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1. Summary

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

The report includes:

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

- 1,367 dwellings were consented in May 2020.
- In the year ending May 2020, 14,489 dwellings were consented in the region.
- 40 per cent of new dwellings consented in May 2020 were houses, 28 per cent were apartments and 31 per cent were townhouses, flats, units, retirement village units, or other types of attached dwellings.
- 26 dwellings were consented on Kāinga Ora or Tamaki Regeneration Company owned land in May 2020.
- 1,291 dwellings consented in May 2020 were inside the RUB. Over the past 12 months, 94 per cent of new dwellings consented were inside the RUB.
- 32 per cent of dwellings consented were inside the 1,500m walking catchments of the rapid transport network in May 2020.
- 691 dwellings were ‘completed’ by having a Code Compliance Certificate (CCC) issued in May 2020.
- In the year ending May 2020, 14,107 dwellings had a CCC issued.
- 678 new residential parcels under 5,000m² were created in June 2020.
- In the past 12 months, 7,692 new residential parcels under 5,000m² were created — an average of 641 each month.
- In June 2020, 702 new residential parcels of all sizes were created inside the RUB.
- Long-term arrivals in April 2020 were 156.
- 28 per cent of residential properties sold in Auckland were purchased by first home owners in May 2020.
- 803 public housing applications have been housed in the March quarter 2020.
3. Dwellings consented

In May 2020, 1,367 dwelling consents were issued, which saw 14,489 consents issued for the past 12 months.

<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></td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>1,367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Of all the dwellings consented in May 2020, 551 were houses, 386 were apartments, and 430 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 May 2020, 26 dwellings (two per cent of total dwellings consented) were consented on Kāinga Ora (KO) or Tāmaki Regeneration Company (TRC) owned land. These included 5 apartment units, 21 houses and 0 townhouses, flats, and other attached dwelling types.

<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>Number of KO/TRC dwellings consented</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total dwellings consented</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</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 May 2020, 1,124 dwellings consented were inside 2010 MUL and a total of 1,293 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>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>1,437</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>1,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2010 MUL and RUB</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside RUB</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

In May 2020, 440 dwellings (32 per cent of total dwellings consented) were consented inside the rapid transport network’s (RTN) 1500m walking catchments. In the last 12 months, 4,067 dwellings were consented inside the 1500m RTN walking catchments.

<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>Dwellings consented inside the</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500m RTN walking catchments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total dwellings</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-month rolling total inside RTN</td>
<td>3,699</td>
<td>4,131</td>
<td>4,208</td>
<td>4,105</td>
<td>4,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walking catchments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion from the last 12-month</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inside RTN walking catchments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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)

691 dwelling units had received CCCs in May 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>May 19</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>Apr 20</th>
<th>May 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2 years</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: Auckland Council
9. Residential parcels created

In June 2020, the total number of residential parcels under 5000m² created was 678.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel size category</th>
<th>Jun 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>Apr 20</th>
<th>May 20</th>
<th>Jun 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1000 m²</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 m² to 1999 m²</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 m² to 2999 m²</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 m² to 3999 m²</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 m² to 4999 m²</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of residential parcels &lt; 5000m²</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

634 of new residential parcels of all sizes created in June 2020 were inside 2010 MUL and a total of 702 new residential parcels were inside the RUB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jun 19</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>Apr 20</th>
<th>May 20</th>
<th>Jun 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside 2010 MUL</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2010 MUL and RUB</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside RUB</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</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 April 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>Apr 19</th>
<th>Jan 20</th>
<th>Feb 20</th>
<th>Mar 20</th>
<th>Apr 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrivals</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>5,059</td>
<td>4,996</td>
<td>2,889</td>
<td>156</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 REINU in May 2020 was $910,000. The District Valuation Roll (DVR) median sales price in May 2020 was $1,030,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</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>REINU</td>
<td>$860,000</td>
<td>$885,000</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td>$910,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVR sales¹</td>
<td>$855,000</td>
<td>$870,000</td>
<td>$897,000</td>
<td>$845,000</td>
<td>$1,030,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count of DVR sales</td>
<td>2,238</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

In May 2020, 28 per cent of residential properties sold in Auckland were purchased by first homeowners, 27 per cent were purchased by movers and 36 per cent were purchased by multi-property owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buyer classification</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>First home buyer</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mover</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-property owner</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New to market</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-entry</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Residential property buyer classification](image)

Data source: CoreLogic NZ
14. **Public housing in Auckland**

This section provides an overview of public housing demand and supply in Auckland region. These data are collected and distributed by the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development on a quarterly basis. In the 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><strong>Public housing stock</strong></td>
<td>31,452</td>
<td>32,184</td>
<td>32,326</td>
<td>32,872</td>
<td>33,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public housing register - housing register (top row) and transfer register (bottom row)</strong></td>
<td>4,846</td>
<td>4,846</td>
<td>5,257</td>
<td>5,455</td>
<td>6,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>1,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public housing register - applications housed</strong></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*

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Public Housing Register
The Public Housing Register is comprised of a Housing Register and a Transfer Register. The Housing Register is prioritised by need and consists of public housing applicants who have been assessed as being eligible. The Transfer Register is made up of people already in public housing, but who have requested and are eligible for a transfer to another property. (definition extracted from Ministry of Housing and Urban Development 2019, Public Housing in Auckland factsheet September 2019, page 3. https://www.hud.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)
Memorandum 03 July 2020

To: Planning Committee members
Local Board chairs

Subject: Approval of the second round Innovating Streets application
Recommended projects for the Auckland Council and Auckland Transport submission

From: Councillor Chris Darby, Planning Committee Chairperson
Councillor Josephine Bartley, Planning Committee Deputy Chairperson
Liane Ngamane, IMSB member

Purpose

1. To advise Planning Committee members and local board chairs of the decision to approve the Auckland Council and Auckland Transport recommended application package for submission to the second round of the Innovating Streets for People pilot fund by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi).

Context

2. The Innovating Streets for People pilot fund (ISPF) was set up to help councils to create more people-friendly spaces through the application of tactical urbanism techniques such as pilots, pop ups and interim projects. The fund supports projects that can be rolled out rapidly and at relatively low cost, but can also demonstrate a pathway to more permanent status should they prove successful. The fund also aims to improve the capability of tactical urbanism for councils across Aotearoa.

