVID-19 has had wide ranging impacts on Auckland’s communities and economy. The focus on recovery and associated reprioritisation could create delays or increased challenges in implementing aspects of the Auckland Plan 2050. The recovery potentially offers new opportunities for implementation.
11. Budget 2020 is the second wellbeing budget. COVID-19 has seen the focus shift away from the published wellbeing priorities to economic and social recovery. This will be primarily achieved through the $50bn COVID-19 Response and Recovery Fund. It aims to preserve and/or create jobs through investment in specific sectors and additional investments to infrastructure and transport, housing and environment projects. Budget 2020 also focuses on social recovery through additional investments in health, social services, education, and continued efforts at reducing child poverty.

Belonging and Participation
12. A sense of belonging can be influenced by whether people feel able to play an active role in decisions that impact them. Recent research by Auckland Council into voting at the 2019 local government election showed large differences in who voted by age, Māori descent status, location and neighbourhood deprivation. Turnout was lowest for 26-30 year olds (only 20% of eligible electors in this age group voted) and Aucklanders of Māori descent were less likely to vote (25%, compared to 36% for non-Māori). Voter turnout was notably lower in southern areas of Auckland, as well as in pockets of west Auckland, the Glen Innes area on the Auckland isthmus and the Glenfield area on the north shore. Rural and coastal areas tended to have higher turnout than other parts of Auckland.
13. Key impacts on this outcome from COVID-19 and central government reform which affect this outcome are set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely impacts from COVID-19</th>
<th>Central government COVID-19 response and Budget 2020</th>
<th>Other central government reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Initial increased social cohesion - enhanced feelings of national unity and a sense of</td>
<td>• $5.6 billion for District Health Boards (DHBs) and the wider health system to maintain existing services and to</td>
<td>• The final report of the Health and Disability Review recommended a significant overhaul of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities coming together</td>
<td>prepare for pandemic response. Additional capital investment for DHBs.</td>
<td>the country’s district health board system, the creation of a new health agency focusing on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demand on mental health helplines and services increased as people sought practical support.</td>
<td>• $246.1 million investment in community services, including a significant funding boost for family violence service providers.</td>
<td>the operational and financial matters and a Māori Health Agency. The government will consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were increased rates of anxiety and depression in response to uncertainty. Experts</td>
<td>• $1.6 billion in both government and non-government social services, which will support New Zealanders’ education,</td>
<td>the recommendations over the coming months and make a decision after the election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suggest that this may be followed by grievance, anger, frustration and Post Traumatic Stress</td>
<td>employment and housing outcomes. This includes $163 million for Family Violence Services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorder (PTSD). This may disproportionately affect those who are already experiencing high rates of poor mental health such as Māori</td>
<td>• $12.1 billion package to support the immediate needs of New Zealanders, including the Wage Subsidy Scheme, a $2.8 billion income support package for the most vulnerable, excluding a permanent benefit increase and a doubling of the Winter Energy Payment for 2020, and an initial $500 million boost for health services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased unemployment may lead to challenges around housing stress, financial hardship and addiction issues. Demand for welfare support has declined/levelled-off as we moved into level 1 although more hardship may lie ahead as higher rates of unemployment are predicted</td>
<td>• $27 million package provided to social sector services and community groups to ensure they can continue to provide essential support to communities - included funding for community food distribution and extension of free school lunches programme. A further $30 million support package was provided to bolster the delivery of food and welfare assistance (including emergency accommodation) by local authorities and Civil Defence Emergency Management Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A move towards increased digital approaches although those on the wrong side of the digital divide excluded</td>
<td>• Pre-budget, $11m distributed to budgeting and financial mentoring services; budget included an additional $25 million over 2 years for budgeting services funded by MSD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health and economic impacts expected to be borne disproportionately by disadvantaged communities, the most vulnerable, and low income households. If not properly addressed, the social crisis may also increase inequality, exclusion, and discrimination</td>
<td>• The budget included $969 million in measures directed to Māori, including $137 million for Whanau Ora over the next 2 years; the budget also included a $195 million Pasifika package</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Long-term trend of inequality of outcomes for Māori and Pasifika communities is likely to be magnified by the pandemic</td>
<td>• $83.25 million to provide security of funding for services to people with long-term physical, intellectual and/or sensory impairment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Ministry of Health’s COVID-19 Psychosocial and Mental Wellbeing Recovery Plan aims to protect and enhance people’s mental wellbeing so that they can adapt and thrive after their lives have been disrupted by the COVID 19 pandemic. It seeks to build on the vision of He Ara Oranga: Report of the Government Inquiry into Mental Health and Addiction and the Government’s response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Māori Identity and Wellbeing

14. Ngā Mātāa is developing the Māori Outcomes Framework that will guide Auckland Council’s work programme in delivering across the ten Māori priorities. This will contribute to the Māori Identity and Wellbeing, Homes and Places and Environment and Cultural Heritage Outcomes. The framework is scheduled to go to Parks, Arts, Community and Events Committee in July with work programmes considered as part of the upcoming 10-year budget.

15. The Independent Māori Statutory Board has released its Māori Values Reports, a comprehensive set of reports that are Auckland specific. These reports measure progress in Māori wellbeing by using a Māori values approach (Te Ao Māori). Understanding Māori wellbeing is important for informing policy direction and for monitoring the impact of policy interventions on Māori in Tāmaki Makaurau.

16. Recently released Census 2018 data showed that younger Māori are achieving outcomes closer to the national average than their counterparts in older age groups. 80.6 percent of Māori 15- to 24-year-olds had at least a level 1 qualification or equivalent (such as School Certificate), compared with 85.8 percent of 15- to 24-year-olds nationally. Older age groups showed a larger difference, with 73.0 percent of Māori 45- to 54-year-olds having at least a level 1 qualification or equivalent, compared with 84.6 percent of 45- to 54-year-olds nationally.

17. Key impacts on this outcome from COVID-19 and central government reform which affect this outcome are set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely impacts from COVID-19</th>
<th>Central government COVID-19 response and Budget 2020</th>
<th>Other central government reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Standards of living will be significantly impacted for Māori, in particular, based on the type of jobs and industries they are employed in</td>
<td>• $56m initial response fund for Māori including:  o $30 million targeted health funding for Māori  o $10 million Whānau Māori community outreach  o $15 million Whānau Ora to reach into Māori communities  o $1 million to provide Māori businesses with advice and planning tools to tackle the economic impact</td>
<td>• Changes to the Local Government (Rating) Act 2002 will reduce rating barriers for owners of Māori land who want to use and develop their whenua  • Wai 262: Te Pae Tawhiti - The Government is taking a whole-of-government approach to addressing the Treaty of Waitangi claim concerned with the control and use of taonga including taonga species of flora and fauna, mātauranga Māori, and traditional Māori roles such as kaupapa and their relationship with taonga. This work is at an early stage, however central government has identified a number of its affected work streams areas which may impact on councils’ work in areas such as three waters, biosecurity and biodiversity, and resource management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Further set back in creating individual wealth – home ownership for Māori (40% for Census 2013) was already low in comparison to non-Māori. Home ownership is the main pathway to grow individual wealth</td>
<td>• Budget 2020 included an additional $900 million in response to COVID-19  Specifically Whanau Ora, Kohanga Reo, employment and skills training and housing challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Māori economy in particular around tourism, international education and service sectors likely to be significantly impacted due to border restrictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase demand for societal support – most vulnerable people will be affected by the COVID-19 crisis first (first economically then socially)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Māori social wellbeing was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Social distancing and lockdown measures have prevented the exercise of tikanga Māori practices, which have deep spiritual meaning and enhance social, cultural and physical wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Homes and Places

18. Since the last update there has been increasing interest in, and adoption of, new housing models such as shared equity and rent to buy. In Auckland this has primarily been led by the community housing sector and the Tamaki Regeneration Company. The increased adoption of these models contributes to the implementation of the Homes and Places outcome, particularly Focus area 2: Increase security of tenure and broaden the range of tenure models, particularly for those most in need.

19. Statistics New Zealand has now released data from Census 2018 which showed that Auckland homes have high rates of persistent or occasional dampness (22 per cent) and high rates of persistent or occasional mould (19 per cent). Māori and Pasifika homes experience even higher rates. This is the first time the New Zealand Census has gathered this information.

20. Key impacts on this outcome from COVID-19 and central government reform which affect this outcome are set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely impacts from COVID-19</th>
<th>Central government COVID-19 response and Budget 2020</th>
<th>Other central government reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The requirement to isolate had immediate impacts on the homeless and those with insecure housing</td>
<td>• Immediate focus in lockdown on support for vulnerable people, including temporary accommodation. Further funding in Budget for transitional housing and local initiatives to tackle homelessness</td>
<td>• Continued implementation of tenancy reform programme (security of tenure, warmer, dryer homes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Loss of income and employment will mean housing is less affordable for many, leading to increased numbers on the Public Housing Register (already at a five-year high in Auckland of 6,000 pre lockdown), increased overcrowding and increased homelessness</td>
<td>• Restrictions on eviction and rent increases</td>
<td>• Building system legislative reform to lift the efficiency and quality of building work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased rental market demand despite fewer international tourists and students due to housing affordability issues and numbers of returning Kiwis</td>
<td>• Investment in housing and related infrastructure is a key element of central government’s recovery approach. This includes 8,000 new state or transitional homes, insulation and heating for 9000 homes, and $40m to deliver better housing for Māori</td>
<td>• National Homelessness Action Plan, a multi-year, cross-government plan focused on prevention initiatives, increasing supply, wraparound support and enabling the system to respond, backed up by over $300 million of new government funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased focus on ensuring vulnerable people – including homeless – who were housed during lockdown continue to be supported and remain in secure housing</td>
<td>• Implementation of fast track consenting delivering infrastructure to enable housing development</td>
<td>• Environment Committee final report on Urban Development Bill released. Council’s proposed partnership approach to consenting not accepted. However Kāinga Ora must have regard to the Auckland Plan as it applies to a specified development project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inability to work at level 4, skills challenges from border restrictions, conservative bank lending, and lower confidence has led to challenges for the construction industry which may reduce private development</td>
<td>• $85m to implement Progressive Home Ownership scheme which will provide access to home ownership and include targeted programmes focussed on Māori outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environment and Cultural Heritage

21. In May 2020 the Hauraki Gulf Forum adopted an updated set of goals. It has increased its goal of marine protection in the gulf to at least 30 per cent and affirmed its goal of 1000sqkm of shellfish-bed and reef restoration. It has also adopted two new goals of riparian planting of the Gulf’s catchment and an end to marine dumping in or near to the gulf. Realising these goals would contribute to the implementation of this outcome.

22. Key impacts on this outcome from COVID-19 and central government reform which affects this outcome is set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely impacts from COVID-19</th>
<th>Central government COVID-19 response and Budget 2020</th>
<th>Other central government reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Short term positive impacts in water quality and air quality from decreased activity</td>
<td>• The RMA fast-tracking bill enables fast-tracking of key projects. Six out of the 11 projects in the first tranche are in Auckland. Consideration of key environmental impacts as well as the principles of Te Tiriti as per Part 2 of the RMA will still be required. Under the new process the consents are expected to take between 45 and 75 days and will be presumed to be granted</td>
<td>• The resource management system review panel has completed their report. This may be released before the election, although further consultation by the Government on its preferred option will occur after the next election. Any ultimate changes as a result of the review are not expected before the end of 2021. The current RMA Amendment Bill, which reverses some changes made by the previous government and introduces a new freshwater planning process, is currently awaiting second reading. The select committee has recommended additions which would remove restrictions on considering carbon emissions in RMA plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A risk that the recovery could decrease focus on this outcome. Recent announcements regarding fast track consenting and infrastructure investment show some consideration of positive environmental and climate outcomes in the recovery</td>
<td>• The Wellington budget priorities included a Just Transition (supporting New Zealanders in the transition to a climate-resilient, sustainable, and low-emissions economy), however the focus on the recovery from COVID-19 seems to have de-emphasised this focus</td>
<td>• The Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill has been passed. Auckland Council was generally supportive of the reform, and its alignment with the direction of the draft Auckland Climate Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Delayed start to our regional parks planting programme</td>
<td>• Climate Change Commission to review New Zealand’s Nationally Determined Contribution under the Paris Agreement, and report back in early 2021 to inform the setting of emissions budgets by the end of 2021.</td>
<td>• Amended drafts of the new National Policy Statement and National Environmental Standard (NES) for Freshwater Management, as well as proposed stock exclusion regulations, will be considered for approval by Cabinet shortly. Changes made made after consultation and in light of COVID-19 will reduce immediate costs to farmers and growers to help with the COVID-19 response and recovery, and will allow councils longer timeframes to develop freshwater planning instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Temporary reduction in predator and plant pest management</td>
<td>• $1.1b has been set aside to redeploy Kāiks into “environmental jobs” over the next 4 to 5 years. It is unclear how much of that may be invested in Auckland</td>
<td>• Government is consulting on amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality (NESAQ). Auckland Council’s submission was broadly supportive of the more stringent regulation of air quality, but highlighted that the proposed framework needed to better address transport emissions as these are the major source of particulate matter in Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Health Select Committee will report back on a bill establishing Taumata Arowai (the Water Services Regulator) soon. A second bill to be introduced shortly will add to provisions for the new drinking water regulatory system, source water protection, and Taumata Arowai’s wastewater and stormwater function. The regulator is expected to be fully operational in mid-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultation on the NPS indigenous biodiversity national policy statement has also been completed. Council submitted and was generally supportive and identified a number of opportunities for improvement in the provisions. Ministerial decisions are pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Transport and Access

23. **Key impacts on this outcome from COVID-19 and central government reform which affect this outcome are set out below:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely impacts from COVID-19</th>
<th>Central government COVID-19 response and Budget 2020</th>
<th>Other central government reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Reductions in public transport patronage during the shutdown period. This led to revenue loss, whilst still paying for operating costs.</em></td>
<td><em>Eleven projects have been identified in the first tranche of shovel ready projects for fast tracking under the COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track) Bill that is expected to be introduced to the House shortly. The Auckland transport projects include the Britomart East Upgrade, Papakura to Pukekohe electrification, Northern Pathway and Papakura to Drury SH1 road upgrade.</em></td>
<td><em>$6.8 billion investment across road, rail, public transport and walking and cycling infrastructure as part of the New Zealand Upgrade Programme. $3.48 billion is to accelerate delivery of several projects in Auckland from the timeframes envisaged in the Auckland Transport Alignment Project (ATAP).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>During the first week of alert level 2 traffic levels were at 85 per cent of what they were pre-lockdown while public transport patronage was down to 60 per cent of usual levels.</em></td>
<td><em>Once the Bill passes these projects will be referred directly to expert consenting panels, which will set appropriate conditions on the projects before they can proceed.</em></td>
<td><em>The draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2021/22 proposes to prioritise safety, better transport options, improving freight connections, and climate change. These priorities generally align with the Auckland Plan 2050 and ATAP.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>It is unclear if there will be longer term mode shift impacts.</em></td>
<td><em>The budget allocated $1.1 billion to improve transport across the country; this builds on the $0.8 billion NZ Upgrade Programme for Transport. Within the $1.1 billion, $421.7 million has been allocated over the next four years which is outside of the National Land Transport Fund for rail infrastructure. It includes funds for the European Train Control System for Auckland, which will provide safer and more reliable services on the Auckland metropolitan rail network.</em></td>
<td><em>The draft National Rail Plan (NRP) is the first component of the new planning and funding framework for rail. It sets out intentions for the first decade of investment needed to achieve a reliable, resilient, and safe rail network. The investment priorities will inform the development of the GPS 2021.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anecdotal evidence suggests increased interest in working from home or flexible working arrangements post COVID.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Land Transport (Rail) Legislation Bill seeks to implement a new planning and funding framework for the heavy rail track network owned by KiwiRail. Some aspects of the bill would see partial rather than full integration of rail into the land transport planning and funding system.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Accessible Streets Regulatory Package proposes a collection of rule changes designed to improve safety for footpath, shared path, cycle lane and cycle path users, encourage more active transport and clarify the rules for using small personal transport devices, such as e-scooters. The Council supports most of the proposal but seeks some changes to prioritise pedestrian safety and encourage more walking and cycling. The proposal generally aligns with the Auckland Plan 2050, the Auckland Transport Alignment Project 2018, and the draft Auckland Climate Plan.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Opportunity and Prosperity

24. Skills and training has seen significant recent focus with the opening of the Manukau and Northern Jobs and Skills Hubs and the proposed acceleration of various aspects of the Reform of Vocational Education including the establishment of Regional Skills Leadership Groups. Auckland Council will be involved in the Auckland Regional Skills Leadership Group through ATEED. This shows progress in implementing this outcome, particularly Focus area 5: Increase educational achievement, lifelong learning and training, with a focus on those most in need.

25. Key impacts on this outcome from COVID-19 and central government reform which affect this outcome are set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely impacts from COVID-19</th>
<th>Central government COVID-19 response and Budget 2020</th>
<th>Other central government reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Under alert level four, Auckland was operating at approximately 43 per cent capacity (of total employment)</td>
<td>• Wage subsidy and its subsequent extension to retain jobs</td>
<td>• Incremental lifts in minimum wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accommodation and food services, construction, manufacturing, transport, postal and warehousing, retail, and administrative and support services forecast to be the worst hit nationally with Auckland at risk due to its growth focused economy (i.e. tourism and construction)</td>
<td>• Increases in infrastructure spending to stimulate the economy</td>
<td>• Paid parental leave extension by 4 weeks to 26 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Current (May 2020) domestic spending is at 97 per cent of previous year’s levels, although accommodation, arts and recreation and transport and travel agencies spend is still well below normal levels</td>
<td>• Environmental employment package – 1.1b to create almost 11,000 jobs to restore the environment</td>
<td>• Equal Pay Amendment Bill (addressing pay equity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International spend is only half of previous year’s levels</td>
<td>• COVID-19 Response Bill gives SMEs more than $3b in tax refunds</td>
<td>• Increased funding for the Oranga Mahi programme and Work and Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As at May 2020, Jobseeker benefits in Auckland has increased by 27 per cent over this time last year</td>
<td>• Crown expenses increase of $31b will be driven by more people on the unemployment benefit, and higher benefit rates alongside response and recovery activities</td>
<td>• Proposed acceleration of various aspects of the Reform of Vocational Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prosperity gaps that already exist may widen as certain communities experience greater levels of unemployment and economic hardship</td>
<td>• $900 million to support whānau, hapū and iwi to deal with the fall-out of Covid-19, including $400m on Māori education, and $200m on a Māori Employment Package targeted at the regions and $50m Māori trades training fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Young people are likely to experience higher levels of unemployment, which may lead to an increase in participation in education and training</td>
<td>• Funding boosts for He Poutama Rangatahi, Mana in Mahi and Māori Cadetships Food and Fibre Skills Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Education package for trades and apprenticeships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Note: The above table and text are a summary of impacts and responses related to COVID-19 and central government reforms.*
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27. This is the second Annual Monitoring Report since the adoption of the Auckland Plan 2050 in June 2018. It follows the baseline measures report in November 2018 (PLA/2018/125) and the first annual report in July 2019 (PLA/2019/64). As the report mainly uses data from 2019 or earlier, the impacts of Covid-19 are not captured (these will start to be measured in the 2021 Annual Monitoring Report).