3. Auckland Council, Auckland Transport, Panuku Development Auckland and Kāinga Ora staff have prepared a joint application for the second application round of the fund. For the second application package, project proposals from local boards, internal departments within Auckland Council, Auckland Transport, Panuku and Kāinga Ora have been collated and assessed.

4. Projects proposals that demonstrated strong alignment with the required Waka Kotahi and the strategic Auckland Council / Auckland Transport criteria have been developed into full applications for submission. At the committee meeting on 4 June 2020 (report CP2020/06423 and Minutes), authority was delegated to the chair, deputy-chair and one IMSB member to approve the final recommended application package before submission by the 3 July 2020 deadline.

Decision on the application

5. On 1 July 2020, Cr Chris Darby, Cr Josephine Bartley and IMSB Member Liane Ngamane agreed to approve the recommended application package, consisting of 29 projects, for submission to Waka Kotahi.
Summary of the application

6. The 29 projects approved for submission have all been identified as being strongly aligned with the Wāka Kotahi and the strategic Auckland Council / Auckland Transport criteria for the fund.

7. Seven of the recommended projects were put forward by local boards, nine projects were put forward by Auckland Council departments, eight by Auckland Transport (including one project prepared on behalf of Tāmaki Regeneration), three by Panuku and two by Kāinga Ora.

8. The projects to be submitted are geographically spread over 18 local board areas across Auckland: Albert-Eden, Devonport-Takapuna, Franklin, Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Kaipatiki, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Manurewa, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Ōrakei, Ōtara-Papatoetoe, Papakura, Puketapapa, Upper Harbour, Waiheke, Waitākere Ranges, Waitakaruru and Whau.

9. The following projects have been included in the final application package:
   - Clevedon Village - Welcome and Slow Tactical Urbanism Project (Franklin)
   - Al Fresco Fridays - Pop up outdoor dining and entertainment areas in three town centres (Devonport-Takapuna)
   - Broadway Papakura – Shared space (Papakura)
   - Maungakiekie Tāmaki Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (Maungakiekie-Tāmaki)
   - Re-imagining Surfdale Precinct – co-design for improved safety, cycling and walking (Waiheke)
   - Glen Eden Town Centre pop-up cycleway: Captain Scott Road to Savoy Road (Waitakere Ranges)
   - Papatoetoe Speed Management Programme (Ōtara-Papatoetoe)
   - Street Activation Inverness Rd, Browns Bay (Hibiscus and Bays)
   - Tāmaki Makaurau Open Streets (Albert-Eden, Devonport-Takapuna, Howick, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Manurewa, Ōtara-Papatoetoe, Papakura, Upper Harbour, Waitākere Ranges, Waitakaruru)
   - Pavement to Parklets (Albert-Eden, Waitākere Ranges)
   - Community Play Street Pilot for Tāmaki Makaurau (Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Papakura, Manurewa, Henderson-Massey, Waitākere Ranges, Whau)
   - Creating Safer Streets – Britomart Tyler Street (Waitakaruru)
   - Creating Safer Streets – Emily Place (Waitakaruru)
   - Creating Safer Streets – Te Tōangaroa (Waitakaruru)
   - Federal Street Laneway – Swanson to Fanshawe (Waitakaruru)
   - Ōtāhuhu Canal Reserve Portage (Māngere-Ōtāhuhu)
   - Safe and Healthy Streets South Auckland – Safe school streets (Māngere-Ōtāhuhu)
   - School Pavement Artwork (Manurewa, Waitākere Ranges, Whau, Ōrakei, Puketapapa, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Hibiscus and Bays, Kaipatiki, Henderson-Massey and Albert-Eden)
   - Royal Oak Roundabout Improvements (Maungakiekie-Tāmaki)
• Ponsonby Road – Te Rimu Tahi – returning Ponsonby to the people (Waitematā)
• Sandringham Road – Exploring Nga Anawai, The Watery Caves of Sandringham (Albert-Eden)
• Manukau Road – Greening Greenwoods Corner, Auckland (Maungakiekie-Tāmaki)
• Project WAVE – Westhaven and Viaduct Enhancements (Waitematā)
• Make it Safe, Make it Playful and Celebrate Tāmaki (Maungakiekie-Tāmaki)
• Connect Oranga (Maungakiekie-Tāmaki)
• Maximising Māngere – Time to Thrive (Māngere-Ōtāhuhu)
• Queen Road Streetscape, Panmure (Maungakiekie-Tāmaki)
• Pukekohe – Eat Streets and Laneway Enhancements (Franklin)
• Manukau – Safe and Healthy Streets South Auckland (Manurewa, Ōtara-Papatoetoe).

10. Seventeen project proposals have not been included in the final application package as they were not closely aligned with Waka Kotahi and council family criteria, particularly the criteria of demonstrating a pathway to permanence, the availability of the local funding share, and deliverability by 2021.

11. The full list of projects part of the final application package, as well as project proposals not included in the application, are in the attachment.

Next steps

12. Approved applications have been submitted to Waka Kotahi’s second ISPF application round by the 3 July 2020 deadline.

13. Waka Kotahi will announce successful applicants for round two funding by 31 July 2020.

Attachment

List of recommended projects for the final ISPF round two submission, and projects not included in the application.
Table 1: List of projects developed into full applications for inclusion in the ISPF round 2 submission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Local board area</th>
<th>Proposal submitted by</th>
<th>How will the 10% local funding share be met?</th>
<th>Total pilot cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clevedon Village - Welcome and Slow Tactical Urbanism Project</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Local board</td>
<td>Local Board Transport Capital Fund</td>
<td>$181,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Al Fresco Fridays - Pop up outdoor dining and entertainment areas in three town centres</td>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>Local board</td>
<td>Local Board OPEX</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Broadway Papakura – Shared space</td>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>Local board</td>
<td>LDI CAPEX</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maungakiekie Tāmaki Low Traffic Neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>Local board</td>
<td>Local Board Transport Capital Fund</td>
<td>$580,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Re-imagining Surfdale Precinct – co-design for improved safety, cycling and walking</td>
<td>Waieke</td>
<td>Local board</td>
<td>Local Board Transport Capital Fund</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glen Eden Town Centre pop-up cycleway: Captain Scott Road to Savoy Road</td>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>Local board</td>
<td>Local Board Transport Capital Fund</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Papatoetoe Speed Management Programme</td>
<td>Otara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>Local board</td>
<td>Local Board Transport Capital Fund</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Street Activation Inverness Rd, Browns Bay</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>Auckland Council, Community Facilities</td>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays - action centre plans</td>
<td>$140,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tāmaki Makaurau Open Streets</td>
<td>Albert-Eden, Devonport-Takapuna, Howick, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Māngere-Otāhuhu, Manurewa, Ōtara</td>
<td>Auckland Council, Arts, Community and Events</td>
<td>Mix of Local Board OPEX and funding from Business Associations</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 August 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attachment B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavement to Parklets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Play Street Pilot for Tāmaki Makaurau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Safer Streets - Britomart Tyger Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Safer Streets – Emily Place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit of Measure</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council, Arts, Community and Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth activation budget investment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Council, Parks, Sports and Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact locations TBC</td>
<td></td>
<td>$159,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura, Upper Harbour, Waterview, Ranges, Watemata</td>
<td></td>
<td>$113,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exact locations and local boards areas, BC, Epsom, Waterview, Ranges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attachments
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Department/Office</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Creating Safer Streets - Te Tōangaroa</td>
<td>Waitamata</td>
<td>Auckland Council, Development Programme Office</td>
<td>Development Programme Office</td>
<td>$186,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Federal Street Laneway (Swanson to Fanshawe)</td>
<td>Waitamata</td>
<td>Auckland Council, Development Programme Office</td>
<td>Development Programme Office</td>
<td>$396,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ōtāhuhu Canal Reserve Portage</td>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>Auckland Council, Auckland Design Office</td>
<td>Local Board Transport Capital Fund</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Safe and Healthy Streets South Auckland - Safe school streets</td>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>$972,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>School Pavement Artwork</td>
<td>Manurewa, Waitākere Ranges, Whau, Órākei, Puketāpapa, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Hibiscus and Bays, Kaipatiki, Henderson-Massey and Albert-Eden</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>$119,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Royal Oak Roundabout Improvements</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tamaki</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>$819,742.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ponsonby Road – Te Rimu Tahi – returning Ponsonby to the people</td>
<td>Waitamata</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>$910,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sandringham Road – Exploring Nga Anawai, The Watery Caves of Sandringham</td>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Implementor</td>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Manukau Road – Greening Greenwoods Corner, Auckland</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tamaki</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Project WAVE (Westhaven and Viaduct Enhancements)</td>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
<td>$924,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> This is a resubmission from Round 1 of the fund.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Make it Safe, Make it Playful and Celebrate Tamaki</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tamaki</td>
<td>Tamaki Regeneration Company</td>
<td>Tamaki Regeneration Company</td>
<td>$181,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Connect Oranga</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tamaki</td>
<td>Kāinga Ora</td>
<td>Kāinga Ora</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Maximising Māngere – Time to Thrive</td>
<td>Māngere-Ötāhuhu</td>
<td>Kāinga Ora</td>
<td>Kāinga Ora</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Queen Road Streetscape, Panmure</td>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tamaki</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
<td>Panmure Town Centre Streetscape project budget</td>
<td>$454,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Pukekohe – Eat Streets and Laneway Enhancements</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
<td>The Eat Streets and Laneway Enhancements</td>
<td>$805,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Manukau – Safe and Healthy Streets South Auckland</td>
<td>Manurewa, Otara-Papatoeloë</td>
<td>Panuku</td>
<td>AT will cover 10% of the estimated costs for the Wiri School safe school trial. Panuku will cover the remaining costs from the Transform Manukau Programme</td>
<td>$925,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Proposal submitted by</td>
<td>Rationale why the project was not developed into a full application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Trialling Bike Safety Improvements and Tactical Intersections | Henderson-Massey Local Board | This project does not link to an approved project and therefore does not meet the ‘pathway to permanence’ criteria of the ISPF.  
- Vodanovich Road/Amerley Ave intersection  
Any intervention here is not linked to any permanent project or programme. This is on a blind crest and has an informal pedestrian crossing in an area with limited visibility. Physical treatments here could not be considered within the Residential Speed Management programme as advance visibility of any treatments/devices was limited. Any proposed treatment here may not meet safety audit requirements.  
Monitoring has shown that speeds on Vodanovich Rd are in the vicinity of 37km/h with further reduction expected when speed limits reduce to 30km/h in this area after June 30. It is not clear what safety issue would be mitigated with any additional works.  
- Te Atatu Rd/ Flanshaw Rd  
This intersection is a major signalised intersection which was upgraded 3 years ago. It has high traffic volumes with crosswalks on all approaches. There are no upgrades programmed to this intersection in the near future, and it is not clear what the temporary measures would tie into.  
  Please note that Flanshaw Road would have speed limit reduced to 30km/h after June 30, however the threshold treatment for this has already been provided. |
<p>| Hillsborough Primary School - Safer streets intervention | Puketāpapa Local Board         | Although the project is rated as high, further investigation identified that the project does not have agreement with the school that they are happy for the proposal, and school buy-in is essential for these projects. The Safe Schools team suggest that the environment outside of the school is not lend itself to a Safe School Streets treatment. Nevertheless, there will be potential opportunities for the school to opt in to the wider Safe Schools project approved in round one. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mangere East pedestrian improvements including Massey Road</th>
<th>Mangere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This project does not link to an approved project and therefore does not meet the ‘pathway to permeance’ criteria of the ISPF. The proposal submitted seems to be more applicable to permanent infrastructure as opposed to trialling a solution. The idea had many different components as opposed a single refined idea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Pt Chevalier ‘Bird’ Streets - a low traffic neighbourhood</th>
<th>Albert-Eden Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This project does not link to an approved project and therefore does not meet the ‘pathway to permeance’ criteria of the ISPF. In addition, closing off streets in a tactical way without a linkage to a permanent solution will present issues relating to ongoing maintenance and the ability for turning movements where the closure has been put in place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glenfield – Beach Haven Wharf cycle lanes</th>
<th>Kaipātiki Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This project does not link to an approved project and therefore does not meet the ‘pathway to permeance’ criteria of the ISPF. Although this section has been identified as part of the future cycle network it has not been prioritised, which means that the delivery of a permanent solution within the foreseeable future is unknown. In addition, there are a number of elements, such as pedestrian refuges and bus stops which may prevent installation of temporary measures. Parking removal, for the extent and duration (1 year) that is being proposed would require extensive (and traditional) consultation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finlayson Avenue traffic calming</th>
<th>Manurewa Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This project does not link to an approved project and therefore does not meet the ‘pathway to permeance’ criteria of the ISPF. Implications of road closures or one-way systems would require analysis beyond isolated roads. Such interventions also entail a higher risk. We note that this area is not a high priority for speed-calming in Manurewa. We are happy and willing to discuss options for allocation of the Local Board Capital Transport Fund such that permanent measures can be more efficiently delivered to assist with speed-calming within the Manurewa Local Board jurisdiction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wakefield Park</th>
<th>Waitakarūa Local Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This project was not progressed as it is not clear at that it could be resourced and delivered by 2021 and did not align to a clear existing programme of works. There was also a risk that the seed funding would not be available through the Transport Capital Fund. Staff will continue to work with the local board to determine if there is a future opportunity to look at this street under the Access for Everyone Programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okahu Bay Wharf &amp; Tamaki Drive Cycleway/Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Ōrākei Local Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau Town Centre Connections</td>
<td>Whau Local Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared path on western half of Otake Valley Road</td>
<td>Upper Harbour Local Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport safer street initiative</td>
<td>Put forward by Councillor Darby on behalf of architect and urban designer, Ken Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe, Accessible, Connected Streets project – Cross Street and West Terrace – Wai āmatā</td>
<td>Auckland Council, Development Programme Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood/Stanmore Modal Filters – Wai āmatā</td>
<td>Auckland Council, Auckland Design Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Responsible Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut through Pavement Marking – Waitematā</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Pavement Pilot – Waitematā</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting Roskill on the map – Puketapapa</td>
<td>Kāinga Ora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōwairaka Temporary Greenway – Albert-Eden</td>
<td>Kāinga Ora</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