28. The Three Yearly Progress Report, reported to the Planning Committee in March 2020 (PLA/2020/16), supplements the annual monitoring reports and provides a more detailed analysis of trends for each outcome. The analysis draws on a range of other reports and data sets to understand where progress has been made and to identify opportunities for greater progress.

29. The Auckland Plan 2050 Development Strategy sets out how Auckland will grow and change over the next 30 years. The second monitoring report for the Development Strategy will be published around the end of September 2020. There are four common measures that will be reported in both the Auckland Plan annual monitoring report and the Development Strategy monitoring report.

30. The Annual Monitoring Report uses 33 measures to measure general progress and trends across the six outcomes. Trends are summarised under each outcome below. The measurement framework will continue to change over time as the availability and quality of data improves. Any changes (or proposed changes) to the data sets are noted below.

Belonging and Participation

31. The Annual Monitoring Report provides updated data for two of the six measures – relative deprivation across Auckland and Treaty of Waitangi awareness and understanding. There is no significant change for either of these measures.

32. There are two surveys that will not take place in 2020 due to the effects of COVID-19, the Quality of Life Survey and the Auckland Council Citizen Engagement and Insight survey. This will have an impact on our understanding of progress against the Belonging and Participation outcome in particular. To address this, supplementary data sets will be considered for the 2021 Annual Monitoring Report.

Māori Identity and Wellbeing

33. There has been a gradual improvement in the proportion of Māori youth in education, employment or training, but no significant change for the other measures in the Māori Identity and Wellbeing outcome.

34. We are anticipating data in the next six months for two measures (whānau wellbeing and Te reo Māori) to provide a 2018 baseline. In particular, the whānau wellbeing measure will provide an improved understanding of the Māori Identity and Wellbeing outcome. For the Māori decision-making measure (Measure 3), an alternative measure will be considered as the number of co-governance/co-management agreements remains the same since 2014 and is not effective in measuring annual progress.

Homes and Places

35. Data for the Homes and Places outcome shows there are ongoing increases in the number of new dwellings consented and completed. Housing costs as a percentage of household income have stayed the same, as has resident satisfaction with the built environment at a neighbourhood level. Homelessness figures have previously increased, however more recent data is expected to be published in the next couple of months (current data is from the 2013 census as analysis of the 2018 census data has not been completed).
36. The data used for Measure 3: “Housing costs as a percentage of household income” has been updated from ‘housing costs as a percentage of average annual gross household income’ to ‘housing costs as a percentage of annual disposable household income’. This is in line with Statistics New Zealand reporting.

Transport and Access
37. Public transport and cycling numbers both show an increasing positive trend in the Transport and Access outcome. There is no significant change to congestion levels or transport costs as a percentage of household income. Serious injuries remain a concern, as the numbers have increased over the decade.

38. Two measures in the Transport and Access Outcome have had data sets added, in line with measures agreed by the Auckland Transport Alignment Plan (ATAP) working group. For Measure 2: “Delay from congestion”, a real time data set has been added which measures congestion on the arterial network. This real time data supplements the modelled congestion data.

39. For Measure 3: “Use of public transport, walking and cycling” two data sets have been added. First, the annual number of public transport boardings and second, the annual number of cycle movements past selected count sites. Again real time data will supplement the modelled data to ensure a robust understanding of progress. Further work will be done to consider whether there is also appropriate real time data to supplement Measure 1: “Access to jobs”.

Environment and Cultural Heritage
40. There is updated data reported on the levels of air quality pollutants (NO₂) and greenhouse gas emissions, both of which have reduced. There has been a reduction in the number of volunteer hours worked.

41. Auckland’s next five yearly State of the Environment Report is due to be published in the 2020/2021 financial year and provides an integrated overview of trends across all environmental domains. This additional information will be reflected in the Annual Monitoring Report for 2021. Further work is also planned to consider the range of measures and monitoring frameworks currently available for the Environment and Cultural Heritage outcome to ensure they are fit for purpose.

Opportunity and Prosperity
42. Labour productivity and average wages in Auckland have continued to rise and unemployment has decreased for the period. This includes median weekly earnings increasing for all ethnic groups. There has been no significant change for the other measures in the Opportunity and Prosperity outcome - employment in advanced industries, zoned industrial land and educational achievement of young people.

Next steps
43. The Planning Committee will continue to receive regular reporting on the Auckland Plan 2050:
   - The next update on new information relevant to the Auckland Plan 2050 is planned for February 2021
   - The next annual monitoring report is due in July 2021
   - The next three yearly progress report will be provided in March 2023.

44. The strategic direction set in the Auckland Plan 2050 is a basis for alignment with the council’s 10-year budget and other decision-making as appropriate.

Attachments
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### Transport and Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Access to jobs</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Delay from congestion</td>
<td>48</td>
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Executive Summary

The Auckland Plan 2050 is a 30-year spatial plan for Auckland adopted in June 2018. It provides broad direction for Auckland’s growth and development through the six outcomes and the Development Strategy contained within the Plan.

The Auckland Plan Annual Monitoring Report uses 33 measures for tracking progress against the outcomes in the Auckland Plan 2050. This is a high-level analysis of the trends. More detailed analysis is carried out as part of the Three Yearly Progress Report. The first of these reports was reported to the Planning Committee in March 2020 (and is available on the Auckland Plan website www.aucklandplan.govt.nz, in the measuring progress section).

This Annual Monitoring Report mostly uses data from 2019 or before, therefore the impacts of Covid-19 are not captured. For the most recent data available for Auckland (for example on the economic impacts of Covid-19) go to Auckland Council’s Research and Evaluation Unit website at https://knowledgeauckland.org.nz/ in the ‘new on Knowledge Auckland’ section.

The breadth of the Auckland Plan 2050 outcomes requires the annual monitoring report to use metrics and data sources which vary in terms of their availability and frequency. This means that there will not be updates for all measures.

Four of the 33 measures included in this report (new dwellings consented, new dwellings completed, delay from congestion and zoned industrial land) are drawn from the Development Strategy monitoring framework which is reported separately in August/September each year. The Development Strategy report provides a more comprehensive overview of growth, housing and land supply across the region.

Below is a summary of findings based on the data and trends across the six outcomes:

| Belonging and Participation Outcome | This report provides updated data for two of the six measures for this outcome – relative deprivation across Auckland and Treaty of Waitangi awareness and understanding. There is no significant change for either of these measures.  

The previous annual monitoring report showed positive trends for Aucklanders’ sense of safety in their neighbourhoods and the city centre after dark and secondly for their quality of life. There was no significant change for the other measures. |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Maori Identity and Wellbeing Outcome | There has been a gradual improvement in the proportion of Maori youth in education, employment or training, but no significant change for the other updated measure (the number of co-governance/co-management arrangements).  

We are expecting new/updated data for two measures in the next six months (whanau wellbeing and Te reo Maori). In particular, the whanau wellbeing measure will provide an improved understanding of the Maori Identity and Wellbeing outcome. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homes and Places Outcome</td>
<td>The number of new dwellings consented and completed continues to increase. Housing costs as a percentage of household income have stayed the same, as has resident satisfaction with the built environment at a neighbourhood level. Homelessness figures have increased, however we are awaiting more recent data (current data is from the 2013 census).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Access Outcome</td>
<td>Public transport and cycling numbers both show an increasing positive trend. There is no significant change to congestion levels or transport costs as a percentage of household income. Serious injuries remain a concern with increased numbers over the last decade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Cultural Heritage Outcome</td>
<td>The levels of air quality pollutants (NO₂) and greenhouse gas emissions have reduced. There has been a reduction in the number of volunteer hours worked. Auckland’s next five yearly State of the Environment Report is due to be published in the 2020/2021 financial year and provides an integrated overview of trends across all environmental domains. This additional information will be reflected in the Annual Monitoring Report for 2021. Further work is also planned to consider the range of measures and monitoring frameworks currently available for the Environment and Cultural Heritage outcome to ensure they are fit for purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity and Prosperity Outcome</td>
<td>Labour productivity and average wages in Auckland have continued to rise and unemployment has decreased for the period. This includes median weekly earnings increasing for all ethnic groups. There has been no significant change for the other measures: employment in advanced industries, zoned industrial land and educational achievement of young people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of measures

The Auckland Plan Annual Monitoring Report uses 33 measures for tracking progress against the Auckland Plan 2050. Progress is reported as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▲ Positive trend</td>
<td>The trend is tracking in the right direction (towards the outcome to be achieved).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▼ Negative trend</td>
<td>The trend is tracking in the wrong direction (away from the outcome to be achieved).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− No significant change</td>
<td>Over the period measured there has been little or no change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⋯ Insufficient data to determine a trend</td>
<td>There is not enough data to establish a trend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following tables provides a summary for each measure in terms of how they are tracking. Further detail on each measure is provided in the body of the report. Measures which have been updated this year are shown in light blue.

**Belonging and Participation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUCKLAND PLAN MEASURE</th>
<th>DATA (DATE)</th>
<th>TREND</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aucklanders' sense of community in their neighbourhood</td>
<td>50% (2018)</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>Quality of Life Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who strongly agree or agree there is a feeling a sense of community in their local neighbourhood (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aucklanders' sense of safety in their homes and neighbourhood</td>
<td>62% (2018)</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Quality of Life Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rate their feelings of personal safety as safe or very safe (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aucklanders' quality of life</td>
<td>83% (2018)</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Quality of Life Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rate their overall quality of life positively (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AUCKLAND PLAN MEASURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Relative deprivation across Auckland</th>
<th>DATA (DATE)</th>
<th>TREND</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Relative deprivation across Auckland Percentage of local board population with a Deprivation Index score of 8, 9 or 10</td>
<td>Not applicable – this measure is only meaningful at the local level</td>
<td>⋮</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aucklanders’ health Proportion of respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rated their personal health positively (%)</td>
<td>78% (2018)</td>
<td>⋮</td>
<td>Quality of Life Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Treaty of Waitangi awareness and understanding Respondents to council’s resident survey who rate their knowledge of te Tiriti o Waitangi / the Treaty of Waitangi either very well or a fair amount (%)</td>
<td>45% (2019)</td>
<td>⋮</td>
<td>Auckland Council Resident Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Māori Identity and Wellbeing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AUCKLAND PLAN MEASURE</th>
<th>DATA (DATE)</th>
<th>TREND</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Whānau wellbeing Transfer of cultural knowledge (in development for Indicators Aotearoa) Self-rating of Whānau wellbeing</td>
<td>Pending data release</td>
<td>⋮</td>
<td>Stats NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Māori in employment, education and training Proportion of Māori youth in education, employment or training (%)</td>
<td>82% (2019)</td>
<td>⬆</td>
<td>Household Labour Force Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Māori decision making Number of co-governance/co-management arrangements</td>
<td>9 co-governed/co-managed arrangements in place (2019)</td>
<td>⋮</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Te reo Māori across Tāmaki Makaurau Ability to understand te reo Ability to speak te reo</td>
<td>Pending data release</td>
<td>⋮</td>
<td>Stats NZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Homes and Places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUCKLAND PLAN MEASURE</th>
<th>DATA (DATE)</th>
<th>TREND</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New dwellings consented by location and type</td>
<td>15,154 (2019)</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Stats NZ Building Consent Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dwellings consented by location and type (Development Strategy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dwellings issued with Code of Compliance Certificate (Development Strategy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing costs as a percentage of household income</td>
<td>24% (2019)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Household Economic Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of housing costs to disposable household income (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>20,296 (data from 2013, analysis completed in 2018)</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Stats NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people living without shelter and in temporary accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident satisfaction with built environment at a neighbourhood level Respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who agree they feel a sense of pride in their local area (%)</td>
<td>61% (2018)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Quality of Life Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transport and Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUCKLAND PLAN MEASURE</th>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>TREND</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to jobs Proportion of jobs accessible to the average Aucklander in the morning peak within 30 minutes by car and 45 minutes by public transport (%)</td>
<td>35% of jobs are accessible within 30 minutes by car 8% of jobs are accessible within 45 minutes by public transport (2018)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Auckland Regional Transport Model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Item 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUCKLAND PLAN MEASURE</th>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>TREND</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2  Delay from congestion</td>
<td>a) Per capita annual delay from congestion (minutes) (Development Strategy)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) 841 minutes per capita (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Annual congestion rate of 24% (2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Use of public transport, walking and cycling</td>
<td>a) 7.4% of trips made by public transport and 15.1% of trips made by active transport (walking and cycling) (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 100.8 million (2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 3.77 million (2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Household transport costs</td>
<td>$233.5 per week (2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Household Economic Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Deaths and injuries from transport network</td>
<td>567 serious injuries</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Zealand Transport Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 fatalities (2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environment and Cultural Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUCKLAND PLAN MEASURE</th>
<th>DATA (DATE)</th>
<th>TREND</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  State and quality of locally, regionally and nationally significant environments</td>
<td>No updated data, measure under review</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Marine and fresh water quality</td>
<td>No updated data, measure under review</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Air quality and greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>Penrose 11.1 Queen Street – 38 Takapuna – 8.8 (2020)</td>
<td>⬤</td>
<td>Auckland Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Opportunity and Prosperity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Plan Measure</th>
<th>Data (Date)</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Data Source (Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Labour productivity Real GDP per filled job ($)</td>
<td>$125,491 (2019)</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Auckland Economic Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Aucklanders’ average wages Average weekly wages ($)</td>
<td>$1,055 (2019)</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Labour market statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Employment in advanced industries Number of people employed in knowledge intensive industries</td>
<td>2.3% growth (versus 2.0% growth in total employment) (2019)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Auckland Economic Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Zoned industrial land Zoned industrial land (hectare) (Development Strategy)</td>
<td>6,331 hectares (2020)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Auckland Unitary Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Level of unemployment Unemployment level (%)</td>
<td>4.3% (2020)</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>Household Labour Force Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> Internet usage based on income Proportion of respondents under 65 years of age by internet user status by household income bracket (%)</td>
<td>98.9% users 1.1% non-users (2017)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>World Internet Project New Zealand (WiP NZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUCKLAND PLAN MEASURE</td>
<td>DATA (DATE)</td>
<td>TREND</td>
<td>DATA SOURCE (DATE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Educational achievement of young people</td>
<td>40% (2019)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Household Labour Force Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of those aged 20-24 with a Level 4 qualification or above (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future work and next steps

The measurement framework for each annual monitoring report will continue to change over time as the availability and quality of data improves. Any future changes (or proposed changes) to the data sets are noted below.

Belonging and Participation outcome

There are two surveys that will not take place in 2020 due to the effects of Covid-19: the Quality of Life Survey and the Auckland Council Citizen Engagement and Insight survey. These surveys include the data sources for six of the Auckland Plan measures and data will therefore not be available for the Auckland Plan Annual Monitoring Report in 2021. This will mostly have an impact on the Belonging and Participation outcome. To address this, supplementary data sets will be considered for the 2021 Annual Monitoring Report.

Māori Identity and Wellbeing outcome

Stats NZ has work underway in two areas in relation to the Whānau wellbeing measure (Measure 1). First, development of the Ngā Tūtohu Aotearoa indicators one of which is looking to measure the transfer of cultural knowledge between generations. Second, the Te Kupenga survey undertaken in 2018 included a self-rating of whānau wellbeing. At the time of reporting, Tamaki Makaurau data was yet to be released (expected in the next six months).

For the Māori decision-making measure (Measure 3), an alternative measure will be considered as the number of co-governance/co-management agreements remains the same since 2014 and is not effective in measuring annual progress.

Transport and Access outcome

Data sets for two of the measures have been updated in this report, to include both modelled data and real time data (Measure 2: Delay from congestion and Measure 3: Use of public transport, walking and cycling). Further work will be done to consider whether there is real time data to supplement Measure 1: Access to jobs.

Environment and Cultural Heritage outcome

Auckland’s next five yearly State of the Environment Report is due to be published in the 2020/2021 financial year and provides an integrated overview of state and trends across all environmental domains. This analysis of environmental trends will be reflected in the 2021 Annual Monitoring Report.

Monitoring the Environment and Cultural Heritage outcome currently involves use of 13 data sets across six measures. A number of the data sets that we currently use are only updated infrequently. Further work is planned to consider the range of measures and monitoring frameworks currently available and whether the current measures are fit for purpose.
Outcome

Belonging and Participation

Measure 1
Aucklanders’ sense of community in their neighborhood

Respondents to the Quality of Life survey who rated their sense of community in their local neighborhood

Data
Proportion of respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who report feeling a sense of community in their local neighbourhood.

Source

Frequency
Every 2 years.

Availability
The reports are available on Knowledge Auckland (www.knowledgeauckland.org.nz).

Note
From 2012, the Quality of Life survey method changed from a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) survey to an online self-complete survey. The 2018 survey used a sequential mixed-method methodology, enabling respondents to complete the survey either online or via a hard copy of the questionnaire.
Note that the Quality of Life survey will not be conducted in 2020 because of the impacts of Covid-19.

Relevance
A sense of community is an important component of the liveability of a city, as it enables the establishment of social networks and builds social capital.

Baseline (2018)
In 2018, 50% of Auckland respondents agreed that they felt a sense of community with others in their neighbourhood.

Analysis
Between 2012 and 2018 there was a decrease from 53 percent to 50 percent of respondents feeling a sense of community with others in their neighbourhood. Sense of community peaked at 56 percent in 2016.

Trend
- From 2012 to 2018 there has been no significant change.
Outcome

**Belonging and Participation**

**Measure 2**

*Aucklanders’ sense of safety in their homes and neighbourhood*

Respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rated their sense of safety in their neighbourhood and city centre (%)

Data

Proportion of respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rate their feelings of personal safety as very safe or fairly safe.

Source


Frequency

Every 2 years.

Availability

The reports are available on Knowledge Auckland (www.knowledgeauckland.org.nz).

Note

The Quality of Life Survey asks respondents whether they feel very unsafe, a bit unsafe, fairly safe, or very safe in different situations, including walking alone in their neighborhood after dark. From 2012, the Quality of Life survey method changed from a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) survey to an online self-complete survey. The 2018 survey used a sequential mixed-method methodology, enabling respondents to complete the survey either online or via a hard copy of the questionnaire.
Note that the Quality of Life survey will not be conducted in 2020 because of the impacts of Covid-19.

**Relevance**
Perceptions of safety impact on the health and well-being of the individual, family and the wider community. If people feel unsafe, they are less likely to talk to their neighbours, use public transport, go out in the evening, use public amenities and generally participate in their communities.

**Baseline (2018)**
91% of Auckland respondents felt safe in their home after dark. 62% of Auckland respondents felt safe walking alone in their neighbourhood after dark. 90% of Auckland respondents felt safe in their city centre during the day. 46% of Auckland respondents felt safe in their city centre after dark.

**Analysis**
Between 2012 and 2018 there was a general increase in respondents’ feelings of safety across three of the four categories measured. While a high proportion of Auckland respondents reported feeling ‘very safe’ or ‘fairly safe’ (91%) in 2018, this proportion dropped to 64% when considering their sense of safety in their city centre after dark, and 62% per cent when thinking about walking alone in their neighbourhood. Both these numbers however had increased by 7% and 2% respectively on their 2016 comparative measures.