07 July 2020

To: Planning Committee and Local Board members

Subject: Summary of the Upper North Island Supply Chain Strategy Working Group Options for moving freight from the Ports of Auckland

From: Toby Shephard, Lead Strategist

Contact information: toby.shephard@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose

1. To summarise the key points of the Sapere report released by Central Government:

   Analysis of the Upper North Island Supply Chain Strategy Working Group Options for moving freight from the Ports of Auckland – Sapere.

Summary of the key points in the Sapere report

2. The Government has released the Sapere new report on the options for relocating the Port of Auckland’s freight operations while deferring any decision on the issue.

3. Cabinet were of the view that POAL operations could not remain at the Waiemāta site in the long term. Accordingly, the Sapere report provides analysis that assumes the relocation of all freight operations from POAL and as a result considers five options for relocation:

   1. Northport expansion
   2. Port of Tauranga expansion
   3. a shared increase in capacity at both Northport and Port of Tauranga
   4. a new port (greenfield site) on the Firth of Thames
   5. a new port (greenfield site) on the Manukau Harbour.

4. Of the options considered by the report, a new port on the Manukau Harbour stands out as the highest-ranked option on the basis of being the least costly over the long-term, primarily because of the proximity of Manukau Harbour to the freight destinations in South Auckland.

5. The Port of Tauranga option is ranked second in terms of net economic cost, followed by Northport and the option of a shared increase at Northport and the Port of Tauranga.

Context

6. An investigation into moving Auckland’s port to Northland was part of the coalition agreement between Labour and NZ First.

7. The 2018-2019 Upper North Island Supply Chain Study (UNISCS) working group provided its final report to Cabinet late last year. The group was independent of Central Government and led by Wayne Brown. The Working Group concluded that the POAL’s freight operation on the Waiemāta Harbour “is no longer economically or environmentally viable” and that the freight operations should be progressively closed and freight shipping handled by an expansion of Northport and the continuation of Tauranga’s existing expansion plans.

8. Upon receipt of the UNISCS report, Cabinet initiated a further investigation into the issue of port relocation by way of review of the Working Group’s recommended option and other long-term scenarios for the Upper North Island Supply Chain, this time led by the Ministry of Transport with support from Treasury. The Ministry of Transport commissioned a consortium to inform its work, led by Sapere.
9. At the Council’s request, in February 2020 Deputy Chief Executive of the Ministry of Transport Nick Brown, along with supporting staff, spoke to the Planning Committee and briefed the Committee on the Government’s port analysis.

10. Auckland Council was named a ‘cornerstone partner’ along with the Ports of Auckland and other port companies and port owners in the Upper North Island.

11. Sapere were engaged as the lead consultant and tasked with feeding into the work of the Ministry and Treasury officials.

12. The timeframe for that analysis intended a May 2020 report to Cabinet. That timeframe was interrupted by the Coronavirus response effort and redeployment of Central Government resource to that effort.

13. The Government has now released the Sapere report. We understand that no advice to Ministers from Ministry officials is planned before the 2020 general election.

**Discussion**

14. Late last year Cabinet were of the view that POAL operations could not remain at the Waitematā site in the long term. Accordingly, the Sapere report provides analysis that assumes the relocation of all freight operations from POAL and as a result considers five options for relocation:

1. Northport expansion
2. Port of Tauranga expansion
3. A shared increase in capacity at both Northport and Port of Tauranga
4. A new port (greenfield site) on the Firth of Thames, and
5. A new port (greenfield site) on the Manukau Harbour.