**Trend**
▲ From 2012 to 2018 a positive trend.
Outcome

Belonging and Participation

Measure 3
Aucklanders’ rating of their quality of life

Respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rate their overall quality of life positively (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good*</th>
<th>Extremely good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data
Proportion of respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rated their overall quality of life positively.

Source

Frequency
Every 2 years.

Availability
The reports are available on Knowledge Auckland (www.knowledgeauckland.org.nz).

Note
Respondents were asked to rate their overall quality of life and to also indicate the extent to which they felt their quality of life had changed from 12 months prior. Note that the 2012 Quality of Life survey method changed from a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) survey to an online self-complete survey. The 2018 survey used a sequential mixed-method methodology, enabling respondents to complete the survey either online or via a hard copy of the questionnaire.
Note that the Quality of Life survey will not be conducted in 2020 because of the impacts of Covid-19.

Relevance
Aucklanders’ perception of their quality of life is central to their health and well-being. Satisfaction with overall quality of life is a measure of subjective wellbeing. A number of factors contribute to satisfaction with quality of life, which are further explored in the Quality of Life survey.

Baseline (2018)
42% of Auckland respondents rated their quality of life as extremely or very good. 41% of Auckland respondents rated their quality of life as good. 13% of Auckland respondents rated their quality of life as neither good nor poor. 4% of Auckland respondents rated their quality life as poor or very poor. No Auckland respondents rated their quality of life as extremely poor.

Analysis
Due to the change to a 7-point scale for the 2018 survey, the 2018 Quality of Life survey is difficult to compare against previous surveys. Generally, there is an improving trend in Aucklanders’ quality of life, as there is a reduction in Aucklanders who rate their quality of life as poor / very poor, as well as Aucklanders who rate their quality of life as neither good nor bad. There is also an increase in Aucklanders who rate their quality of life as good, very good or extremely good.

Trend
- From 2012 to 2018 a positive trend.
Outcome

Belonging and Participation

Measure 4

Relative deprivation across Auckland

Percentage of Local Board population with a Deprivation Index of 8, 9 or 10

Data
Socioeconomic Deprivation Index (NZDep).

Source
Department of Public Health, University of Otago, Wellington.

Frequency
The deprivation index is produced after each census, generally every 5 years.

Availability
Deprivation index data can be downloaded from the “New Zealand Indices of Deprivation” section of the University of Otago website, where more technical details about the index can also be found (https://www.otago.ac.nz/wellington/departments/publichealth/research/hrp/otago020194.html).

Note
The deprivation index assigns a value to Census Area Units (CAUs) across New Zealand as a way to indicate relative socioeconomic deprivation. The index is not a measure of absolute deprivation (the lower the number the lower the relative deprivation). The index is calculated via a number of census variables from the following themes: access to communications; income, employment, qualifications, home ownership, single-parent family status, living space and access to private transport.
Relevance
The deprivation index allows investigation of spatial patterns of relative socioeconomic deprivation, which can be used in planning both council and community projects.

Baseline (2018)
Not applicable at the regional level, this measure is only meaningful at the local level.

Analysis
In three local board areas (Waiheke, Waitakere and Papakura local board areas), the percentage of residents living in areas with a high deprivation index value declined significantly indicating that there is now less socioeconomic deprivation in these areas. In other local board areas, the percentage of residents living in areas with a high deprivation index value rose slightly or stayed the same.

Trend
*** This measure shows meaningful change in deprivation at the local level, but at the regional level deprivation levels average out (because it is a relative measure).
Outcome

Belonging and Participation

Measure 5
Aucklanders’ health

Respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rate their personal health (%)

Data
Proportion of respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who rated their health positively.

Source

Frequency
Every 2 years.

Availability
The reports are available on Knowledge Auckland (www.knowledgeauckland.org.nz).

Note
Respondents were asked to rate their general overall health. From 2012, the Quality of Life survey method changed from a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) survey to an online self-complete survey. The 2018 survey used a sequential mixed-method methodology, enabling respondents to complete the survey either online or via a hard copy of the questionnaire.

Note that the Quality of Life survey will not be conducted in 2020 because of the impacts of Covid-19.
Relevance
Good health is critical to wellbeing as it enables people to participate in society and the economy. Without good health, people are less able to enjoy their lives to the fullest extent, and their options may be limited. Self-rated health is a widely used indicator of health status and has been shown to have a strong relationship with objective measures of health status.

Baseline (2018)
78% of Auckland respondents rated their health as good, very good or excellent. 18% of Auckland respondents rated their health as fair. 4% of Auckland respondents rated their health as poor.

Analysis
Between 2012 and 2018 there was no significant change in how Aucklanders rate their personal health. In 2018 there was a small decrease in the number of Aucklanders who rate their personal health as good, very good and extremely good. There was also a small increase in the number of Aucklanders who rate their personal health as either fair or poor.

Trend
- From 2012 to 2018 there has been no significant change.
Outcome

Belonging and Participation

Measure 6
Treaty of Waitangi awareness and understanding

Respondents to the Council’s Resident Survey who rate their knowledge of Te Tiriti o Waitangi - the Treaty of Waitangi.

Data
Respondents in council’s resident survey who rate their knowledge of Te Tiriti o Waitangi - the Treaty of Waitangi.

Source
Auckland Council – Citizen Engagement and Insights.

Frequency
Annual.

Availability
On request from Auckland Council.

Note
The survey primarily measures respondents’ use of, and satisfaction with, a range of council services. It is conducted using a mix of online, phone and face-to-face interviews among Auckland Residents aged 15 years and over. In 2019, 4,325 respondents took part in the survey.

Note that the resident survey will not be conducted in 2020 because of the impacts of Covid 19.
Relevance
Te Tiriti o Waitangi - the Treaty of Waitangi is important as a ‘living document’, central to New Zealand’s present and future, as well as its past. It provides the basis for all people to belong, while recognising Māori as tangata whenua. Valuing and better understanding the Treaty contributes to our shared identity and sense of belonging.

Baseline (2018)
In 2018 respondents in Council’s resident survey rate their knowledge of Te Tiriti o Waitangi - the Treaty of Waitangi with:

- 13% considered they knew it very well.
- 36% considered they had a fair amount of knowledge.
- 35% considered they knew just a little.
- 8% considered they knew almost nothing.
- 4% considered they knew nothing about the Treaty of Waitangi.
- 4% said they didn’t know their knowledge level.

Analysis
Between 2018 and 2019 there has been no significant change in how Auckland residents rate their knowledge of Te Tiriti o Waitangi - the Treaty of Waitangi. In 2019 there was a small decrease in the number of residents who consider that they know the Treaty very well or have a fair amount of knowledge. There was a small increase in the number of residents who consider they know just a little or almost nothing about the Treaty.

Trend
- From 2018 to 2019 there has been no significant change.
Outcome

Māori Identity and Wellbeing

Measure 1
Whānau wellbeing – based on principles of whanaungatanga

Note: there is currently no data available for this measure.

Explanation of measure
The general principles of whanaungatanga have been used as the basis for determining whānau wellbeing. For the purpose of defining whanaungatanga various sources including the Māori dictionary, Te Puawaitanga o ngā whānau – six markers of flourishing whānau, and the Māori Plan 2017 Glossary (Independent Māori Statutory Board). Common across the different definitions for whanaungatanga were the important themes of whānau relationships and connectedness as described in the notes below.

Data
Aspects of whānau relationships and connectedness will be measured through the following datasets:

- Transfer of cultural knowledge between generations – Nga Tūtohu Aotearoa indicators (measures for New Zealand’s wellbeing)
- Whānau wellbeing – Te Kupenga (survey of Māori wellbeing in New Zealand)

Source
Statistics New Zealand.

Frequency

- Nga Tūtohu Aotearoa indicators (to be determined)
- Te Kupenga (5 yearly)

Availability
The Nga Tūtohu Aotearoa indicators are in development. Only provisional data for New Zealand is currently available from the Te Kupenga survey at the time of reporting. We are waiting for Tamaki Makarau data to be released.

Relevance
Whānau Relationships – ‘Whānau will flourish when they are cohesive, practise whanaungatanga, and are able to foster positive intergenerational transfers.’ Whānau cohesion includes: the quality of relationships within households and within the wider whānau; the use of on-line communication systems; opportunities for whānau living elsewhere to participate in whānau life; whānau leadership; whānau events and participation in those events; involvement in whānau ‘traditions’; whānau wānanga.” – Te Puawaitanga o ngā whānau.

Whānau connectedness – Whānau will flourish when their connections beyond the whānau lead to empowerment.’ Whānau Connectedness includes: whānau utilisation of societal institutions (e.g. schools,
health care) and facilities (e.g. sport grounds, gymnasium), whānau participation in sport and/or recreation; whānau engagement in community affairs; whānau exercise of citizenship rights; whānau utilisation of banking and other financial institutions; whānau contributions to community committees, boards, voluntary efforts. - Te Puawaitanga o ngā whānau.

Baseline (2018)
To be determined.

Analysis
To be determined.

Trend
--- To be determined.
Outcome

Māori Identity and Wellbeing

Measure 2
Māori in employment, education and training

Measure 2a.
Proportion of Māori youth in education, employment or training (%)

Data
Derived from youth (aged 15–24) NEET rates (not in employment education or training) by ethnicity and age (15–19, 20–24).

Source
Statistics New Zealand, Household Labour Force Survey (HLFS); Auckland Council, Research and Evaluation Unit (RIMU) calculations.

Frequency
Quarterly and moving annual average (to avoid seasonality).

Availability

Note
Education and training data is only available for youth (ages 15–24). Employment here is number of
individuals in paid employment (including self-employed and working proprietors and part-timers). People not working or studying include those who are not available (e.g. full-time parents and other caregivers), as well as unemployed and other jobless people (not just the workforce). All data is subject to sampling errors, which increases for smaller sub-samples. Quarterly data is seasonal, so annual averages are recommended.

Relevance
Employment generates wealth for society, and income and job experience for the individual; education and training enables youth in particular to improve their prospects. In the labour market, young people are often the first to lose their jobs and the last to gain employment. Youth who are in employment, education or training are less at risk of long-term unemployment, have better health outcomes and are less likely to be socially or economically disadvantaged in the future.

Baseline (2018)
In 2018, 81% of Maori youth aged 15 – 24 were in employment, education or training.

Analysis
Between 2007 and 2019 the proportion of Maori youth aged 15 – 24 in employment, education or training increased slightly from 78% to 82%.

Trend
From 2007 to 2019 a positive trend.

Measure 2b.
Type of employment for Maori (%)

Data
Employment (filled jobs) of Maori and all-ethnicities by occupation (ANZSCO I digit), modelled by
Infometrics from Statistics NZ data (census and quarterly HLFS).

Source
Infometrics, Auckland regional economic profile.

Frequency
Annual

Availability

Note
Employment here is number of filed jobs (including self-employed and working proprietors and partners). Infometrics model Māori occupation data using their Regional Industry-Occupational matrix.

Relevance
Modern economies tend to shift employment out of lower skilled occupations such as labourers and machinery operators, and into higher skilled ones such as managers and professionals. Higher skilled occupations generally tend to be more productive and rewarding, and to offer better opportunities. Skills require education and training.

Baseline (2018)
Employment by occupation for Māori in 2018 relative to the total population:
- Labourers - 15% (Total population - 8.7%)
- Machinery operators and drivers - 11% (Total population - 5.2%)
- Sales workers - 8.4% (Total population - 10%)
- Clerical and administrative workers - 11.2% (Total population 11.9%)
- Community, personal service workers - 11.9% (Total population - 8.9%)
- Technicians and Trade workers - 12.7% (Total population - 12.5%)
- Professionals - 17.6% (Total population - 25.3%)
- Managers - 12.1% (Total population - 17.5%)

Analysis
As at 2019, Māori employed as labourers, machinery operators and drivers, community and personal service workers were above the regional average. Māori employed as clerical and administrative workers, technicians and trade workers were approximately the same as the Auckland population. Māori employed in sales dropped below the general population whilst professionals and managers also remained below the general population.

Trend
- From 2018 to 2019 no significant change
Outcome

Māori Identity and Wellbeing

Measure 3

Māori decision making

Number of co-governance/co-management arrangements

Data

Number of co-governance/co-management arrangements.

Source

Auckland Council, Ngā Mātārae.

Frequency

Annual

Availability

On request from Auckland Council, Ngā Mātārae.

Note

Data collection notes:

- All years exclude Rangihoa and Tawaiparera Committee, which is not currently in operation
- All years exclude new governance structure over the Ōnehunga Portage, which is not yet fully operational.
- All years include 2 co-management agreements – Pūkaki and Wai-o-maru
- 2018 list reclassifies Puketawhiru Pā Joint Management Committee as co-governance rather than
co-management.

An alternative measure will be considered for the next annual monitoring report as the number of co-governance/co-management agreements remains the same since 2014 and is not effective in measuring annual progress.

Relevance
Reciprocal decision-making is a significant issue concerning Māori and is a primary pillar for Māori well-being and capacity.

Baseline (2018)
There are nine co-governance arrangements (with one in abeyance), some of which were initiated by Treaty of Waitangi Settlement legislation.

Analysis
As at May 2020 there were the following co-governance/co-management arrangements in place:

- Tūpuna Maunga Authority (statutory).
- Wai-o-maru.
- Te Motu a Hiaroa (Puketutu Island) Governance Trust.
- Mutukaroa (Hamins Hill) Management Trust.
- Ngāti Whātau Ōrākei Reserves Board (statutory).
- Pukekiwiriki Pa Joint Management Committee.
- Te Poari o Kaipātiki ki Kaipara (statutory).
- Rangihoua and Tawaiparera Management Committee (in abeyance)
- Te Pūkaki Tapu o Poutukeka Historic Reserve and associated Māori lands co-management Committee (Pukaki).

Trend
- From 2014 to 2020 there has been no significant change.
Outcome

Māori Identity and Wellbeing

Measure 4
Te reo Māori across Tāmaki Makaurau

Te reo Māori proficiency (self-rated) (%)

Data
Self-rated te reo Māori proficiency.

Source
Te Kupenga, Stats NZ

Frequency
5 yearly.

Availability
Available from the Stats NZ website.

Relevance
Language is intrinsic to expressing and sustaining culture as a means of communicating values, beliefs, and customs. As the indigenous culture of New Zealand, Māori culture is unique to New Zealand and forms a fundamental part of the national identity. Māori language is central to Māori culture and an important aspect of cultural participation and identity.

Baseline (2018)
Of the Te Kupenga data set, only provisional results are available for New Zealand. The data release for
Tāmaki Makarau is expected in the next six months.

Analysis
Analysis is subject to the release of Te Kupenga data.

Trend
*** Insufficient data to determine a trend.
Outcome

Homes and Places

Measure 1
New dwellings consented by location and type
(Development Strategy)

Number of new dwellings consented by type

Data
Numbers of new residential dwellings consented (per annum) by location and type.

Source
Statistics New Zealand, building consent data.

Frequency
Annual (financial year, also available monthly).

Availability
Building consent data for Auckland is freely available on Statistics New Zealand’s Infoshare website. Detailed data at subregional level is available on request from the Research and Evaluation Unit (RIMU) at Auckland Council.

Note
Statistics NZ building consent data is produced both for the number of consents issued and the number of dwellings consented – this analysis is for dwellings consented. Data is for financial years and is presented for the previous 11 years.
A single building consent may allow for the building of more than one dwelling.

In 2015 Stats NZ revised the classification of data resulting in four categories: 1) Houses, 2) Apartments, 3) Townhouses, flats, units and other dwellings 4) Retirement village units.

Relevance
The housing preferences of Aucklanders are diverse. A broad range of housing types are required, in a variety of locations. These characteristics are also important measures of a quality compact urban form.

This measure will also be used to track progress towards the aims of the Auckland Plan 2050 Development Strategy.

Baseline (2018)
For the 2018 (financial) year:

- Houses – 5,917 new dwelling consents.
- Townhouses, flats, units, and other dwellings – 2,823.
- Apartments – 2,811
- Retirement village units – 817.
- Total – 12,368.

Analysis
Since 2010 there has been a continued increase in the number of new dwellings consented. Between 2013 and 2019 the number of new dwellings consented annually increased significantly from 5,501 to 15,154. The typology of housing also changed significantly in this period. In 2013, apartments, townhouses, flats, units, and other dwellings made up approximately 24% of new dwellings consented. In 2019 this had risen to 49%.

This change in the types of dwellings consented has enabled most growth to occur within the existing urban area, particularly in and around centres (refer to Map - Number of dwellings consented by location).

Trend
▲ From 2010 to 2019 a positive trend.
Map 1. Residential building consents issued in FY2018/2019
Outcome

Homes and Places

Measure 2
New dwellings consented and completed
(Development Strategy)

Number of new dwellings issued with a code of compliance certificate

Data
Numbers of new residential dwellings that have a code of compliance certificate issued per annum.

Source
Auckland Council, code of compliance certificate data.

Frequency
Annual (financial year, also available monthly).

Availability
Numbers of code of compliance certificates and the number of dwellings with code of compliance certificates are coded as part of Auckland Council’s building consenting processes. Detailed data at sub-regional level is available on request from the Research and Evaluation Unit (RIMU) at Auckland Council.

Note
‘Dwellings with code of compliance certificates issued’ is a metric that was developed by Auckland Council’s Building Control department in response to monitoring requirements for the Auckland Housing Accord. ‘Dwellings with code of compliance certificates issued’ data is only available from October 2013.
onwards, and spatial matching of this data is only 93 per cent.

Note that this measure is also reported in the Auckland Plan Development Strategy monitoring report.

**Relevance**
Code of compliance certificates provide a measure for when a dwelling is able to be occupied rather than a building consent that indicates an intention to build. There are no strict requirements to obtain a code of compliance certificate, however they are a useful indicator of actual completions.

**Baseline (2018)**
In 2018 (financial year) there were 9,433 residential dwellings that had a code of compliance certificate issued.

**Analysis**
Between 2014 and 2019 the number of new dwellings issued with a code of compliance certificate has steadily increased. The largest year on year increase during the monitored timeframe was for 2018 at 9,433 (an increase of 2,017 code of compliance certificates on the 2017 figure). The number of new dwellings issues with a code of compliance certificate in 2019 was 10,080 (an increase of 647 from the 2018 figure).

**Trend**
▲ From 2014 to 2019 a positive trend.
Outcome

Homes and Places

Measure 3
Housing costs as a percentage of household income

Housing costs to disposable household income (%)

Data
Auckland average household annual expenditure on housing costs and average annual household disposable income.

Source

Frequency
Annual.

Availability
Published on the Statistics New Zealand website.

Note
This measure has been updated in 2019, from average annual gross household income to average annual disposable household income. This is in line with Statistics New Zealand, who note that ‘releasing disposable income as our key income measure will offer a better representation of the economic resources available to meet household needs.’ The data for previous years have been revised accordingly.

All dollars are nominal (not adjusted for inflation) and include survey error margins of up to 10%. Values
are averages (not medians) of households in the Auckland region. Household income includes wages and salary, self-employment, investments and government benefits, and superannuation. Housing costs include rent and mortgages, property rates and building-related insurance.

Relevance
Although this ratio is a common indicator of housing cost stress, the household income component depends on many things, including household size and number of income earners. Housing affordability can also be affected by the interplay of a wide range of factors including taxation and fiscal policy, planning and regulatory requirements and costs; industry practice and productivity, migration and demographic changes. These factors affect housing costs for a very broad cross-section of society. It should also be remembered that people who already owned (or inherited) property prior to the price rises, were largely unaffected or even benefited from the price rises.

Baseline (2018)
In 2018 the ratio of housing costs to household disposable income was 23.9%.

Analysis
Between 2010 and 2018 expenditure on housing costs as a percentage of disposable household income remained stable at between 23% to 26%.

Trend
- From 2010 to 2019 no significant change.
Outcome

Homes and Places

Measure 4

Homelessness

Numbers of people living without shelter and in temporary accommodation

Data
Census figures, Statistics New Zealand and administrative data from emergency housing providers.

Source
Report on Severe housing deprivation in Aotearoa/New Zealand 2001-2013 by Kate Amore (2016). He Kāinga Oranga / Housing and Health Research Programme, Department of Public Health, University of Otago, Wellington.

Frequency
Every five years. Note the analysis using data from the 2018 census is not available yet.

Availability

Note
Severe housing deprivation refers to people living in severely inadequate housing due to a lack of access to minimally adequate housing. This means not being able to access an acceptable dwelling to rent, let alone buy.
It includes four main categories:

- Uninhabitable housing – garages, sheds.
- Sharing temporarily – Couch surfing in private residence.
- Temporary accommodation – Emergency housing, refuges, camp grounds, boarding houses, hotels, motels, marae.
- Without shelter – Rough sleeping, vehicles, improvised or makeshift shelter.

Relevance
Severe housing deprivation is an important social issue which requires an integrated approach at both the local and national level, to reduce poverty and increase opportunity as well as to develop effective interventions to meet the needs of homeless people.

Baseline (2018)
As at 2013: 20,296 Aucklanders were homeless. Note the analysis using data from the 2018 census is not available yet.

Analysis
Between 2001 and 2013 the number of Aucklanders who were homeless increased significantly from 13,009 to 20,296.

Trend
- From 2001 to 2013 a negative trend.
Outcome

Homes and Places

Measure 5
Resident satisfaction with their built environment at a neighbourhood level

Respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who agreed they feel a sense of pride in their local area (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data
Proportion of respondents to the Quality of Life Survey who feel a sense of pride in the way that their local area or neighbourhood looks and feels.

Source

Frequency
Every 2 years.

Availability
The reports are available on Knowledge Auckland (www.knowledgeauckland.org.nz).

Note
From 2012, the Quality of Life survey method changed from a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) survey to an online self-complete survey. The 2018 survey used a sequential mixed-method methodology, enabling respondents to complete the survey either online or via a hard copy of the questionnaire.
Relevance
How residents feel about their local area or neighbourhood can also be considered a reflection in part of how satisfied they are with the built environment. This measure will help to determine whether Auckland is creating a strong sense of place that resonates with its residents.

Baseline (2018)
In 2018, 61% of Auckland respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they felt a sense of pride in the way their city or local area feels.

Analysis
Between 2012 and 2018, respondents that felt a sense of pride in the built environment was relatively steady between 60% to 64%.

Trend
- From 2010 to 2018 no significant change.
Outcome

Transport and Access

Measure 1

Access to jobs

Proportion of jobs reached by car or public transport – 2016 baseline (%)

Data

Number of jobs accessible to the average Aucklander in the morning peak within 30 minutes by car and 45 minutes by public transport in 2016 (modelled data).

Source

Auckland Regional Transport (ART) model outputs, Auckland Forecasting Centre.

Frequency

Variable – an updated version of the model (using 2018 census data) is not yet available.

Availability

Data can be sourced from the Auckland Forecasting Centre.

Note

ART model uses a combination of real data and various assumptions to predict the level and rate of change across different areas and components of the transport network. The use of modelling enables targeted interventions to be made and understood within the context of the broader network now and into the future. The model output was prepared for the 2016 Auckland Transport Alignment project (ATAP). Further refinement to the model outputs was carried out through the revised ATAP in 2018. Note that this measure is also reported in the Auckland Plan Development Strategy monitoring report.
A real time measure for monitoring access to jobs will be further considered in discussion with the ATAP measures working group.

Relevance
For Auckland to benefit from the region’s growth, it is essential for people from all parts of Auckland to have good access to the employment, education and other opportunities that growth creates. Our continued prosperity is dependent on the convenient, affordable, safe and sustainable movement of people, goods and services within Auckland, and with the rest of New Zealand and the world. Improving access to employment and education is particularly critical to boosting Auckland’s economic productivity and overall prosperity (Ministry of Transport, 2014). To be productive, businesses need a wide choice of potential employees. Similarly, workers need a wide choice of potential jobs within a reasonable commute time to best match their skills and to reduce their vulnerability to long-term unemployment in the event of job loss.

Baseline (2016)
34.6% of jobs are accessible to the average Aucklanders in the morning peak within 30 minutes by car. 8.3% of jobs are accessible to the average Aucklanders in the morning peak within 45 minutes by public transport.

Analysis
Job accessibility varies significantly by mode and distance. The number of jobs accessible by public transport is expected to significantly increase over the next 30 years. In 2016, 8 per cent of jobs were considered accessible to Aucklanders within a 45-minute trip on public transport. This figure is expected to increase to 25 per cent by 2036. Access by car is also expected to increase significantly especially between 2016 and 2036. In 2016 35 per cent of jobs were considered accessible to Aucklanders within a 30-minute trip by car. This figure should increase to 61 per cent by 2036.

Trend
*** A trend cannot be determined.
Outcome

Transport and Access

Measure 2
Delay from congestion

Measure 2a.
Per capital annual delay from congestion – 2016 baseline
(hours/capita) (Development Strategy)

Data
Per capita annual delay from congestion (minutes) in 2016 (modelled data).

Source
Auckland Regional Transport model outputs, Auckland Forecasting Centre.

Frequency
Variable – an updated version of the model (using 2018 census data) is not yet available.

Availability
Data can be sourced from the Auckland Forecasting Centre.

Note
The Auckland Regional Transport model uses a combination of real data and various assumptions to predict the level of congestion across different areas and components of the transport network. The use of modelling enables targeted interventions to be made and understood within the context of the broader network now and into the future. The model output was prepared for the 2016 Auckland Transport Alignment project. Further refinement to the model outputs was carried out through the revised Auckland Transport Alignment Project in 2018.
Note that this measure is also reported in the Auckland Plan Development Strategy monitoring report.

**Relevance**
Traffic delays constrain economic productivity so moving people and goods efficiently through Auckland is a key transport objective. This measure shows the total and per capita delay across the network based on the projected volume of traffic divided by its theoretical capacity (VC ratio).

Congestion is defined by combining the two worst levels of service measures for measuring network performance:

- Significant delay and low average speed (Level of service E).
- High delay and extremely low speeds (Level of service F).

**Baseline (2016)**
841 minutes per capita annual from congestion.

**Analysis**
Delay from congestion, measured as per capita additional delay, is expected to peak in 2026 before reducing heavily from 2026 and rising gain from 2036.

**Trend**

- A trend cannot be determined.

**Measure 2b.**
Congestion in the arterial network in the AM peak (%)

![Bar chart showing congestion in the arterial network in the AM peak from 2017 to 2019.](chart)

**Data**
The proportion of the arterial network that has a median travel speed of less than 50% of the posted...
speed during the AM peak hour (7:30 – 8:30am). This is an annual average for the year ending in July.

Source
Auckland Transport data.

Frequency
Annual (for the year ending in July).

Availability

Note
Congestion is defined as average travel speeds of less than 50 percent of the posted speed and the AM peak hour is 7.30–8.30. Regional arterial roads link districts or urban areas within the region, connect regionally significant facilities, and play a critical role in the movement of people and goods within the region. They include Motorways / Strategic Routes / Primary Arterials and Secondary Arterials. A map of the arterial network is available in Auckland Transport monthly indicator reports.

Relevance
The impact of growing congestion is increased travel times and unreliability. Traffic delays constrain economic productivity, moving people and goods efficiently through Auckland is a key transport objective. Congestion also makes Auckland a less attractive place to live and affects the quality of life for many Aucklanders, reducing the time available to spend on leisure activities and with friends and family.

Baseline (2018)
In 2018 there was an annual congestion rate of 23% in the AM peak period.

Analysis
In the 12 months to July 2019, 24% of the arterial network was considered congested in the AM peak. This is slightly down from a peak of 25% in 2017, despite recent strong population growth.

Trend
- From 2017 to 2019 no significant change.
Outcome

Transport and Access

Measure 3
Use of public transport, walking and cycling

Measure 3a. Proportion of trips made by public transport, walking and cycling during the AM peak – 2016 baseline (%)

Proportion of trips made by public transport, walking and cycling during the AM peak.

Source
Auckland Regional Transport (ART) model outputs, Auckland Forecasting Centre.

Frequency
Variable – an updated version of the model (using 2018 census data) is not yet available.

Availability
Data can be sourced from the Auckland Forecasting Centre.

Note
ART model uses a combination of real data and various assumptions to predict the level and rate of change across different areas and components of the transport network. The use of modelling enables targeted interventions to be made and understood within the context of the broader network now and into the future. The model output was prepared for the 2016 Auckland Transport Alignment project (ATAP). Further refinement to the model outputs was carried out through the revised ATAP in 2018.
Relevance
For Auckland to benefit from the region’s growth, it is essential for people from all parts of Auckland to have good access to the employment, education and other opportunities that growth creates. People need access to a range of modes to ensure they can move easily throughout the region.

Baseline (2016)
7.4% of trips made by public transport during AM peak. 15.1% of trips made by active transport (walking and cycling during AM peak).

Analysis
The proportion of trips taken in Auckland by public transport and active modes is expected to increase between 2016 to 2046. In 2016 it was calculated that just over 20 per cent of trips taken in Auckland were by public transport or active modes. In 2046 it is expected that over 30 per cent of trips taken in Auckland will be by public transport or active modes.

Trend
*** A trend cannot be determined.

Measure 3b. Annual number of public transport boardings (millions)

Data
Annual number of public transport boardings (millions).

Source
Auckland Transport.

Frequency
Annual (for year ending in June).

**Availability**

**Note**
Public transport boardings include buses, trains and ferries.

**Relevance**
For Auckland to benefit from the region’s growth, it is essential for people from all parts of Auckland to have good access to the employment, education and other opportunities that growth creates. People need access to a range of modes to ensure they can move easily throughout the region. Public transport is an important part of that mix, reducing congestion and contributing toward our climate change commitments.

**Baseline (2018)**
In 2018 there were 92.36 million annual public transport boardings.

**Analysis**
The number of annual public transport boardings has increased from 79.24 million in 2015 to 100.8 million in 2019.

**Trend**
↑ From 2015 to 2019 a positive trend.

**Measure 3c. Number of cycle movements past selected count sites (millions)**

![Graph showing number of cycle movements past selected count sites from 2017 to 2019.]

**Data**
Annual number of cycle movements past selected count sites.
Source
Auckland Transport data.

Frequency
Annual (year ending in June, data is also available daily and monthly).

Availability
See the Auckland Transport website for cycling data, monitoring and research (https://at.govt.nz/cycling-walking/research-monitoring). The 'active modes quarterly snapshots' include a map of the monitoring sites. Data for specific months and sites can be downloaded from the 'monthly cycle monitoring' section.

Note
The number of cycle movements in Auckland is collected at sites across the region using permanent, automated cycle-monitoring equipment. There are currently 26 sites with counters across the region which report the number of cycle movements all day, every day. The data here starts from 2017, when the number of monitoring sites was increased (from 14 sites).

Cycling counts are an indicator of overall cycling numbers, however data collection is at selective points around the region and can miss local variation. It is also possible for cyclists to go past multiple sites on a single journey.

Relevance
For Auckland to benefit from the region’s growth, it is essential for people from all parts of Auckland to have good access to the employment, education and other opportunities that growth creates. People need access to a range of modes to ensure they can move easily throughout the region. Walking and cycling are an important part of that mix, particularly for short and medium distance trips, reducing congestion, contributing toward our climate change commitments and providing health benefits.

Baseline (2018)
In 2018 the number of cycle movements past selected count sites was 3.6 million.

Analysis
The number of cycle movements past selected count sites has been increasing, from 3.5 million in 2017 to 3.77 million in 2019.

Trend
▲ From 2017 to 2019 a positive trend.
Outcome
Transport and Access

Measure 4
Household transport costs

Average weekly household transport costs ($)

Data
Average weekly transport costs.

Source
Statistics New Zealand, HES Household Economic Survey and HES (Income).

Frequency
3 yearly survey.

Availability
Stats NZ website. The breakdown of household transport costs for the 2019 survey was not available at the time of reporting.

Note
All dollars are nominal (not adjusted for inflation) and include survey error margins of up to 10%. Values are averages (not medians) of households in the Auckland region.

Relevance
Reducing household transport costs can help to improve equity across the region. It can also drive change in mode choice. Transport costs contain expenditure on vehicle purchases, private transport supplies and
services, and passenger transport services. It includes spending on petrol, vehicle parts and servicing, and travel by rail, road, air and sea.

**Baseline (2016)**
As at 2016 the average cost per week as a percentage of average household costs were:

- Purchase of vehicles – $72.50 per week
- Private transport supplies and services – $70.50 per week
- Passenger transport services – $71.00 per week.
- Percentage of transport costs to average household costs (%) - 14.0%

**Analysis**
Between 2016 and 2019 the ratio of transport costs as a percentage of household costs increased from 14% to 16%. However, in the longer term, transport costs have remained relatively constant at between 13.9 to 16.0% of household costs.

Between 2007 and 2016 passenger transport costs as a proportion of average household costs increased the most from $26 to $71. Purchase of vehicle costs showed the second highest increase from $44 to $72 whilst private transport supplies and services decreased slightly from $78 to $71. Note the breakdown of household transport costs for the 2019 data is not currently (June 2020) available.

**Trend**
- From 2007 to 2019 no significant change.
Outcome

Transport and Access

Measure 5
Deaths and injuries from transport network

Number of serious and fatal injuries

![Graph showing the number of serious and fatal injuries from 2010 to 2019.]

Data
Serious and fatal traffic deaths and injuries in the Auckland Region.

Source
New Zealand Transport Agency.

Frequency
Annual (however it is reported weekly).

Availability
New Zealand Transport Agency website.

Note
Road crash ‘fatal and serious injuries’ (FSI) is an annual measure of the number of individual deaths and serious injuries recorded by NZ Police Traffic Crash Reports (TCRs) on all local roads, state highways and motorways within the Auckland Council boundary during a calendar year. Reporting delays may cause numbers to change slightly between reporting cycles.

Relevance
This is a key indicator for understanding annual changes in the severity of road trauma across Auckland. The measure reflects the recent international and national shift to a Safe Road System increasingly free of death and serious injury. This approach acknowledges that while minor injury or non-injury crashes may still occur, road system designers have a responsibility to create and operate a transport system where people are protected from death or serious injury. Auckland became a Vision Zero city in 2019, with a goal of no deaths or serious injuries in our transport system by 2050.

**Baseline (2018)**

In the year to December 2018 there were:

- 595 serious injuries.
- 54 fatalities.

**Analysis**

There has been a reduction in deaths and serious injuries in 2018 and 2019 (from a high in 2017) which is positive. However, the numbers of serious injuries are still significantly higher than the start of the decade.

**Trend**

- From 2010 to 2019 a negative trend.
Outcome

Environment and Cultural Heritage

Auckland's next five yearly State of the Environment Report is due to be published in the 2020/2021 financial year and will provide an integrated overview of data and trends across all environmental domains. Further work is also planned to consider the range of environmental measures and monitoring frameworks currently available and whether the current measures are fit for purpose. The analysis from both pieces of work will be reflected in the 2021 Annual Monitoring Report.

Where we have recent data available, this is included in the report. This data will also be included in the review of all of the measures.

Measure 1

State and quality of locally, regionally and nationally significant environments

Currently no updated data for this measure (see above).

Measure 2

Marine and freshwater quality

Currently no updated data for this measure (see above).
Outcome

Environment and Cultural Heritage

Measure 3
Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Measure 3a.
Concentration of air pollutants (NO₂)

Data
Nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) trends from 2015 to 2020 at Penrose, Queen Street and Takapuna.

Source
Auckland Council ambient air quality monitoring programme.

Frequency
Continuous data is collected every minute and averaged over 10 minutes, 1-hour and 24-hour periods. Most national and regional standards and targets are based on 1-hour and 24-hour periods. Diffusion tube and volatile organic compounds measurements can be obtained over weekly or monthly time periods.

Availability
Real-time and historical data are available from Auckland Council on request. Technical and summary reports describing Auckland’s air quality are available at Knowledge Auckland. (https://knowledgeauckland.org.nz/natural-environment/).

Note
Auckland Council collects the following data for air quality monitoring:
• Emissions from vehicles (especially diesel) contribute nitrogen oxides (NOx), mainly nitric oxide (NO). Nitric oxide reacts with oxygen in the atmosphere to form NO2, which can cause the brown haze that affects our health.

• Ozone (O3) is produced because of vehicle exhaust emissions interacting with sunlight in the presence of volatile organic Compounds.

• PM10 particulate data are currently collected at eight sites across the network. This size of particulate is emitted from natural sources such as oceanic sea salt and pollen. Anthropogenic sources include dust, transport emission and home heating.

• PM2.5 is currently monitored at four sites. PM2.5 measures the smallest size fraction of particulates that are most commonly anthropogenic in origin, including combustion sources, home heating, and secondary particulates emanating from gas emissions.

• Shipping traffic also has an impact, contributing mainly PM, NOx, and Sulphur dioxide (SO2) to the air.

Relevance
There is a statistically significant increase in the number of admissions to hospital for respiratory disorders follow brown haze events over Auckland. This is because the brown haze is a stagnant pool of polluted air sitting over a large area of Auckland’s airshed. These events tend to occur on clear calm mornings in winter when people go out and exercise, unaware of the risks of exacerbating existing bronchial and respiratory disorders. This model will act as a warning for the public, advisory for the District Health Boards and as a mitigation tool for key polluters such as Auckland Transport.

Baseline (2016)
The current baseline is set against 2016 data:

• AC Penrose NO2 [μg/m³] - 10.5
• AC Queen Street NO2 [μg/m³] - 35.5
• AC Takapuna NO2 [μg/m³] - 10.7

Analysis
The graphed NO2 data is collected from 3 air quality monitoring stations across Auckland, Penrose, Takapuna and Queen Street.

Key air quality information can be determined from this graph. A long-term downward trend in measured NOx is evident. NOx is largely emitted from on-road vehicles. As vehicle numbers are known to be increasing, the data may seem surprising. However, improvements in engine efficiency and cleaner fuel have proved more influential on pollution emissions than the increasing traffic volume. This is more evident before 2012. Since then, traffic volume has started to mitigate gains in vehicle efficiency with trends levelling off, and in some locations, now increasing.

Penrose and Takapuna display almost identical concentrations, despite being almost 10km apart. This is due to similarities in their relative proximity to the State Highway 1 motorway. The similarity in data demonstrates that they are measuring the same emission source with similar emission rates.

Queen Street shows a marked drop in 2011. This was due to the reconfiguration of Queen Street.
effectively reducing traffic. Since 2012, the trend in NO₂ has been slowly increasing at this location due to an increasing number of vehicles, and buses.