15. The report does not represent the views of the Ministry of Transport (see para 13).

16. The report takes a 60-year view. Its main conclusions are:

   a) Assuming necessary consents, POAL have capacity for around another 30 years on the current site. This is consistent with the findings of the Port Future Study in 2016.

   b) Neither Northport nor the Port of Tauranga, on their own, can provide sufficient capacity to accommodate the long-term, 60-year freight task.

   c) Northport could provide sufficient berth capacity until around 2060, which is not materially longer than the estimated 30-year capacity at POAL. To accommodate the freight task for the minimum test of 60 years, marine and coastal engineers conclude that Northport would need a 2km long quay, involving dredging and reclamation that expands beyond identified constraints to the west (residents, wetlands) and to the east (into Refining NZ’s liquids berths and well beyond) with significant impacts on coastal processes affecting the nearby coastline and channel.

   d) Northport and Port of Tauranga could accommodate the freight task at 60 years, based on an assumed freight volume split, at which point these ports would likely be at, or near, full capacity with little or no room to expand.

   e) The new port options, on the Firth of Thames or the Manukau Harbour, would have sufficient capacity for the long term beyond 60-years and well beyond. Obtaining resource consents for these new ports, or indeed for any coastal change, will be challenging.

   f) Of the options considered by the report, a new port on the Manukau Harbour stands out as the highest-ranked option on the basis of being the least costly over the long-term, primarily because of the proximity of Manukau Harbour to the freight destinations in South Auckland.

*Note: The Working Group rejected a potential Manukau Harbour on the basis that the Manukau Bar would prevent safe entry and/or insurance. This has been disputed by marine engineers before and since. The Sapere report finds no technical basis for this assumption and find it unlikely that insurance considerations would be a barrier for shipping access.*
g) The Port of Tauranga option is ranked second in terms of net economic cost, followed by Northport and the option of a shared increase at Northport and the Port of Tauranga.

17. Finally, there are several important points to consider:

18. **Auckland Council are the sole owners of the Ports of Auckland.** Often the future location of the port is reported as a Government decision however any decisions about the future of the ports must involve council. Council have communicated this clearly to Government on several occasions, most recently following the February 2020 Planning Committee briefing aforementioned.

19. **The Treaty partner relationship.** As part of its analysis, alongside the Sapere report the Ministry of Transport commissioned a report on Māori and iwi feedback that found that:
   a) Iwi and Māori groups expect a process befitting the Treaty partnership before a decision is taken – including the sharing of detailed information and analysis, and resourcing to facilitate informed decision making.
   b) Iwi dynamics and competing iwi claims will have a significant impact on Government decision-making on the future of POAL land.
   c) Port relocation is likely to increase the pressure for outstanding Treaty and Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act (MACA) claims over Auckland Port/Waitematā Harbour and whatever area is proposed for relocation.
   d) None of the options in the Sapere report necessarily has a ‘fatal flaw’ from the perspective of Māori groups, and some would welcome a port being relocated to their rohe; and they will look to secure protection of customary interests, net environmental benefits and commercial investment opportunities.

20. **Consenting any activity in the coastal environment is highly challenging.** Regulatory frameworks and environmental protections are complex, meaning that getting consent for any of the five options considered in the Sapere report will be challenging. A new port will be necessarily more challenging than for an existing port. Sapere suggest that planning and consenting may take 5-7 years for expansion of an existing port and 7-10 years for a new port. Both are not without risk of failure given the complexity regulatory frameworks and sensitivity of the coastal environment.

21. **Planning a port relocation takes time.** In addition to consenting timeframes, designing and building a new port or expanding an additional port takes time. Sapere suggest that there is ‘window of time’ for a decision about the long-term strategy to future-proof port capacity of approximately 10-15 years. Delays in a decision will make an eventual shift more difficult if existing options are diminished by other developments. The Sapere report, like the 2016 Port Future Study, suggested a ‘triggers’ approach that considers freight throughput growth against POAL capacity in order to ‘trigger’ a pre-planned port relocation option.

22. **The port location will affect long-term infrastructure planning.** Ports and their associated bulk infrastructure are long-term, city-shaping infrastructure investments. The impact of the relocation on Council’s Auckland Plan, Growth Strategy and Infrastructure Strategy (as well as associated processes such as the Auckland Transport Alignment Project) will depend on the time of relocation, site chosen and the planned land use at the current Waitematā site.

**Next steps**

23. The report and the Government’s media release highlights that:
   - The Ministry of Transport will provide additional analysis and advice to Ministers based on the Sapere report.
   - Government have deferred any decisions to the next term of Government.

24. As a council, we will continue to advocate for meaningful engagement and consultation for key partners in this work.
Memorandum 9 July 2020

To: Planning Committee members / Mana Whenua

Cc: Environment and Climate Change Committee members
    Local Board members
    Chief Executive, Independent Maori Statutory Board
    Rural Advisory Panel

Subject: Central government decision announcements on Action for Healthy Waterways package – 28 May 2020

From: Natural Environment Strategy Unit, Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research

Contact information: dave.allen@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose

1. To update Planning Committee members on central government’s announcement of the finalised Action for Healthy Waterways package following consultation on the proposals in 2019.

2. To highlight central government’s expectations of all unitary and regional councils to commit to appropriate work programmes to deliver on these statutory outcomes.

Summary

3. On 28 May 2020, central government announced decisions on the Action for Healthy Waterways package, which was consulted on in September – October 2019.

4. While the policy intent has not significantly deviated from that proposed in 2019, there are a number of substantive changes.

5. The package will be implemented through an updated National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM), a new National Environmental Standard for Freshwater (NES-FW) and regulations under section 350 of the Resource Management Act 1991 for stock exclusion and water use metering respectively.

6. Final drafting of amendments to the above regulatory tools is underway, with gazettal expected in late July 2020. Some provisions are due to take effect 28 days after gazettal, others have a longer lead-in time and will be phased in between mid-2020 and 2026.

7. As Auckland Council has regional statutory responsibilities in managing freshwater and other natural resources, these decisions will have significant implications for planning and regulatory obligations, as well as operational programmes.

8. The Natural Environment Strategy Unit will continue to provide updates to elected members on central government’s ongoing Essential Freshwater work programme. Staff from the Chief Planning Office will provide further updates on the implementation of the Action for Healthy Waterways package and the impacts of the associated regulatory tools.

Context

9. On 28 May 2020, Ministers Parker and O’Connor announced central government decisions on the Action for Healthy Waterways package. The regulatory reform package delivers on the Government’s commitment to stop further environmental degradation, make immediate improvements, and restore waterways within a generation.
10. The announcement was accompanied by a suite of information about the reforms that can be found on the Ministry for the Environment’s website. This includes Cabinet papers, a regulatory impact assessment report, a summary of submissions report, and final reports from the Essential Freshwater advisory groups.

**Development of the Action for Healthy Waterways package and council input to date**

11. The Essential Freshwater work programme for reforming freshwater management was announced on 8 October 2018. This reform to freshwater management represents a significant step-change in the regulatory environment. It is a shift from the current ‘effects-based’ management of freshwater towards a ‘limits-setting’ approach.

12. The decisions released in May 2020 relate to three regulatory instruments:

- a refreshed National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) - a prescribed and detailed set of objectives and policies for the management of freshwater in New Zealand. The NPS-FM sets out requirements for regional and unitary councils for managing freshwater and requires everyone to plan now for changes across the next 30 years and beyond. Te Mana o te Wai is the fundamental concept underpinning the NPS-FM

- introducing a National Environmental Standard for Freshwater (NES-FW) - a set of regulations prescribing standards, methods, and requirements to manage various activities around freshwater. The NES-FW ensures national consistency in standards setting across all councils

- new regulations under section 360 of the Resource Management Act 1991 – these regulations generally deal with matters of detail or implementation and matters of a technical nature. For this package, separate regulations are being made for stock exclusion and water use metering.

13. Accompanying the release is a series of information sheets. These include information for regional and unitary councils, iwi/Māori, dairy farmers, sheep, beef and deer farmers, horticultural growers, farmers and communities.

14. A multi-agency Water Taskforce worked with the Ministry for the Environment to develop proposals. This included four specialist advisory groups: the Freshwater Leaders Group, Te Kāhui Wai Māori, the Science and Technical Advisory Group, and the Regional Sector Water Subgroup. An expert Independent Advisory Panel (IAP) was also commissioned to provide recommendations on the proposals alongside public feedback.

15. The Action for Healthy Waterways discussion document was released for consultation from 5 September to 31 October 2019. Over 17,500 submissions were made.

16. Auckland Council Group’s submission on the proposals generally supported the government’s intent to improve freshwater management. Auckland Council expressed concern that the proposals did not present the best way to address the complex issues in question or adequately address the water issues in an Auckland context.

17. Central government has signalled that there are several additional work programmes planned or underway (such as addressing fair allocation and Māori rights and interests in freshwater, and the ongoing review of Three Waters services).

**Summary of the Action for Healthy Waterways decisions**

18. The 28 May 2020 announcement confirms the policy intent of the Action for Healthy Waterways package that was proposed in 2019. However, there are several substantive changes in the proposals in response to public consultation submissions, the IAP recommendations, reports from specialist advisory groups, and implementation challenges due to the COVID-19 pandemic.
19. Cabinet also agreed to a Supplementary Order Paper to the Resource Management Amendment Bill 2019\(^1\). This will enable mandatory and enforceable freshwater modules of farm plans. The amendments also extend the date by which councils must notify changes to regional plans that implement the new NPS-FM from 31 December 2023 to 31 December 2024.

20. Appendix 1 contains details on all the initiatives to be implemented by these regulatory instruments. These relate to:
   - Preventing further loss and degradation of key freshwater habitats
     - preserving connectivity of fish habitat
     - stopping further loss of natural wetlands and streams
   - Setting up the system to improve freshwater quality and management over a generation
     - amend planning processes to develop regional freshwater plans quicker
     - preserve hydro-electricity flexibility and output to maintain security of supply
     - strengthen and clarify Te Mana o te Wai as the basis for the new NPS-FM
     - Māori values in freshwater
   - Attribute details
     - broaden the focus of national direction and planning to manage all aspects of ecosystem health
     - phosphorus attribute
     - strengthened nitrogen attributes
     - sediment attributes
     - E. coli attribute
   - Taking action on high-risk farming activities
     - exclusion from waterways
     - controls on high-risk feedlots and stocking areas
     - controls on intensive winter grazing
     - controls on intensive winter grazing
     - interim restrictions on major agricultural intensification
     - managing excessive nitrogen discharges through a cap on fertiliser application

21. The substantive changes and their alignment with the Auckland Council submission are further detailed in Appendix 2. Key areas where the package of proposals have changed since consultation include phosphorous and sediment attributes, managing nitrogen, fencing and riparian setbacks, stock exclusion, Freshwater Farm Plans (FW-FP), and interim intensification controls for certain rural land uses.

Implications for Auckland Council

22. The Action for Healthy Waterways package presents significant implications for Auckland Council with its local government responsibilities in managing freshwater and other natural resources.

23. Auckland Council will need to ensure that the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) gives effect to the regulatory and consenting processes arising from the Action for Healthy Waterways package. While it has been indicated that the proposed NPS-FM, NES-FW, and section 360 regulations are to be gazetted in late July 2020, the deadlines by which councils will need to implement these tools vary. Some of the provisions are due to take effect 28 days after gazetted, others will be phased in between mid-2020 and 2026.

24. An overview of timeframes for implementation is provided in Appendix 3.

25. The NES-FW has the shortest implementation time – most standards will take effect 28 days after gazetted. Regulatory Services will need support to evaluate current processes for consenting to ensure that the new standards are applied.

\(^1\) The Resource Management Amendment Bill 2019 was passed in late June 2020.
26. Auckland Council will need to fund and prioritise plan change processes to meet the statutory obligations of implementing the NPS-FM by the end of 2024. This includes working with mana whenua to identify measures to enable kaitakitanga of freshwater health values.

27. To assist in meeting the 2024 deadline, the RMA has recently been amended to provide a new streamlined freshwater planning process for new policy statements or plans (including changes) that give effect to the NPS-FM. This new process includes an independent hearings panel to hear submissions and make recommendations to councils. The council will then need to make decisions within 40 working days. Appeal rights are limited.

28. There are 22 freshwater health indicators which councils are required to maintain or improve, of which 13 are new. There will be increased pressure on sound environmental data, information, monitoring and science, alongside targeted community engagement to support the monitoring and improvement of these attributes.