**Trend**

▲ From 2006 to 2020 a positive trend.

**Measure 3b.**

Greenhouse gas emissions (tonne of CO₂e accounting for CO₂e removed by forests)

**Data**

Multiple indicators and data sources used.

**Source**


**Frequency**

Annual greenhouse gas emissions are reported for 1990 and from 2009 to 2016, so a pre-Auckland Plan 2050 baseline is available. Projected greenhouse gas emissions are reported every 3 to 5 years.

**Availability**

Air quality monitoring is available in the natural environment section of Auckland Council’s Research and Evaluation Unit website (https://knowledgeauckland.org.nz/natural-environment/).

**Notes**

There are multiple indicators and data sets that can be used to report on greenhouse gas emissions and projections across various environmental domains.

**Relevance**
Climate change mitigation contributes to all focus areas and directions of the Environment and Cultural Heritage Outcome, as well as the Auckland Climate Plan. The measure of greenhouse gas emissions enables us:

- To be in line with national and international best practice
- To better measure progress

**Baseline (2015)**
The current baseline is set against 2015 data - 6.7 net tCO₂e per person.

**Analysis**
In 2016, Auckland’s gross greenhouse gas emissions were 11,326 kilo-tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (kt CO₂e) (10,128 kt with forestry sequestration included). Transport emissions made up 43.6% of total emissions, with 37.6% of this made up of road transport emissions. 2016 saw a decrease of 2.3% on net 2015 emissions, and 0.9% on net 2009 emissions. Auckland’s greenhouse gas emissions per capita and per unit GDP have declined.

**Trend**
- From 2009 to 2016 a positive trend.
Outcome

Environment and Cultural Heritage

Measure 4
Protection of the environment

Currently no updated data for this measure (see note above).

Measure 5
Resilience to natural threats

Note this measure is under development (see note above).
Outcome

Environment and Cultural Heritage

Measure 6
Treasuring of the environment

Measure 6a.
Statutory Provisions
Note this measure is under development (see note above).

Measure 6b.
Number of volunteer hours worked in regional parks each year

Data
Number of volunteer hours worked in regional parks each year.

Source
Collated by the Auckland Council Parks, Sport and Recreation Department, also reported in the Auckland Council Long Term Plan.

Frequency
Annual.

Availability
Current data is in the Auckland Council Annual Report: https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-
Notes
There are other environmental volunteer programmes and groups outside of regional parks, for example stream restoration and Conservation Volunteers New Zealand. Inclusion of these groups will be considered for future reporting.

Relevance
Individuals and communities invest considerable time volunteering which makes a contribution to the protection and enhancement of their environment. An individual’s willingness and ability to commit personal time can be considered a general expression and demonstration of how they value their environment.

Baseline (2018)
In 2018, 81,342 volunteer hours were given across the regional parks network.

Analysis
Each 10-year Budget sets targets for volunteer hours, which are used to monitor success. Whether the target has been met has fluctuated over the past 10 years. The number of volunteer hours worked in regional parks peaked in 2015, but has fallen the next four years. 2019 is the first year that the target has not been met.

Trend
▼ From 2015 to 2019 a negative trend.
Outcome

Opportunity and Prosperity

Measure 1
Labour productivity

Real GDP per filled job ($)

Data
Output per worker: real Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in constant 2019 dollars, per filled job.

Source
Infometrics, Auckland regional economic profile

Frequency
Annual (for the year ending in March).

Availability
Public access funded by Council subscription to Infometrics website portal (https://ecoprofile.infometrics.co.nz/Auckland/Productivity), which also includes a variety of related data such as productivity breakdowns by industry and location and changes over time.

Note
Labour productivity uses GDP per employed person (in constant 2019 prices). GDP measures the value of economic units add to their inputs - broadly equivalent to its sales revenue less the cost of materials and services purchased from other firms. Infometrics breaks national production-based GDP (published by Statistics New Zealand for years ended March) down to territorial authority (TA) level by applying estimated TA shares to the national total.
Note that in the 2018 and 2019 annual monitoring reports data was reported in constant 2010 dollars. In 2019 the data has been updated (and backdated) to reflect constant 2019 dollars.

Relevance
Productivity relates to how efficiently a firm or any other organisation can turn its inputs, such as labour and capital, into outputs in the form of goods and services. Labour productivity is a measure of the amount produced for a certain amount of labour effort. It is closely related to individual incomes (i.e. wages and salaries) and living standards.

Growth in labour productivity over time can imply an increase in the efficiency and competitiveness of the economy. (However, comparisons of labour productivity over time or between regions should be done with caution, as each worker may have different levels of access to other production inputs (such as machinery, technology, and land) over time or between regions whose economies have vastly different industrial structures.)

Baseline (2018)
In 2018 GDP per filled job in Auckland was $124,152 (NZD) in 2019 dollars.

Analysis
Between 2000 and 2019 real GDP per filled job in Auckland has increased each year. In 2019 GDP per filled job in Auckland was $125,491 in 2010 dollars. Real GDP per filled job in Auckland remains consistently higher than the New Zealand average.

Trend
▲ From 2000 to 2019 a positive trend.
Outcome

Opportunity and Prosperity

Measure 2

Aucklanders’ average wages

Median weekly earnings of employed people by ethnicity ($)

Data
Earnings of people in paid employment by region, age, sex and ethnic group - median and average, hourly and weekly; inflation-adjusted.

Source

Frequency
Annual (June quarter).

Availability

Note
All data is subject to survey error margins. Coverage is people over 15 years old who work for wages or salaries or are self-employed. Earnings now comprise income from wages and salaries, self-employment, and government transfers, but no longer including private transfers or investment income. Variations in weekly earnings arise from variation in both hourly earnings and hours worked. Weekly earnings comprise full- and part-timers, but median hourly rates typically equate to 37 - 40 hours/week. Respondents can –
and often do - select multiple ethnic groups.

Relevance
Employment earnings are the main source of income for most people and their households, and the main way that improved prosperity benefits the general population. They also generate taxes that help fund government services and transfers to other households.

Baseline (2018)
In 2018 the mean weekly earnings for Aucklanders who identify as European were $1,150 (New Zealand Dollars), $959 (NZD) for Māori, $878 (NZD) for Pacific Peoples, and $928 (NZD) for Asian (Aucklanders' average wages were $1,036).

Analysis
Between 2009 and 2019 there was a general increase in median weekly earnings for all ethnic groups in Auckland. This increase was largest for Pacific Peoples.

Trend
▲ From 2009 to 2019 a positive trend.
Outcome

Opportunity and Prosperity

Measure 3

Employment in advanced industries

Knowledge intensive industries and total employment growth (%)

Data
Employment in advanced industries (Australian & New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification, NZSIC 7 digit) defined as knowledge intensive: 25 per cent of workforce have degrees and 30 per cent are professional, managerial or scientific and technical.

Source
Infometrics, Auckland regional economic profile.

Frequency
Annual (year ending March)

Availability
Public access funded by Council subscription to Infometrics website portal (https://ecoprofile.infometrics.co.nz/Auckland/Skills).

Note
Employment here is average number of filled jobs (including self-employed and working proprietors and part-timers) for the year ended March, estimated by Infometrics from Statistics New Zealand’s quarterly Linked Employer Employee Data (LEED). Advanced industries are largely a subset of knowledge intensive
industries (11% versus 36% of Auckland's workforce), defined by high spending on research and development, and workers having degrees in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM).

Note that the data reported in 2019 (including backdata) has been slightly revised.

Relevance
Knowledge Intensive (KI) industries are those in which the generation and exploitation of knowledge play the predominant part in the creation of economic activity. They represent an increasing share of the New Zealand economy's output and employment, and may be a source of future productivity growth.

Baseline (2018)
In 2019 growth in knowledge intensive industries and the total employment market averaged around 3 per cent and 3.6 per cent, respectively.

Analysis
Between 2000 and 2019 there was a general increase in the growth of Auckland's knowledge intensive industries as well as in the total employment market. Some negative growth occurred in both knowledge intensive industries and the total employment market around 2009 and 2010. Growth figures recovered following this period. However, these figures have not matched the 2004 peak of over 5 per cent and over 4 per cent in the knowledge intensive industries and the total employment market, respectively.

Trend
- From 2001 to 2019 no significant change.
Outcome

Opportunity and Prosperity

Measure 4
Zoned industrial land (Development Strategy)

Zoned industrial land by local board (hectare)

Data
Hectares of zoned industrial land.

Source
Auckland Council.

Frequency
Annual (by request).

Availability
The area of zoned industrial land is calculated in geospatial software, using zoning data from the Auckland Unitary Plan, as at 2017. Detailed data at sub-regional level is available on request from the Research and Evaluation Unit (RIU) at Auckland Council.

Note
Business zoned land under the Auckland Unitary Plan are zones that are classified as being in either the Light Industry or Heavy Industry zones. Land can get rezoned either from a new district or unitary plan (typically every 10 years), or via a plan change targeting a specific area.

Note that this measure is also reported in the Auckland Plan Development Strategy monitoring report.
Relevance
This is a high-level strategic measure directly related to the Development Strategy (DS) required to track zoned land for light and heavy industry. The Development Strategy identifies the need for up to 1,400 hectares of business land (mainly industrial) in the future urban areas, and the retention of existing business land. This will require monitoring as locations of industrial land may shift as they compete with other uses for well-located land.

Baseline (2018)
6,336 hectares.

Analysis
The number of hectares of zoned industrial land has not changed significantly. It has dropped slightly from 6,455 in 2017 to 6,331 in 2020 due to the Drury plan change that rezoned business zone land to residential (in the Franklin Local Board area).

Trend
- From 2017 to 2020 no significant change.
Outcome

Opportunity and Prosperity

Measure 5

Level of unemployment

Unemployment rate for selected age, ethnicity and gender (%)

Data
Unemployment rate by ethnicity, age group and gender.

Source

Frequency
Quarterly.

Availability

Note
Employment here is the number of individuals in paid employment (including self-employed and working proprietors and part-timers). Unemployed excludes people whose only job search method was to look at job advertisements in newspapers or online. All data is subject to sampling errors, which can be prohibitive for small sub-samples. Quarterly data is seasonal, so annual averages are recommended.
Relevance
Employment generates wealth for society and income for the individual, so unemployment diminishes these benefits. Unemployed people (especially youths) who are also not in education or training are particularly at risk of becoming socially excluded – individuals with income below the poverty-line and lacking the skills to improve their economic situation.

Baseline (2018)
In June 2018:
- 9.0 per cent of 20-24 year olds were unemployed.
- 8.4 per cent of Māori were unemployed.
- 8.3 per cent of Pacific people were unemployed.
- 4.9 per cent of females were unemployed.
- 4.3 per cent total level of unemployment

Analysis
Between 1998 and 2020 unemployment rates for those aged 20-24 years, Māori, Pacific peoples and females fluctuated. For all groups, unemployment rates peaked around 1998 and again between 2010 and 2013. Since the last unemployment peak in 2013, unemployment rates have decreased for all groups.

The unemployment rate for those aged 20-24 years, Māori people and Pacific Peoples has remained consistently higher than the overall unemployment level. The female unemployment rate has remained close to the total unemployment percentage.

Trend
▲ From 2010 to 2020 a positive trend.
Outcome

Opportunity and Prosperity

Measure 6

Internet usage based on income

Proportion of respondents under 65 years of age by internet user status by household income bracket (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Bracket</th>
<th>Never-users</th>
<th>Ex-users</th>
<th>Low-level users</th>
<th>First generation users</th>
<th>Next Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to $35,000</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,001 to $50,000</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 to $70,000</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,001 to $100,000</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 or more</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data

Proportion of respondents under 65 years old to the World Internet Project New Zealand survey of internet usage who gave their household income information, by categories of internet user status and household income brackets.

Source

Auckland University of Technology (AUT), World Internet Project New Zealand (WIPNZ) survey of internet users 2017.

Frequency

The WIPNZ survey is generally undertaken every 2 years, the next survey is expected to be conducted in 2020, with results expected in 2021.

Availability

Report of the 2017 survey results for New Zealand is published by AUT in late May 2018. Data and analysis of the results for Auckland are available on request from the Research and Evaluation Unit (RIMU) at Auckland Council.

Note
The WiPNZ survey begins with asking respondents (at the age of 16 or above) whether they are currently using the internet or have used internet in the last three months. Based on answers to a series of questions in regards to internet usage (e.g. frequency of using different devices, type of internet connection at home, abilities in using the internet and frequencies of engaging in a range of online activities), respondents have been grouped into five sub-groups of internet user status:

- never-users (those who have never used the internet).
- ex-users (those who have used the internet in the past but are not current users).
- low-level users (those who use the internet but at a relatively low level).
- first generation users (internet users who tend to connect through traditional devices).
- next generation users (internet users who are highly connected, using multiple, and more mobile devices to go online).

Relevance
Indication of how lower incomes may affect the level of internet usage among Aucklanders. A higher proportion of non-users or low level users among those at the lower income brackets could suggest that those who are socio-economically disadvantaged may also be more likely to be digitally-disadvantaged, which constrains their access to information, education and employment opportunities available online. Data on those aged 65 or above have been excluded as 65 is the retirement age, so the incomes of people in this age group tend be significantly below those who are under 65.

Baseline (2018)
The 2017 data is shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Up to $35,000</th>
<th>$35,001 to $50,000</th>
<th>$50,001 to $70,000</th>
<th>$70,001 to $100,000</th>
<th>$100,000 or more</th>
<th>All income groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Users</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-users</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
For respondents under 65 years of age who gave their income information, 4.9 per cent of the up to $35,000 household income bracket indicated that they are non-users. This is higher compared to those across all other income brackets.

Trend
*** Insufficient data to determine trend at the time of reporting.
Outcome

Opportunity and Prosperity

Measure 7

Educational achievement of young people

Percentage of those aged 20-24 with a Level 4 qualification or above (%)

![Bar chart showing percentage of Level 4 qualification or above from 2014 to 2019]

Data
Proportion of young people aged 20-24 with a qualification registered on the New Zealand Qualifications Framework (NZQF) at Level 4 or above.

Source
Stats NZ Household Labour Force Survey (HLFS).

Frequency
Annual (annual average, year ending December).

Availability
Available by custom order from Stats NZ.

Note
All data is subject to survey error margins. Annual data is obtained by averaging quarterly data across four quarters and is rebased (slightly) as new population estimates are released. Data from previous years have therefore been backdated with revised data.

Relevance
Higher-level qualifications, including vocational education and training at NZQF levels 4, and bachelor’s level and above, have the greatest benefits for students. People with higher qualifications tend to have better economic and social outcomes and higher life satisfaction than those with low qualifications. In particular, individuals with higher level qualifications are more likely to be employed and generally have higher incomes. National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) is the national qualification system for New Zealand’s senior secondary school students and NCEA sits within the larger New Zealand Qualifications Framework (NZQF). A secondary student with qualifications at NCEA Level 1, 2 or 3 has achieved Levels 1, 2 and 3 of the NZQF respectively. Levels 4 and above are usually studied after finishing secondary school. Measuring the NZQF Level 4 and above achievement of young people aged 20 to 24 gauges levels of achievement in both vocational training and tertiary education. This provides insight into how well young people are prepared with the skills required to access employment. As well, this is an indication of how well the education system is assisting young Aucklanders to develop the skills and qualifications to support Auckland’s workforce and economic growth.

**Baseline (2018)**
In 2018, 39 per cent of Aucklanders aged between 20 and 24 had a NZQF qualification at Level 4 or above.

**Analysis**
The percentage of those aged 20–24 with a Level 4 qualification has not change significantly since 2014.

**Trend**
- From 2014 to 2019 no significant change.
Memorandum

26 June 2020

To: Planning Committee members
Cc: Environment and Climate Change Committee members
Local Board members
Chief Executive, Independent Māori Statutory Board

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

From: Jess Gerry, Analyst Strategy, Natural Environment Strategy
Dave Allen, Manager Natural Environment Strategy
Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research department, Chief Planning Office

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

Purpose

1. To provide Planning Committee members with Auckland Council’s final submission on central government’s proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality (NESAQ) and central government’s intended next steps for the proposals.

Context

2. Auckland Council’s submission on the proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality was endorsed by the Planning Committee on 4 June 2020 (PLA/2020/31).

3. The submission was subsequently signed by delegated councillors and an IMSB member, and dispatched to central government on 17 June 2020. The approved Auckland Council submission is attached.

4. It is anticipated that a decision on the proposed amendments will not be made by central government until after the general election, either late 2020 or early 2021.

5. Auckland Council staff will provide updates to the relevant committee(s) as they become available.

Attachments

Cover letter and Auckland Council final submission on NESAQ.
17 June 2020

Ministry for the Environment
PO Box 10362
Wellington
6143

Attention: Minister Mahuta

Auckland Council’s submission on National Environmental Standards for Air Quality: Particulate Matter and Mercury Emissions

Thank you for providing Auckland Council with the opportunity to make a submission on the discussion document entitled ‘National Environmental Standards for Air Quality: Particulate Matter and Mercury Emissions’. Auckland Council’s submission is attached.

This submission is endorsed by the Planning Committee, with final sign off being delegated to the Chair of the Planning Committee, the Chair of the Environment and Climate Change Committee and an Independent Maori Statutory Board member.

Please contact Jessica Gerry (Jessica.Gerry@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz), Natural Environment Strategy Unit (Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department), if you have any queries regarding Auckland Council’s submission.

Kind regards,

Cr Chris Darby
Chair of the Planning Committee

Cr Richard Hills
Chair of the Environment and Climate Change Committee

Liane Ngamane
Independent Maori Statutory Board Member
Auckland Council submission to the Ministry for the Environment

Proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality: Particulate Matter and Mercury Emissions

17 June 2020
Mihimihi

| Ka mihi ake ai ki ngā maunga here kōrero,          | I greet the mountains, repository of all that has been said of this place, |
| ki ngā pari whakarongo tai,                      | there I greet the cliffs that have heard the ebb and flow of the tides of time, |
| ki ngā awa tuku kiri o āna manawhenua,           | and the rivers that cleansed the forebears of all who came those born of this land |
| āna mana a-īwi taketake mai, tauiwī atu.         | and the newcomers among us all. |
| Tāmaki – makau a te rau, murau a te tini,       | Auckland – beloved of hundreds, famed among the multitude, envy of thousands. |
| wenerau a te mano.                               | You are unique in the world. |
| Kāhore tō rite i te ao.                           |                               |
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1. Introduction

1. Auckland Council thanks the Minister for the Environment and the Ministry for the Environment for the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed amendments to the National Environmental Standards for Air Quality: Particulate Matter and Mercury Emissions (NESAQ). The extended deadline for making submissions enabled adequate Auckland Council consideration of the proposals advanced.

2. Auckland Council’s submission has been approved by the Planning Committee, a committee of the whole of the governing body. The Independent Māori Statutory Board (IMSB) is represented on the Planning Committee.

3. Local board feedback is integrated into the submission where relevant and IMSB were provided an opportunity to input into an earlier draft of the submission.

4. The council’s submission consists of high-level feedback, particularly focusing on the scope of the review, followed by comments on the specific proposals it considers most relevant. Comments respond to the questions asked in the consultation document and specific responses to the proposals.

2. Tāmaki Makaurau (Auckland) story

5. Tāmaki Makaurau is New Zealand’s most populous region. With over 1.6 million inhabitants currently, the population is projected to reach approximately 2.4 million people by 2048. In addition, Auckland is New Zealand’s largest city, with most inhabitants living in the urban area.

6. Auckland sits on an isthmus between the Tasman Sea and the South Pacific. With no landmass close to the east or west of the city, a relatively clean and reliable airflow is enjoyed by Auckland, helping remove air pollutants emitted across the region. Despite this, Auckland still manages to self-pollute to levels which can exceed national and international standards and to a degree which impacts people’s health. It is estimated that the social cost from air pollution in Auckland is $1.10 billion per year, and that there are approximately 260 premature deaths in the region caused by air pollution.

7. The Auckland Plan 2050 (AP2050) is Auckland’s long-term spatial plan. AP2050 recognises that the Auckland region is faced with three key challenges: high population growth, ensuring prosperity is shared amongst all, and arresting and reversing environmental degradation. AP2050 identifies six strategic directions in which we must make significant progress. The issue of degraded air quality spans across all these areas.

8. Despite regulation and considerable effort, Auckland’s air quality and Aucklanders’ health and wellbeing continues to be affected by past decisions on emissions and emission causing activities, Auckland’s rapid growth and development, as well as emerging threats such as climate change. Auckland’s urbanisation means that emissions from transport, domestic heating (the use of solid fuels such as wood and coal) and industry combine to degrade air quality.

---

1 The IMSB is established under the Local Government (Auckland Council) Amendment Act 2010. The purpose of the IMSB is to assist Auckland Council when the latter makes decisions, perform functions, and exercises its powers. The Board promotes issues of significance to mana whenua groups and mataawatia of Tamaki Makaurau, and ensures that the council acts in accordance with statutory provisions referring to Te Tiriti o Waitangi / the Treaty of Waitangi.


9. AP2050 acknowledges that there is a need to restore and protect the natural environment. There are a wide range of adverse environmental effects linked to air pollution including degradation of natural ecosystems and biodiversity, effects on wildlife, crop and forest damage, degraded water quality, eutrophication and ozone depletion. Importantly, emission of many pollutants that cause degraded air quality are also linked to climate change. As such, Auckland Council considers that air quality needs to be improved such that environmental degradation is halted.

10. Importantly AP2050 acknowledges that there are significant socio-economic and health disparities across Auckland. Air pollution has been described as the biggest environmental risk to human health globally and while air quality is an issue that affects all Aucklanders, it is important to recognise that those who are most vulnerable are impacted the most (for example young, old, Māori and Pasifika communities, those with existing health conditions). Auckland Council considers that air quality needs to be improved such that prosperity is shared amongst all Aucklanders and poor air quality does not continue to adversely affect the health of our most vulnerable communities and widen disparities.

11. Māori identity and wellbeing is also a key consideration of AP2050. Poor air quality adversely affects cultural values. Air is considered a taonga (treasure) by Māori, and it is important to ensure the mauri (life force) and hau (vitality) of the air is protected and enhanced. Degraded air quality can diminish mauri which upsets the balance within a system and affects the relationship between people and the environment, and the ultimate health of all living things. Māori are also kaitiaki who will play an active role in addressing the effects of air quality issues linked to climate change. These are key considerations in the improvement of air quality.

**Auckland’s emissions profile**

12. Particulate matter (PM)\(^4\) is an important constituent of air pollution and Auckland experiences elevated concentrations of both PM\(_{10}\) and PM\(_{2.5}\)\(^5\).

13. The main sources of PM that degrade Auckland’s air quality are transport and domestic sources (Figure 1).

14. There is also considerable seasonality of emissions of PM. Daily PM emissions are higher in winter, a pattern that is common throughout New Zealand and is largely due to use of wood and coal for home heating. Meteorological conditions can also increase air pollution levels in winter. Cold winter nights under high atmospheric pressure can create temperature inversions close to the ground; these inversions greatly reduce the dispersal of pollutants. Despite this seasonality, even in summer Auckland has elevated PM concentrations due to sources like transport.

---

\(^4\) 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.

\(^5\) 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.
15. The contribution of transport emissions to Auckland’s PM concentrations is further demonstrated by the fact that the most notable improvements in Auckland’s outdoor air quality occurred in the period between 2006-2012, coinciding with regulatory changes to vehicle exhaust and fuel standards. In contrast, between 2013 and 2016, air quality improved at a lesser rate, was static or degraded in some locations, likely as a result of increasing population pressures (notably leading to greater numbers of vehicles).

16. A more recent example of the contribution that transport emissions make to degraded air quality are the air quality improvements experienced during the nationwide lockdown (caused by the Covid-19 pandemic). For the first two weeks of the lockdown (26 March to 8 April 2020), pollutant levels for PM$_{10}$, PM$_{2.5}$ and nitrogen dioxide (NO$_2$) were compared to levels measured in the same time period in previous years. At eight of the region’s monitoring sites there was a reduction in pollution levels of 21% - 49%. Vehicle emissions are a source of NO$_2$, PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$. The decrease in these pollutants highlights the role of traffic as a source of air pollution in the Auckland region.

3. High level response to the proposals

17. Auckland Council broadly supports the intent of central government’s proposals to more stringently regulate pollutants in our air to improve air quality. This recognises the adverse consequences from poor air quality on human and environmental health and Maori cultural values.

18. The Covid-19 pandemic has further highlighted the adverse effects of poor air quality on human health. Studies have found that in New York, USA, and the cities of Lombardy and Emilia Romagna in northern Italy there is a correlation between Covid-19 mortality rates and high levels of pollution. Researchers from Harvard University

---

8 Xiao, S. (2020). Reduction of air pollution levels seen in the Auckland Council air quality monitoring network. Available [here](#).
suggest that an increase of just 1μg/m³ corresponded to a 15% increase in Covid-19 deaths.  

19. While Auckland Council supports the intent expressed in the consultation document, there are several key issues for further consideration:

- the interaction between air pollution and climate change should be addressed in a more integrated way
- the NES AQ framework must consider the way in which it will address transport emissions
- current standards do not adequately regulate gaseous pollutants and need reviewing
- there is a need for alignment with other policy and legislation

**Particulate matter standards**

- the tolerated number of exceedances per year is extremely stringent, unnecessary and unjustified and the threshold for determining that an airshed is polluted is far too low. The proposed standards would result in airsheds that have generally acceptable air quality as ‘polluted’
- there is also a disconnect between the threshold at which an airshed is deemed polluted of one exceedance of the 24hr standard per year over a five-year period, and the three permitted exceedances of the 24hr standard that are proposed. The regulations must be aligned wherever possible to remove any confusion
- the offsetting requirements are not considered to be fair or equitable. The mitigation measures that are triggered when an airshed is deemed to be polluted unfairly puts all the burden to improve the quality of air onto activities that require consent (i.e. industry)
  - by ignoring transport emissions, the offsetting provisions are unlikely to meaningfully address the full range of pollution sources in the Auckland region
  - offsetting and mitigation measures could be more widely applied in polluted airsheds to phase out domestic solid fuel burners, or to ensure that only low emitting burners are installed (<0.5g/kg)
- there is considerable uncertainty for councils around exceptional circumstances and there is a large resource requirement and an administrative burden associated with the process. There is a need for more clarity and guidance on the matter
- careful consideration must be given to the way in which existing PM$_{2.5}$ datasets are used to determine pollution status
- adoption of a more flexible approach to monitoring that allows the use of a wider variety of equipment
- natural sources of PM should be subtracted from the total PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ when reporting compliance

---

• clear guidance is required on the applicability of condensable PM$_{2.5}$ discharges from industry in assessing likely compliance, including for triggering offset requirements

Domestic solid fuel burner standards

• it may be more appropriate and consistent that rather than ‘2ha’ being used as a threshold for the relevant standard, the NESAQ could be aligned to the National Planning Standards, and the Zone Framework Standards

• explore whether standards should also apply to existing domestic solid fuel burners; this is particularly relevant given that some existing burners are likely to be equipped to burn coal, which is a significant source of PM

• there needs to be national direction towards the use of carbon neutral, zero emissions, renewable methods of heating homes

• the NESAQ is the most appropriate, effective and efficient mechanism for controlling the way in which domestic fuel burners are used and as such there is a need for a rule to regulate what can and cannot be burned

• the regulation should allow Auckland Council to amend its bylaw without using the Local Government Act 2002 Special Consultative Procedure, as a consequential action following on from this national review, such that any inconsistency or duplication in the bylaw is removed. Similar statutory provisions are provided in section 199 of the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017 and section 446 of the Food Act 2014. This will enable a bylaw to be amended as a procedural matter.

20. The council looks forward to working with central government to resolve these issues to achieve improved air quality in the Auckland region and collectively at a national scale.

3.1 Scope and direction of the NESAQ

21. While Auckland Council understands that the current review has a narrow scope, we would like to make the following comments to guide any future reviews and ongoing work.

Air pollution and climate change

22. Auckland Council suggests that the interaction between air pollution and climate change should be addressed in a more integrated way. There is the potential for a range of co-benefits, and through the management of air quality, the NESAQ has the potential to make positive gains when it comes to climate change mitigation.

23. Auckland Council, like many other councils in New Zealand, is making a conscious and concerted effort to contribute to reducing emissions and to influence climate change mitigation, adaptation and resilience. Examples of this include:

• in November 2018, Auckland Council recommitted to membership of C40 and joined 94 major international cities taking bold action against climate change

• Auckland Council is currently developing Te Tāruke-a-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Plan (ACP), which outlines a series of required mitigation and resilience actions

• Auckland Council also declared a Climate Emergency in June 2019, which highlights the urgency required to transition Auckland towards a net zero greenhouse gas emissions future
24. Auckland Council considers that there is a need for more focus on mitigation considerations, however, under the current legislative framework the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) does not allow for the consideration of climate change mitigation.

25. Auckland Council made a submission during February 2020 on Transforming the resource management system: opportunities for change - Issues and options paper. Auckland Council observed that the RMA should address climate change mitigation in a way that enables councils, through land use planning, to support certain activities that contribute to low carbon development and decarbonisation of the economy. In doing so, the RMA should discourage or prevent activities that will result in higher greenhouse gas emissions. It is critical that the RMA provides an effective mechanism to ensure as a country we are not locking ourselves into a higher emissions trajectory as a result of land use decisions.

26. In line with this, Auckland Council’s submission on Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill, highlighted that it is important that climate change mitigation (and adaptation) is reflected and embedded throughout all legislation consistently and not overlooked. The submission also emphasised that it is of critical importance that all legislation be aligned such that New Zealand can progress towards limiting global warming to within 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels.

27. The Resource Management Amendment Bill is proposing that, since the original drafting of the RMA, climate change policy has evolved, and the policy goal is to transition to net zero carbon emissions by the second half of the 21st Century. Central government’s Environment Committee is proposing that the RMA be amended to reflect this, specifically that:

- councils should consider climate change when making and amending regional policy statements, regional plans, and district plans; and
- authorities should be able to consider climate change when making decisions under the RMA.

28. Auckland Council reiterates that the resource management framework should enable decision making that supports a reduction in emissions and a low carbon future. The NESAQ is an important tool that could and should be used to achieve climate change outcomes.

Managing transport emissions

29. Auckland Council emphasises that for the NESAQ to adequately address PM pollution in Auckland, the amendments must at the next opportunity consider how it will address transport emissions.

30. While domestic sources of emissions are significant contributors to PM pollution, in Auckland, transport emissions are also a significant source, contributing 57% of PM10 pollution and 41% of PM2.5 pollution.\(^1\)

31. The consultation document explains that the Ministry of Transport (MOT) and the Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) can influence emissions and exposure from PM from transport through their respective policy and delivery functions. As the NESAQ only regulates domestic emissions and emissions that require resource consent, the proposed amendments will not adequately regulate transport emissions in an Auckland context. In turn, this limits the effectiveness of the

---

regulatory instrument to achieve air quality outcomes and fails to give Auckland the tools/mechanisms to ensure the region complies with the standards.

32. Auckland Council considers that there is a need for stronger policy links, and the NESAQ framework must consider the way in which it will address transport emissions.

33. In the context of climate change, Auckland Council has already recognised the contribution transport makes to emissions. As part of Te Tāruke-a-Tāwhiri: Auckland’s Climate Plan, Auckland Council is addressing transport emissions through actions focused on travel demand management, mode shift, fleet decarbonisation and behavioural change. These actions are aimed at reducing transport-related emissions and will also have co-benefits in improved air quality.

Standards relating to gaseous pollutants

34. Auckland Council considers that the current NESAQ does not adequately regulate gaseous pollutants and would welcome a review of these standards.

**Sulphur dioxide**

35. Sulphur dioxide (SO2) is produced mainly from the combustion of fossil fuels that contain sulphur, such as coal and oil (e.g. coal being burnt in a home fireplace for heating and diesel-powered vehicles). SO2 is also produced from some industrial processes (e.g. fertiliser manufacturing, aluminium smelting and steel making). SO2 can cause respiratory problems such as bronchitis, coughing, wheezing, phlegm and asthma attacks. It has also been linked to cardiovascular disease.

36. Auckland Council seek inclusion of a 24hr average SO2 standard, in accordance with the WHO guideline of 20 μg/m³. This would supplement the current 1hr average SO2 standards within the NESAQ (350 μg/m³ / 540 μg/m³), which are notably higher than the acute WHO guideline (500 μg/m³ as a 10-minute average) and US EPA’s standard (212 μg/m³ 1hr average). As stated on the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) website, this is currently being investigated by central government. Auckland Council strongly supports this be undertaken in this review of the NESAQ.

**Nitrogen dioxide**

37. The inhalation of nitrogen dioxide (NO2) has a range of respiratory effects. The main source of NO2 resulting from human activities is the combustion of fossil fuels.

38. Although the NESAQ has a 1hr average standard of 200 μg/m³ (in accordance with the WHO 2005 guideline), Auckland Council recommends central government consider including an annual average NO2 standard in the NESAQ to better regulate chronic exposure to transport-related air pollution.

39. The annual-average WHO guideline, which Auckland Council recommends be included, is 40 μg/m³.

40. The importance of this standard is exemplified by the fact that at present, Auckland Council’s Queen Street monitoring site complies with the NESAQ 1hr standard, while the annual average readings at this site exceed the WHO annual guideline value.

---

13 It is important to note that while regional and unitary councils are able to include more stringent rules in their plans, there is a lack of feasibility in doing so. Auckland Council sought to include the WHO guideline for 24-hour average SO2 in the Auckland Unitary Plan, however the Independent Hearing Panel recommended that the standards not be included in favour of relying on national standards only. For more information see Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan Hearings Topic 38 and subsequent appeal to the Environment Court.
3.2 Alignment with other legislation

41. While the relationship between other national directions and the NESAQ is acknowledged in the consultation document, Auckland Council reiterates the need for central government to better integrate the outcomes sought from such national directions.

42. Greater consideration needs to be given to the relationship between multiple National Policy Statements and National Environmental Standards. While central government notes the relationship between urban development and air quality, there is no attempt to articulate how the National Policy Statement for Urban Development may enable the improvement of air quality.

43. As discussed in the preceding section 3.1, Auckland Council considers more thought should be given to the way in which transport emissions are managed, and the way in which the NESAQ contributes to climate change mitigation. There is a need for better alignment between the NESAQ and other policy and work programmes.

4. Particulate matter

4.1 Introduction of PM$_{2.5}$ standards to the NESAQ

Question 1: Do you agree the proposed PM$_{2.5}$ standards should replace the PM$_{10}$ standard as the primary standard for managing particulate matter?

44. Auckland Council supports the proposed introduction of a PM$_{2.5}$ standard which would replace the PM$_{10}$ standard as the primary standard for managing PM. There are several reasons for this, including:

- PM$_{2.5}$ is a better proxy than PM$_{10}$ for anthropogenic air pollutant sources of concern (Figure 2)

- while there are several adverse health impacts associated with PM$_{10}$, it has been acknowledged for some time that the health implications of exposure to PM$_{2.5}$ are more severe and significant\(^{14}\)

- PM$_{2.5}$ includes black carbon particles (ultra-fine soot), emitted from some combustion sources (notably diesel and wood-combustion), a significant climate-forcing agent and cause of notable health effects

- the regulation of PM though the use of PM$_{2.5}$ standards would enable effective management of key pollutant sources (transport, combustion).

\(^{14}\) Review of evidence on health aspects of air pollution REVIHAAP WHO, 2013
**Question 2: Do you agreed we should include both a daily and an annual standard for PM$_{2.5}$?**

**Annual average PM$_{2.5}$ standard**

45. Auckland Council supports the use of the annual average standard which replaces the annual average PM$_{10}$ as the primary standard for managing PM. There are recognised health effects that occur from chronic exposure to PM$_{2.5}$, and PM$_{2.5}$ is a better proxy for anthropogenic air pollution than PM$_{10}$.

**24hr average PM$_{2.5}$ standard**

46. Auckland Council supports the introduction of a 24hr average PM$_{2.5}$ standard. The reason for this is that there are health effects associated with both acute and chronic PM$_{2.5}$ exposure and the 24hr period captures peaks from high PM$_{2.5}$ periods, typically during winter, under calm and stable meteorological conditions.

47. However, the seasonal pattern of PM is less pronounced than elsewhere in New Zealand. Even in summer Auckland has elevated PM concentrations, due to sources like transport (including shipping). This means that Auckland has pollutant sources to manage all year round (which have an impact on annual average measures), rather than just in winter like many other regions.

48. Auckland Council considers that the use of a 24hr average and annual average standard are sufficiently effective for managing PM$_{2.5}$ pollution.

**PM$_{2.5}$ standards**

49. Auckland Council supports 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$^3$. Both are considered reasonable standards to implement and represent a sufficiently effective approach to managing air pollution. This is supported by the fact that both are currently included:

- in the World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines (2005); and
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- 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 towards, and is in line with the Auckland Unitary Plan’s approach of setting standards for PM$_{2.5}$. At present, through the consenting process, resource consent applicants (typically industrial) must demonstrate that the targets are not likely exceeded.

**Question 3: Do you agree the standards should reflect the WHO guidelines?**

50. Auckland Council supports that the standards should reflect the WHO guidelines. However, the WHO (2005) guidelines are currently under review, with a strong direction that they should be lower (i.e., stricter). By adopting the WHO (2005) guidelines now, New Zealand risks lagging behind updates expected to come by the end of 2020. The WHO guidelines are ‘pragmatic’ and it should be noted that there is no safe threshold for exposure to PM$_{2.5}$. Therefore, the NESAQ should direct air quality to be improved as far as practicable, not merely to meet pragmatic ambient air quality standards.

4.2 Retention of PM$_{10}$ standard and monitoring requirements

51. Auckland Council strongly supports the retention of the standards and monitoring requirements for PM$_{10}$. The primary reason for this is that the PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ standards regulate different air pollutant sources, including non-combustion sources such as dust from unsealed surfaces.

52. In addition, there are significant and distinct adverse health effects caused by both PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$. While PM$_{10}$ exposure can cause significant respiratory problems, due to the smaller size of particles, PM$_{2.5}$ can penetrate deep into the lungs, enter the bloodstream and cause a range of acute and chronic health impacts including strokes, chronic respiratory and cardio-vascular diseases$^{16}$.