29. Over the next five years, Auckland Council will need to work alongside mana whenua, landowners, consent holders and other stakeholders to ensure that new requirements are implemented. Examples include:

- additional advice to landowners on what changes will need to be made on their properties
- create or modify consenting systems to receive new data requirements, such as levels of synthetic nitrogen fertiliser use and electronic water use data from consent holders using more than five litres of water per second
- changes to the assessment of consent applications by staff (for example, more detailed assessments on avoiding, remediating or mitigate adverse effects on streams and wetlands alongside applications) and increased compliance monitoring.

30. Central government has recognised that there are ongoing costs associated with implementing these new changes and will support councils to do so. More than $700 million was earmarked in Budget 2020 for assisting communities making improvements for healthier freshwater bodies.

31. Costs for councils have been estimated at $76 million a year (including existing and new obligations). Some of these costs may be able to be recovered (e.g. through consenting fees).

Central government next steps

32. The proposed NPS-FM, NES-FW, and section 360 regulations are being redrafted to reflect cabinet decisions. These are scheduled to be gazetted in late July 2020.

33. Central government is also preparing guidance to help local government, Treaty partners and other stakeholders to understand, interpret and implement the Action for Healthy Waterways package, in the context of the revised instruments.

34. While the Action for Healthy Waterways package is a significant portion of the work programme to address freshwater issues, central government has highlighted future work will include:

- ongoing support for the implementation of the Action for Healthy Waterways package
- considering the proposal from Freshwater Leaders Group and Te Kāhui Wai Māori to establish a Freshwater / Te Mana o te Wai Commission
- consider over the next 12 months whether there should be a Dissolved Inorganic Nitrogen (DIN) national bottom line in the NPS-FM
- review the cap on the use of synthetic nitrogen fertiliser by 2023
- address fair allocation and Māori rights and interests in freshwater
- develop the operational regulations and requirements of freshwater modules of farm plans

---

2 Each panel will generally consist of five members: two freshwater commissioners appointed by the Minister of the Environment, two members nominated by the relevant regional or unitary council and one member with an understanding of tikanga Māori and mātauranga Māori who is nominated by local mana whenua.

• develop greater central oversight of the performance of the freshwater management system and council performance
• make improvements to Oversee⁵.

**Auckland Council next steps**

35. Given the significance of these changes, the Planning Committee would require a reset implementation plan for the NPS-FM from the Chief Planning Office and associated departments. A workshop with elected members and mana whenua to articulate the statutory obligations in the refreshed NPS-FM and associated instruments, and to identify alignment with council programmes, is suggested as an appropriate first step.

36. Considerations for refocusing council departments include:
• Planning – a reset plan for prioritising implementation of the NPS-FM including timeframes and programmes of work, recognising central government expectations
• Research and monitoring – implementation of additional monitoring and scientific assessment required by the NPS-FM and NES-FW (undertaken through the Research and Evaluation Unit, APSR)
• Regulatory – enforcement of new provisions under the NPS-FM and NES-FW (e.g. through resource consenting and compliance monitoring as appropriate)
• Operational – alignment of programmes with the NPS-FM and NES-FW, including scale and focus, to meet planning and regulatory statutory obligations over the near term
• Council-controlled organisations – alignment and prioritisation of work programmes and projects to better reflect the statutory obligations of the NPS-FM and NES-FW provisions, and the expectations on Auckland Council in meeting those obligations
• Local Boards – reflection of the NPS-FM and NES-FW provisions within local plans and projects, including consideration of wider regional impacts (e.g. at a catchment scale so that land and water management issues are considered across Local Board boundaries).

37. The scale of future and planned urban growth within the Auckland region presents an opportunity to improve freshwater outcomes, through recognising and providing for the NPS-FM and NES-FW provisions from the outset of these programmes of work. This includes considering and providing for the cumulative effects of growth, ensuring that positive freshwater outcomes are prioritised and that decisions made are resilient, in alignment with the NPS-FM and NES-FW provisions.

38. Political decisions and operational actions focused on land use activities (e.g. urban growth) will need to better account for the clear direction provided by these statutory obligations. An example would be how freshwater outcomes will be met in the Pahekahu catchment downstream of Drury with significant planned housing growth in this area.

**Attachments**

• Appendix 1: Detailed initiatives to be implemented by the *Action for Healthy Waterways* package
• Appendix 2: Alignment of substantive changes to the *Action for Healthy Waterways* package with Auckland Council’s submission
• Appendix 3: Timeframes for implementing the *Action for Healthy Waterways* package

---

⁵ Oversee is a model that can be used to estimate nitrogen and phosphorus discharges and greenhouse gas emissions from farms.
Appendix 1: Detailed initiatives to be implemented by the Action for Healthy Waterways package

Preventing further loss and degradation of key freshwater habitats

Preserving connectivity of fish habitat

- protecting habitats for native fish species, by improving habitat management, the quality of water they live in, and their access to and from the sea
- standards to regulate in-stream structures to provide for fish passage. This includes monitoring of fish abundance, diversity and fish passage by councils, and establishing work programmes to address barriers to fish passage where needed

Stopping further loss of natural wetlands and streams

- new rules within the NES-FW to protect wetlands and streams from further damage and net loss. Activities such as clearing vegetation, earthworks and changes to the water levels in wetlands will generally not be allowed
- some activities will be allowed (e.g. significant infrastructure, flood control, and for stream reclamation) if applicants can demonstrate they have first avoided, remedied, mitigated and then offset significant adverse effects
- restoration and maintenance activities can be undertaken without a consent if the effects are no more than minor

Setting up the system to improve freshwater quality and management over a generation

Amend planning processes to develop regional freshwater planning instruments more quickly

- a new planning process for freshwater will be added to the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) to help councils expedite the plan making required to implement the new NPS-FM
- the notification date of regional freshwater plans has been extended by one year to 31 December 2024, with final decisions made by 2026-27. This is in recognition that local government and iwi were going to face challenges meeting the original deadline for notifying changes required (particularly when considering the impacts from COVID-19)

Move to real-time measuring and reporting data on water use

- amendment to Resource Management (Measurement and Reporting of Water Takes) Regulations 2010 requiring the collection and transmission of real-time electronic water use data for consents taking more than five litres of water per second directly to councils
- these requirements will be phased but will need to be fully implemented after six years from the regulatory amendments taking effect (mid-2026)