53. Further, the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) does not have a PM$_{10}$ 24-hour Average Ambient Air Quality Target as the AUP does not duplicate national regulations. This means that when processing consent applications, the council’s Regulatory Services function uses the existing NESAQ PM$_{10}$ 24hr standard in assessing impacts of industrial discharges. Removing this from the NESAQ would create a gap for Auckland, which may require a plan change. Retaining this standard would be preferable as it would ensure national consistency.

**Question 5: Do you agree councils should be required to keep monitoring PM$_{10}$ and Question 6: What would be the additional costs involved in retaining PM$_{10}$ monitoring alongside PM$_{2.5}$ monitoring, versus the potential loss of valuable monitoring information?**

54. Auckland Council supports retaining the requirement to monitor PM$_{10}$. As discussed, the PM standards regulate an important component of air pollution, which causes distinct adverse health outcomes. As such it is important that compliance with these standards is monitored.

55. Auckland Council does not support the removal of requirements to monitor PM$_{10}$. While there will be increased costs associated with monitoring both PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$, there is

---

$^{16}$ For more information refer to the ‘Review of evidence on health aspects of air pollution REVIHAAP’ WHO, 2013.
a need to monitor both pollutants. In addition, there is recognised value in continuing to measure PM$_{10}$ to maintain the long-term dataset.

**Cost of monitoring both PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$**

56. Robustly monitoring PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ is challenging and expensive. Auckland Council has several years of PM$_{2.5}$ concentration data, and source apportionment data already. However, additional monitoring will be required to comply with the amended NESAQ, which will have financial implications for councils.

57. Currently Auckland Council monitors PM$_{10}$ as the primary measure of air quality. While regulatory air quality monitoring occurs at ten sites across Auckland (Figure 3), PM$_{10}$ is measured at nine of these, and PM$_{2.5}$ monitoring only occurs at four of these sites. There would be a need to co-locate PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ monitoring equipment at the remaining five sites. In addition, Auckland Council does not currently monitor in Rural Town Airsheds as monitoring is only required in each airshed where it is deemed that an exceedance is likely.

58. As the cost associated with the increased need to monitor is reasonably significant (initial estimates ~$220,000 - $430,000 for set up and one year of operation if all current regulatory monitoring sites were co-located with new PM$_{2.5}$ monitoring equipment), Auckland Council suggests that a lead in time of at least two years would be required to enable funding and site placement to be undertaken.

![Figure 3: Auckland Council air quality monitoring sites.](image-url)
4.3 Monitoring methods

59. The current NESAO specifies monitoring methods for NESAO compliance monitoring, which in practice accord with USEPA reference and equivalence methods. Instruments meeting these criteria are expensive to purchase, and expensive to operate correctly.

60. Auckland Council suggest that consideration be given to the following:

- adopting an approach which would allow councils to use new, more flexible methods as a means of performing survey work, for assessing appropriateness of new sites, within the compliance period, which will give more credibility to these surveys. While the NESAO does not stop councils from doing so, it may be preferable for MFE to give councils more time to do this work (e.g. not penalise councils for not monitoring while assessing best location)
- consider granting councils a ‘grace period’ for using these methods to assess PM$_{2.5}$ more fully or spatially
- allow councils to use a wider range of instruments with demonstrated near-reference or near-equivalence performance (like nephelometers), to support more detailed assessments of PM$_{2.5}$
- MFE investigate options for providing access to funding for additional monitoring work

4.4 Compliance with and exceedances of PM$_{2.5}$ standards

*Question 4: Do you consider that your airshed would meet the proposed PM$_{2.5}$ standards? If not, what emissions sources do you expect to be most problematic?*

61. PM$_{2.5}$ data, collected as part of Auckland Council’s ambient air quality monitoring programme, has been used to assess the ability of the Auckland Urban Airshed to comply with potential PM$_{2.5}$ standards. An internally reviewed report has been completed, which suggests that:

- the 24hr PM$_{2.5}$ standard of 25 µg/m$^2$ could be typically met by the Auckland Urban Airshed. Given that compliance has only been achieved since 2015 (only at the four sites monitored), this compliance is not certain across the region and Auckland Council supports that there should be a number of allowable exceedances
- annual PM$_{2.5}$ standard of 10 µg/m$^2$ could be met by the Auckland Urban Airshed, having been compliant since 2009

62. While Auckland Council supports the use of the PM$_{2.5}$ standard as the primary standard to regulate PM, it is more likely that the PM$_{2.5}$ 24hr standard (25 µg/m$^2$) would be breached in Auckland than the PM$_{10}$ 24hr standard (50 µg/m$^2$).

---

17 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 local sources such as transport, industry or solid fuel use for home heating) may impact the respective airshed’s ability to comply with a PM$_{2.5}$ NESAO.

63. As outlined in the following subsections, there are various pollutant sources which are a cause of concern and may be problematic for Auckland’s compliance with the standards.

Transport emissions

64. One of the sources of emissions that is of concern is transport generated PM. At Auckland’s urban sites, PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations and peaks are generally declining. However, at road-side ‘peak’ monitoring sites, PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations have remained generally static since approximately 2012; the hypothesis being that increasing numbers of vehicles have balanced the PM$_{2.5}$ exhaust emission improvements in newer vehicles.

65. Between 2006 and 2012, significant reductions in ambient PM$_{2.5}$ were observed due to improvements in vehicle exhaust regulations and fuel standards during this period.

66. The PM$_{2.5}$ standard is such that an idling vehicle alongside a road-side monitor could be a sufficient contributor to exceeding the daily standard.

67. Auckland Council emphasises the importance of the NESAAQ being used to regulate transport emissions, particularly as they may be a significant contributor to any exceedances.

Domestic emissions

68. As the largest anthropogenic contributor of PM to Auckland’s airshed, domestic emissions may contribute to an exceedance of the proposed 24hr average PM$_{2.5}$ standard, particularly in winter. The concerns and risks relating to these emissions is discussed in detail in section 5.

Sea Salt

69. PM$_{2.5}$ still contains a sizeable contribution from ‘non-anthropogenic’ sources, such as sea salt (an annual average of 21% of PM$_{2.5}$ is sea-salt in Auckland). This source is unexpectedly variable year-on-year. Unusually high levels of sea salt blown in under specific meteorological conditions may contribute to a PM$_{2.5}$ daily exceedance.

70. While sea salt PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations significantly decreased in Auckland’s data from 2006-2013, there may again be an increase due to variations in long-term oscillations that influence New Zealand.

71. Source apportionment analysis indicates that an average of 2.3 µg/m$^3$ of PM$_{2.5}$ at Auckland’s Takapuna monitoring site is sea salt (PM$_{2.5}$(sea sal)). Over 24-hour averaging periods, there is very high variability to the ambient concentrations of PM$_{2.5}$(sea sal) depending on meteorological factors (Figure 4). Takapuna has regularly measured PM$_{2.5}$(sea sal) as more than 10 µg/m$^3$ as a 24-hour average. As a result of this, Auckland Council considers that there is a chance that there could be an exceedance of the proposed 25 µg/m$^3$ 24-hr average standard.

---

72. Some agencies around the world have standards where sea salt (and other natural sources of PM such as volcanic dust and particles from naturally occurring fires) are subtracted from the total PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ when reporting compliance.

73. The subtraction of sea salt from total PM$_{2.5}$ is justifiable. The reason for this is that WHO are clear that there is extremely limited evidence that sea-salt is harmful. The 2013 WHO 'Review of evidence on health aspects of air pollution (REVIHAAP)' states that:
   - "All in all, there is little epidemiological evidence of the harmfulness of sea salt."
   - "The study provided clear evidence that PM dominated by sea salt and/or sea spray is far less toxic than equal amounts of combustion-derived PM."
   - "...sea salt is not classified as a hazardous compound and it is plausible that at current exposure levels no harmful effects will occur."

74. Auckland Council suggests that MfE investigate this further to determine the way in which such a method could be applied in a New Zealand context.

**Industrial sources**

75. Industrial sources of PM are also a concern, although they contribute only a small proportion of PM to the Auckland Urban Airshed.

76. Industry discharged PM$_{2.5}$ often requires resource consent. The majority of dispersion modelling assessments for industrial activities seeking resource consent show that Auckland's industrial point-source discharges readily comply with annual-average PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ targets (as set by Table E14.3.1 of the AUP(OP) and accounting for background concentrations), but can require further mitigation measures to comply with the 24-hr PM$_{2.5}$ standard.

77. This is typically a result of assessing short-term ambient PM concentrations under the ‘worst case’ dispersive conditions and assuming conservative existing background concentrations. When modelling PM over annual averaging periods, the frequency of highly dispersive meteorological conditions (i.e. windy periods) in Auckland reduces the off-site ground-level ambient concentrations to typically negligible values.

78. The quantity of PM$_{2.5}$ discharged from combustion processes is unknown and depends on a technical definition for ‘condensable’ PM.$^{21}$ For example, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) defines PM$_{2.5}$ discharges from industrial combustion processes as including both solid particles directly emitted, and ‘pre-cursor gases’ that are likely to form solid particles in the atmosphere following discharge.

---

$^{21}$ A background to the issue of condensable PM$_{2.5}$ with respect to national emissions inventories is available [here](link)
There is currently no guidance for New Zealand for how PM$_{2.5}$ from industrial processes is defined or measured. As a PM$_{2.5}$ standard is being established, Auckland Council requests that there is clear guidance from MFE regarding the applicability of condensible PM$_{2.5}$ discharges from industry in assessing likely compliance, including for triggering offset requirements.

*Unexplained exceedances.*

79. The proposed 24-hour average PM$_{2.5}$ standard (25 μg/m$^3$) may be occasionally exceeded in Auckland due to unexplained reasons. This has previously occurred, in 2016 there were several spikes in PM$_{2.5}$ in Takapuna that are not able to be explained (Figure 5)$^{22}$.

![Figure 5: PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations at Takapuna between 2013 and 2018 showing spikes in concentrations in 2016 that are unexplainable.](image)

80. The 24-hour average PM$_{2.5}$ standard will therefore require additional investigation and reporting by councils to determine the causes / reality of measured exceedances. Increasing the tolerated number of exceedances for the daily PM$_{2.5}$ standard would reduce this burden and risk of breaches.

*Exceptional circumstances causing breach of standard*

81. Auckland Council suggests that MFE provide greater guidance to regional and unitary councils about what may be considered an exceptional circumstance. While there is some guidance in the ‘2011 Users’ Guide to the revised National Environmental Standards for Air Quality: Updated 2014’, there is considerable uncertainty for councils around exceptional circumstances.

82. In addition, as regional and unitary councils are required to apply to the Minister for the Environment for each ‘exceptional circumstance’ there is a considerable resource requirement and an administrative burden. There is a need for central government to address this and reduce the administrative burden and uncertainty for councils.

---

83. Auckland Council suggests:
   - there is a need for more clarity on what exceptional circumstances means. As a
     starting point it would be useful to define ‘exceptional circumstances’ in the
     regulation
   - that the NESAQ state a type or range of ‘exceptional circumstances’ for which an
     application does not need to be lodged with the Minister (e.g. dust storms, wild
     bush fires, property fires)
   - guidance is provided for retro-actively applying for an exceptional event for a
     PM_{2.5} exceedance, as this could impact the calculation for determining a Polluted
     Airshed. Or, previously approved PM_{10} exceptional events are extended to
     approve a coincident PM_{2.5} exceedance. This is discussed in more detail in the
     answer to Question 10.
   - there is a need for improved guidance relating to exceptional circumstances to
     assist councils in the application process. This could include examples of
     successful and unsuccessful applications etc.

_Tolerated exceedances of the PM_{2.5} standard_

84. Auckland Council considers that three tolerated daily exceedances per year of the
24hr PM_{2.5} standard of 25 \mu g/m^3 is very stringent. Moreover, for the purposes of
determining whether an airshed is polluted an average of one exceedance per year is
extremely stringent and unjustified.

85. This is particularly the case when compared to international standards. The USEPA
daily PM_{2.5} standard (35 \mu g/m^3) is calculated at the 98th percentile over 3 years (18th
highest result over three years). The European EEA PM_{10} daily limit (50 \mu g/m^3) is
based on the 90th percentile, enabling 36 exceedances of this level per year. A 99th
percentile (allowing three exceedances of the 24hr guideline to occur over a 12-month
period) is recommended by the WHO 2005 Guidelines.

86. The implications of the proposed standards are that if there are four exceedances in a
three-year period, an airshed is deemed to be polluted. Auckland’s Urban Airshed is
very large, covering most of the urban area. Auckland Council is of the view that four
isolated exceedances should not result in the geographically large airshed being
deemed ‘polluted’. Auckland Council requests that the number of permitted exceedances be increased, in doing so having a greater tolerance for unusual, as well as
exceptional, circumstances.

87. Auckland Council recommends that MfE consider either of the following options:
   - allow six exceedances of the 24hr standard per year before determining that an
     airshed is polluted. This would be the equivalent to the 98th percentile. This
     ensures that there is greater tolerance for unusual circumstances whilst still being
     stringent and achieving good air quality outcomes
   - allow three exceedances of the 24hr standard per year (when averaged over
     three years) before determining that an airshed is polluted. This maintains the
     WHO recommendation to apply the 99th percentile while accepting that
     experiencing some unusual meteorological or discharge events in a single year
     may not indicate a poorly managed airshed.

88. Auckland Council also suggests that MfE consider the implications of having such a
restrictive number of exceedances in large airsheds and consider providing guidance
to local government about the most appropriate way to delineate airsheds.
4.5 Polluted airsheds and offsetting

**Question 7**: Do you agree an airshed should be deemed polluted if it exceeds either the annual or the daily PM$_{2.5}$ standard?

89. Auckland Council supports in principle that airsheds should be managed such that they do not become polluted. However, Auckland Council does not support the way in which an airshed is determined to be polluted. An average of one exceedance per year over a 5-year period is unnecessarily stringent and too low a threshold for the determination that an airshed is polluted. This is especially so when taking into consideration the offsetting and mitigation requirements that are triggered by the ‘polluted’ status.

90. The proposed standards would result in airsheds that have generally acceptable air quality as ‘polluted’. Auckland Council suggests consideration be given to the appropriate method of determining whether an airshed is polluted, and whether such stringent thresholds are suitable.

91. There is also a disconnect between the threshold at which an airshed is deemed polluted (of one exceedance of the 24hr average standard per year over a five-year period) and the three permitted exceedances of the 24hr average standard that are proposed. Auckland Council suggests that the regulations be aligned wherever possible to remove any confusion.

92. Auckland Council would prefer that the regulations be amended to reflect the WHO guidelines and as such, an airshed be allowed three (or more) permitted exceedances of the 24hr standard per year without being deemed polluted. Auckland Council consider that this is the most stringent the NESAQ should be, especially considering the implications of the offsetting requirements.

**Offsetting in polluted airsheds**

93. While polluted airsheds must be managed such that air quality improves, we do not support the inclusion of offsetting provisions as proposed in the NESAQ to achieve this.

94. The offsetting standards within the NESAQ are impractical to implement. At the time of promulgating the current Regulation 17 offsetting requirements in 2011, MIE acknowledged that it was difficult to see how an enforceable condition of consent could be practically imposed requiring offsets. A condition of consent cannot impose requirements on a third party, and therefore the notion that other sources such as domestic fires could be removed by a consent holder is ultra-vires.

95. Under section 15 of the RMA, industrial and trade activities require resource consent or other express permission to discharge contaminants into air. Therefore, the burden of offsetting within the NESAQ falls inequitably on industry as part of the resource consenting process, even though this sector is a minor contributor to PM$_{2.5}$ in Auckland. By ignoring the most significant sources of air pollutants, the offsetting provisions are unlikely to address any pollution issues in the Auckland region.

96. The proposed way in which pollution is to be offset is not considered to be fair or equitable. The mitigation measures that are triggered when an airshed is deemed to be polluted unfairly puts all the burden to improve the quality of air onto activities that require consent.

97. The link between ‘non-compliant’ burners and offsetting is discussed further in sections 5.2 (Question 12) and 5.3.
Question 8: If all new resource consent application to discharge PM$_{2.5}$ into a polluted airshed must be offset or declined, how would this affect your activities, or activities in your region?

98. While there are many sources of PM in Auckland (such as transport, home heating and natural sources), the NESAO offsetting provisions result in the burden to change behaviour being primarily put onto industrial activities while requiring no change in behaviour from other polluters.

99. If the Auckland Urban Airshed (covering the entire urban area from Whangaparaoa to Papakura) or the Auckland Rural Airshed were ever to be classified as ‘Polluted’, industry could be unfairly penalized and significantly impacted. As written, Regulation 17 is extremely restrictive to industry, effectively disallowing any expansion of consented activities regardless of economic benefit. The 2011 Users’ Guide to the NESAO acknowledges the difficulty of undertaking offsets, failing to explain how conditions of consent could be imposed that are not ‘Ultra-vires’. Therefore, Regulation 17 effectively prohibits any expansion to a consented air discharge, or the establishment of any ‘significant’ new discharge.

100. As more is understood regarding PM$_{2.5}$ discharges, there is a potential that more activities could be classified as ‘significant’ under Regulation 17. For example, poultry farms have been highlighted as a potential PM$_{10}$ source causing more than 2.5 $\mu$g/m$^3$ 24hr average concentrations. However, such activities do not appear to have been in mind when the term ‘significant’ was included in the NESAO.

101. In addition, the offsetting requirements do not encourage existing polluters to reduce emissions. Rather it simply puts all the burden on future potential polluters, effectively disallowing any expansion of consented activities.

102. Given the range of sources of PM in Auckland, offsetting and the mitigation measures included in the NESAO are not able to effectively manage the sources of pollution that are most likely to cause exceedances and breaches (e.g. transport).

103. Auckland Council reiterates that the threshold for an airshed to be deemed polluted is too low for such stringent offsetting requirements to be triggered. The 'Polluted Airshed' calculation proposed for Regulation 17 would classify airsheds that have normally acceptable air quality as ‘polluted’.

Question 9: Can you identify a more appropriate, measurable threshold for controlling consented discharges in a PM$_{2.5}$ context?

104. Auckland Council suggests that consideration be given to other options that could be used to mitigate PM in polluted airsheds, noting that there may be limitations with alternative options. The current 2.5 $\mu$g/m$^3$ ambient concentration threshold for PM$_{10}$ in Regulation 17 is already less than the margin of error for dispersion models. Any reduction of this threshold would further exacerbate the impracticality of determining what constitutes a ‘significant’ discharge.

105. Given the difficulty of defining ‘significant’ discharges and implementing offsets, Auckland Council suggests that Regulation 17 is replaced by the simpler language of Regulation 20 and an over-arching requirement that compliance with the standard is achieved as soon as practicable. This would require that ‘principal’ sources of PM$_{2.5}$ are declined resource consent if it is likely to cause an exceedance of the standard. The ‘Users’ Guide to the revised National Environmental Standards for Air Quality (2014) includes definitions of ‘principal’ and further guidance could be provided regarding this.
Question 10: Do you agree that if councils do not have adequate PM$_{2.5}$ data, the airshed’s classification under the PM$_{10}$ standards should apply?

106. Auckland Council considers that it is important that the transition into the amended provisions is well thought through.

107. It may be appropriate that the PM$_{10}$ standards continue to apply in the classification of an airshed. A lead in time would be needed to allow councils to purchase and install equipment, and to then collect data.

108. There are several options available for transitioning to the new standards. For example, it is possible to apply an assumed percentage of PM$_{2.5}$/PM$_{10}$ concentrations to determine the likely PM$_{2.5}$ compliance for airsheds without PM$_{2.5}$ monitoring at present. However, this option assumes that all regions have undertaken co-located monitoring (as Auckland Council has) to determine the ratio. In addition, it is important to recognise that at monitoring sites within the same airshed, there can be differences in the PM$_{2.5}$/PM$_{10}$ ratio (e.g. near the sea with high proportion of marine aerosols).

Implications of existing PM$_{2.5}$ datasets

109. While it is important to consider the way in which councils without adequate data will transition, it is also critical that consideration is given to the implications of the proposed standards on councils already collecting PM$_{2.5}$ data.

110. Auckland Council has been anticipating for some time that the NESAQ be amended such that the PM$_{2.5}$ standard is the primary standard for managing particulate matter and has been measuring PM$_{2.5}$ for some years$^{23}$ to determine likely compliance with the standards. Three of the four PM$_{2.5}$ monitors are co-located with regulatory PM$_{10}$ monitors. Since the installation of the PM$_{2.5}$ monitors, there have been a number of exceedances of both the PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ standards. As PM$_{10}$ is currently the primary standard, applications have been lodged with MFE seeking that exceptional circumstances be granted for the exceedance. However, the same has not been completed for PM$_{2.5}$, as there are currently no standards$^{24}$.

111. The implications of this are that the Auckland Urban Airshed may be deemed polluted based on data that was collected prior to the standards being implemented.

112. Auckland Council seeks consideration of the way in which existing PM$_{2.5}$ data be used. Councils that have chosen to invest in monitoring PM$_{2.5}$ prior to the requirement under the NESAQ, should not be unfairly disadvantaged.

113. To avoid airsheds being unjustifiably deemed polluted once the amendments are adopted, Auckland Council suggests the following as a starting point:

- where a breach of the PM$_{2.5}$ standard has occurred at the same time as a PM$_{10}$ breach (that has since been deemed an ‘exceptional circumstance’), the Minister automatically grant the PM$_{2.5}$ exceedance as an ‘exceptional circumstance’
- provide councils with an opportunity to apply to the Minister for an ‘exceptional circumstances’ that occurred more than three months ago.

---

$^{23}$ Auckland Council first began measuring PM$_{2.5}$ in 1996

$^{24}$ For example, on 23 October 2019 an exceedance of the PM$_{10}$ standard was measured by the Queen Street air quality monitor. This was caused by an accidental fire at the New Zealand International Convention Centre construction site. The Associate Minister for the Environment later deemed that this exceedance was caused by exceptional circumstances. However, during the same period the proposed PM$_{2.5}$ standard was also exceeded at the Queen Street monitoring site as there was a reading of 64 µg m$^{-3}$. 
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4.6 Guidance for councils

114. Auckland Council reiterates that there is a need for the NESAO to be accompanied by clear and detailed guidance.

Guidance for offsetting

115. If ME (and the Minister) make the decision that offsetting of industrial sources is the most effective and efficient way to manage polluted airsheds, Auckland Council suggests the following:

- better practical guidance on how to implement offsetting
- consideration of how the offsetting measures can be used to change polluter behaviour more broadly.

116. Ideally, this evaluation and guidance should be readily available prior to the offsetting tool being introduced into a regulatory framework.

5. Domestic fuel burner standards

5.1 The Auckland context

117. The burning of wood, pellets and coal are an important source of home heating in Auckland. The 2018 census found that 17.7% of Aucklanders burnt wood, coal or pellets to heat their homes (Figure 6).

![Figure 6: Main types of heating for dwellings in Auckland Region and New Zealand, 2018 Census](#)

118. This burning of fuel for domestic heating contributes to the degradation of air quality, and higher concentrations of PM, within the Auckland region. In 2016, 35% of Auckland’s anthropogenic PM emissions was estimated to be produced by domestic sources (largely wood burners), a figure which rises to 49% for PM_{2.5} pollution(25) (Figure 7).

119. As in many regions of New Zealand, there is a seasonal pattern to the emission of PM in Auckland. While in the summer months there is an average of 7 tonnes of PM_{10} emitted per day, this figure more than doubles in the winter months (18.9 tonnes per

---


day). Domestic emissions make up 2.8% of PM₁₀ pollution in the summer compared to winter where it reaches 64% (Figure 7).

120. While the burning of coal and wood is an important method of heating homes, Auckland Council supports the need to more stringently regulate the emissions generated by domestic solid fuel burners at a national level.

121. To provide regulatory context, the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) regulates the discharge of contaminants from many industrial, commercial and residential activities that have the potential to adversely affect air quality. However, to regulate the use of indoor domestic fires, Auckland Council developed the Air Quality Bylaw for Indoor Domestic Fires 2017. The bylaw regulates what can and cannot be burnt in an indoor domestic fire (for example it prohibits the burning of wet wood or wood that is painted, tanned or treated) and sets standards for new (installed, replaced or retrofitted) indoor fireplaces. 

![Figure 7: Daily PM₁₀ emissions in summer and winter 2016.](image)

### 5.2 Emissions standards

**Question 11:** Do you agree with the proposal to reduce the emissions standard to no more than 1.0g/kg? If not, what do you think the standard should be?

122. Auckland Council supports that the revised standard for newly installed solid-fuel burners is reduced to no more than 1.0g/kg (down from 1.5g/kg). As technology is continually improving, Auckland Council considers that it is appropriate that the emissions standards are amended.

**Question 12:** Are there areas where a lower (more stringent) standard could be applied?

123. Auckland Council agrees that more stringent standards could be applied in certain areas.

---


124. Auckland Council suggests that central government re-consider adopting the RIS ‘Option 4 - Strong Regulation’ that proposed that the emission standards be lowered to <0.5g/kg for domestic burners installed in polluted airsheds.

125. As discussed, Auckland Council consider that the offsetting and mitigation measures that are triggered by the ‘polluted’ status need further consideration and need to more equitably distribute the burden to improve air quality. As such, one way to reduce the potential for further degradation of air quality in a polluted airshed may be have more stringent emissions standards for new domestic fuel burners.

**Question 13: Do you agree the new emissions standard should apply to all new domestic, solid fuel burners newly installed on properties less than two hectares in size?**

**Application to all new domestic, solid fuel burners**

126. Auckland Council supports that the emission standards being expanded to include all types of new, domestic solid-fuel burners (including coal burners, multifuel burners, pellet burners, open fires, cookers, and water boilers).

127. Auckland Council considers this is an important amendment that the standard be extended to apply to all types of burners rather than just wood burners used for space heating. Auckland Council supports this as it is a more equitable way to target all domestic PM emissions.

128. In addition, the amendment would result in the prohibition of high emitting burners (e.g. coal burners), so is an effective way to more stringently regulate emissions (although the Auckland Council Air Quality Bylaw for Indoor Domestic Fires 2017 prohibits the installation of coal burners).

**Properties less than two hectares in size**

129. As the purpose of the NESAQ is to regulate air quality at an acceptable standard for human health, domestic solid fuel burners are only an issue where they are in sufficient density to cause PM_{2.5} or PM_{10} concentrations to spike.

130. Auckland Council supports that the NESAQ stringently regulate emissions from domestic burners in areas where the density is such that adverse air quality outcomes are experienced.

131. Auckland Council suggests that central government consider whether the 2ha property size is an appropriate way to achieve this as it may have unintended consequences. For example, in some rural areas, land parcels may be smaller than 2ha (e.g. a farm house on a separate title to the productive land, rural communities on islands), and the NESAQ clauses would apply regardless of the likelihood of the PM_{2.5} standards being exceeded.

132. Auckland Council suggest that it may be more appropriate that rather than the somewhat arbitrary ‘2ha’ being used as a standard, the NESAQ could be aligned to the National Planning Standards, and the Zone Framework Standards. While zoning takes into account property size and therefore may encounter similar issues in places, it is considered that alignment to National Planning Standards (therefore district and regional plans) would be more consistent and therefore beneficial.

133. This is the approach that Auckland Council used in the Air Quality Bylaw for Indoor Domestic Fires 2017 (see Box 1).
Box 1: Extract from Auckland Council Air Quality Bylaw for Indoor Domestic Fires 2017 showing the way in which the rules are applied to different zone types

Part 1 – Preliminary provisions

5 Interpretation

(1) In this by law, unless the context otherwise requires:

*Auckland urban air quality area means all land within:

a) The following Unitary Plan residential zones:
   (i) large lot;
   (ii) rural and coastal settlement;
   (iii) single house;
   (iv) mixed housing suburban;
   (v) mixed housing urban;
   (vi) terrace housing and apartment buildings; and
b) The following Unitary Plan business zones:
   (i) city centre;
   (ii) metropolitan centre;
   (iii) town centre;
   (iv) local centre;
   (v) neighbourhood centre;
   (vi) mixed use;
   (vii) general business;
   (viii) business park;
   (ix) heavy industry;
   (x) light industry; and

   c) Unitary Plan open space zones that adjoin one or more of the zones listed in (a) or (b);
   d) Unitary plan special purpose areas that adjoin one or more of the zones listed in (a) or (b);

   e) The following zones in the Auckland Council District Plan: Hauraki Gulf Islands Section – Operative 2013:
      (i) residential zones;
      (ii) commercial zones;
      (iii) Matiatia; and

   f) The areas illustrated in Schedule 1 of this bylaw.*

134. As the NESAQ seeks to regulate domestic solid fuel burners where they are in sufficient density to cause PM$_{2.5}$ or PM$_{10}$ concentrations to spike, the standards will affect rural and urban communities differently. While households in urban areas will be more restricted in their choices when installing a new domestic burner, this is not considered to be a significant concern. As has been demonstrated in several regions in New Zealand, as standards have been amended, the industry has responded by developing domestic solid fuel burners that meet the emissions standards.

135. In rural areas there are valid reasons that houses need cook-stoves, wood burners with water heating capacity and similar ‘NESAQ non-compliant burners’ given the less
reliable power supply. However, if the resource management system is to be amended to consider climate change mitigation under the RMA and subsequently the NESAQ, it may be that there is a moderate benefit to climate change mitigation of the regulations being extended to all properties.

136. However, there would need to be consideration of the feasibility of this, and the effect on these rural communities. For example, within the Hauraki Gulf there are several habited islands, with isolated rural communities that do not have access to mains electricity. The options available to these communities for cooking, heating water and homes are more limited. Auckland Council suggests that the way in which the NESAQ applies to regions in the country that do not have access to mains power be considered.

Question 14: Do the current methods to measure emissions and thermal efficiency need updating or changing? For example, to address any trade-off between thermal efficiency and emissions, or to test other types of burners or burner modifications that seek to reduce emissions?

137. No comment.

5.3 Emissions standards for existing fires and a transition to zero emission heating

138. Auckland Council considers that central government should explore whether standards should also apply to existing domestic fuel burners. This is particularly relevant given that some existing burners are likely to be equipped to burn coal, which is a significant source of PM. There are a number of options that could be available to phase these out, including but not limited to:

- progressive phasing out of ‘pre-NESAQ’ / non-compliant burners (e.g. ‘pre-NESAQ’ burners have a ‘life’ of 20 years and after such a time the non-compliant burner must be removed)
- ‘point of sale rule’ or similar. Under such a rule, the onus is on the vendor to remove or replace all non-compliant solid fuel burners before the title transfers to the new owner29
- Removal of ‘pre-NESAQ’ / non-compliant burners in all airsheds deemed to be polluted. At present, the only implications for exceeding the PM_{2.5} standards are the impractical offsetting rules for industry, and the prohibition on new installations of open fireplaces. Auckland Council considers that the scope of the offsetting rule should be extended to require the removal of all non-compliant burners (while also extended these rules to manage transport emissions).

139. While Auckland Council recommends that the financial and social implications of such a phase out be considered, the potential positive outcomes could include:

- significant air quality outcomes, particularly where emissions are predominantly from domestic sources
- co-benefits of improved air quality and climate change (particularly reducing CO_{2} emissions from coal combustion)

29 Proposed in Option 5 of the current Regulatory Impact Statement for the proposed amendments to the NESAQ
• reduction of black carbon emissions, soot particles emitted by wood and coal burners that have significant health and climate effects
• the burden to improve air quality is more equitably shared among polluters (particularly relevant in polluted airsheds).

140. In addition to this, Auckland Council considers that there needs to be national direction towards the use of carbon neutral, zero emissions and renewable methods of heating homes. The 2018 census found that 36.2% of Auckland homes are heated using non-renewable sources (wood, coal, gas and pellets). While some consider that the burning of wood is carbon neutral, it is important to note that, in the short term the burning of wood is not carbon neutral.

141. Auckland Council suggests that the NESAQ is an important tool that could be used to encourage the use of renewable, zero emissions and carbon neutral forms of heating rather than fuel burners.

5.4 Integration with existing policy

142. Auckland Council considers that it is critical that the NESAQ is aligned with other central government policy and initiatives.

143. As already discussed, Auckland Council considers that it is critical that the NESAQ is aligned with the Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Bill. It is suggested that central government consider the way in which the domestic heating standards align to this bill, particularly the way in which the use of coal is regulated. Not only that, these initiatives could be used to achieve positive air quality outcomes.

144. Auckland Council suggests that central government consider the ways in which existing policy can be used to achieve air quality outcomes (e.g. Healthy Homes Heating Standards, Warmer Kiwi Homes etc).

145. These schemes could be used to ensure that only zero emissions heating be installed, or solid fuel burners that meet more stringent emissions standards (e.g. 0.5g/kg, rather than the proposed NESAQ standard of 1.0g/kg).

5.5 National direction for the way in which fires are used

146. Auckland Council recognises that the emissions standards for domestic solid fuel burners are just one aspect of ensuring acceptable levels of air quality. The adverse health and environmental effects of burning materials such as plastic, treated / painted timber, green waste etc within domestic burners are widely recognized. Although ministerial decisions in the development of the amendments (to date) have ruled out prohibitions on behaviour that can increase emissions from wood burners, there is a need for national direction through the NESAQ regarding the way in which domestic fuel burners are used.

147. The NESAQ is the most appropriate, effective and efficient tool to regulate the materials that are burned in fuel burners. Rather than leaving regional and unitary councils to regulate this through regional plans and bylaws (as Auckland Council has done – see Box 2), Auckland Council considers that a more consistent and efficient approach would be through a clause in the NESAQ (similar to regulations 4 to 12).
Box 2: Rule in Air Quality Bylaw for Indoor Domestic Fires 2017.

Part 2 – Using indoor domestic fires in Auckland

6 Use of indoor domestic fires in Auckland – general conditions

(1) The owner or occupier of a property containing an indoor domestic fire may not discharge, or permit to be discharged, contaminants into the air from an indoor domestic fire on that property, if that contaminant causes or is likely to cause a nuisance beyond the boundary of the property containing the indoor fire.

(2) The owner or occupier of a property containing an indoor domestic fire may not burn, or permit to be burnt, any of the following in an indoor domestic fire on that property:

(a) wood with a moisture content of more than 25 per cent by dry weight;
(b) fuel with a sulphur content of more than 0.5 per cent (by weight);
(c) waste, including household waste, plastic, rubber, paint, used oil, motor oil or solvents
(d) wood and wood products, including particle board, that are painted, tanalised (treated with copper, chrome and arsenic), or treated with preservatives or chemicals to prevent the wood from deteriorating; or
(e) green waste and vegetation.

5.6 Implementation

148. Auckland Council supports retaining the ability to make bylaws that are more stringent than the regulation.\(^{30}\)

149. Where a bylaw sets a less stringent rule however, Auckland Council suggests that the regulation allows that local authority to amend its bylaw without using the Local Government Act 2002 Special Consultative Procedure.

150. The reason for this is that as it is mandatory for all councils across New Zealand to implement and give effect to the NESAQ, all regional plans, bylaws and lower order documents will need to be amended to ensure alignment. As the opportunity for the public to provide feedback on the issues has been undertaken through the NESAQ consultation process itself, Auckland Council does not consider it appropriate to reconduct on issues that have already been determined through a national process. Similar statutory provisions are provided in section 199 of the Fire and Emergency New Zealand Act 2017 and section 446 of the Food Act 2014. This will enable a bylaw to be amended as a procedural matter.

6. Mercury emission standards

Question: 15: Do you support the proposed amendments to the NESAQ to support ratification of the Minamata Convention on Mercury?

151. Auckland Council supports the inclusion of standards in the NESAQ relating to mercury emissions in order to ratify the Minamata Convention on mercury.

---

\(^{30}\) Clause 28, Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Air Quality) Regulations 2004
152. While anthropogenic mercury pollution is a global threat to human health and the environment, it is not a significant pollutant in New Zealand. Despite this, Auckland Council supports the ratification of the Minamata Convention on Mercury.

153. Many of the categories of industry that these amendments will apply to relate to coal combustion through coal fired boiler plants and industrial coal fired burners. There are few industrial discharges of this nature in the Auckland region.

154. Auckland Council supports the amendments to the NESAQ and considers that it is likely to have very little practical impact for the council, or the region. However, Auckland Council considers that industry are better placed to provide comment on the ways in which the specific amendments are likely to affect them.

**Question 16: Do you agree with how these amendments will affect industry?**

155. Auckland Council also considers that affected industry are best placed to provide feedback on the way in which these standards are likely to impact them specifically.

**Question 17: What guidance do you think will be needed to support implementation of the proposed amendments? Will industry need help to interpret the best practice guidance for the New Zealand context?**

156. Auckland Council considers that there is a need for the NESAQ to be accompanied by clear and detailed guidance. As a council, we will require guidance for the applicability of any new NESAQ regulations for mercury as relevant to resource consenting. For example, if coal-fired boilers require best practice assessments for mercury emissions, guidance will be required for the format and content of these assessments.

157. With regard to the interpretation of the best practice guidance, Auckland Council considers that industry are best placed to provide feedback on the guidance that they require.

**Question 18: Do you use any of the manufacturing processes listed in Proposal 9? If so, does this process use mercury?**

158. Not applicable – no comment.

**Question 19: Do you agree with the Government’s proposed approach to regulate the source categories in Proposal 10? If not, why not?**

159. No comment.

**Question 20: What air pollution control technologies are currently required for existing source categories listed in Proposal 10?**

160. Not applicable – no comment.

7. **Timing, Implementation and transitional provisions**

**Question 21: Do you agree that lead-in times are required for starting to monitor PM$_{2.5}$ and for burners that will no longer be compliant? What lead-in times do you suggest and why?**

161. Regarding PM$_{2.5}$, please see paragraph 58 under heading ‘Cost of monitoring both PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$’.
162. Regarding non-compliant burners, Auckland Council suggests that a lead in time would be required. In determining the appropriate length of time, Auckland Council suggest that consideration must be given to individuals and suppliers who have already purchased ‘non NESAQ’ burners, and any financial implications that may arise from revised standards being implemented. A one-year lead in time may be appropriate.

**Question 22: Are there any matters you think would require transitional provisions? If so, what?**

163. No comment.

8. Other comments

**Question 23: Do you have any other comments you wish to make?**

164. Please see other comments throughout submission.