Preserve hydro-electricity flexibility and output to maintain security of supply

- regional councils allowed to maintain freshwater quality below national bottom lines where it is necessary to secure the benefits of New Zealand’s five largest hydropower schemes (Waikato; Tongariro; Waitaki; Manapouri and Clutha)

Strengthen and clarify Te Mana o te Wai as the basis for the new NPS-FM

- Te Mana o te Wai is now reframed as the fundamental concept underpinning the NPS-FM. It provides a framework for freshwater management, and establishes principles and obligations sustaining the health and wellbeing of water before providing for human and other uses
- clarification on how councils engage with tangata whenua and give effect to Te Mana o te Wai and the long-term vision for freshwater management

Māori values in freshwater

- inclusion of a new compulsory value for mahinga kai
- requirement for regional and unitary councils to work with and enable tangata whenua to implement the NPS-FM in relation to Māori values in a local context
Attribute details

Broaden the focus of national direction and planning to manage all aspects of ecosystem health
- amendment to definitions and policies to make explicit that all components\(^6\) of ecosystem health must be managed and reported on in an integrated fashion
- requirement for councils to report on overall ecosystem health, taking all relevant information into account and considering the habitat and needs of threatened species

Phosphorus attribute
- requirement for councils to maintain or improve dissolved reactive phosphorus (DRP) through an action plan including adaptive management regimes. If the outcomes of the action plan are not met, or monitoring observes declining trends, regional and unitary councils must investigate the causes and describe through the action plan how they will respond
- a national bottom line for DRP will not be included as further work is required to develop this. A DRP attribute that requires limit-setting and a bottom line would need an environmental classification system, such as that used in the sediment attributes, to reflect the high natural variation in DRP in New Zealand’s rivers and streams

Strengthened nitrogen attributes
- inclusion of significantly strengthened nitrogen toxicity attributes to prevent nitrogen levels degrading further. Where nitrogen levels are worse than bottom lines for the new toxicity thresholds, periphyton, or total nitrogen in lakes, councils will be required to improve them
- regional and unitary councils can allow for water quality attributes for ammonia and nitrate toxicity (rivers) and total nitrogen (lakes) below national bottom lines if necessary to preserve fresh vegetable production within specific areas.\(^2\) Regional and unitary councils will be required to improve freshwater affected by fresh vegetable growing to the extent possible\(^3\)
- a DIN (dissolved inorganic nitrogen) bottom line is not included. Further work is required to reassess the appropriateness of a DIN bottom line against associated environmental and economic implications

Sediment attributes
- inclusion of a limit-setting attribute for suspended fine sediment and an action plan attribute for deposited sediment. Both now have four river type classes with associated bottom lines. This approach is now simplified from the previous 12 river type approach. This approach reflects natural variation in water clarity and deposited sediment cover of rivers across New Zealand
- the limit-setting attribute for suspended fine sediment requires regional and unitary councils to undertake pro-active and immediate rulemaking to be implemented in regional plans by 2024
- the action plan attribute for deposited sediment will require regional and unitary councils to form and implement an action plan, similar to the phosphorus attribute

E. coli attribute
- regional and unitary councils will be required to improve water quality at places where people swim and recreate – in freshwater. Water quality at these sites must be managed so that indicators of disease risk (E. coli) are better than a new national bottom line, adopted in line with national microbiological guidelines to protect people’s health

---

\(^6\)The new NPS-FM identifies five components of ecosystem health that must be managed and reported on; water quality (chemical, physical, biological), water quantity (water flows and levels), physical habitat (available for plants and animals), aquatic life (animals, plants and algae present) and functioning ecosystem (interactions between them all)

\(^2\) of the Pukokohia (Franklin) and Lake Horowhenua catchments, which are being specified

\(^3\) Through methods such as freshwater modules of farm plans as one identified tool in the first instance
Taking action on high-risk farming activities

Stock exclusion from waterways
- exclusion of dairy and beef cattle, deer, and pigs from waterways greater than one metre wide in lowland areas (less than 10 degrees slope). In hill country (greater than 10 degrees slope), dairy (but not beef) cattle and pigs must be excluded from these same waterbodies. Sheep are excluded from these controls.
- requirements for ungrazed setbacks of at least three metres from margins of waterways (down from a previously proposed five metres) except where an existing permanent fence or existing riparian planting exists (including those with less than a three-metre setback).
- excluding hill country deer and beef cattle from streams and lakes if they are grazing on fodder crops, pasture that has been irrigated in the last year, or break-feeding. They must also be excluded from wetlands in existing district or regional plans, and areas identified containing NPS-FM values (such as mahinga kai or threatened species).
- prohibiting dairy and beef cattle and pigs from crossing waterbodies more than twice per month, unless they cross by way of a dedicated culvert or bridge.
- regional plans and freshwater farm plans will be able to contain more stringent requirements.

Controls on high-risk feedlots and stocking areas
- feedlots and stock-holding areas to be defined within the NES-FW regulations, with minimum requirements to be set before winter 2021.

Controls on intensive winter grazing
- inclusion of standards for intensive winter grazing on forage crops – a practice most prominent in Southland, Canterbury, and Otago.

Interim restrictions on major agricultural intensification
- further intensification of certain land uses is restricted until councils implement the NPS-FM
- restrictions will not apply to commercial vegetable growing as previously proposed and will provide flexibility for horticulture and catchment-level offsetting. These would still need to be consistent with the NPS-FM requirement to maintain or improve waterways.

Managing excessive nitrogen discharges through a cap on fertiliser application
- a new national synthetic nitrogen fertiliser cap of 190 kg of nitrogen per hectare (kg N/ha) per year to all pastoral sectors (dairy, dairy-support, sheep, beef, and deer)
- This cap does not apply to arable and horticultural crops. These sectors cover a very small portion of agricultural land (about 5%) and contribute to ongoing domestic food security.

---

8 Intensification activities to be restricted include:
- more than 10 hectares of land-use change to dairy farming
- more than 10 hectares of land-use change from woody vegetation or plantation forestry to pastoral farming
- expanding irrigation by more than 10 hectares on dairy farms
- expanding areas of intensive winter grazing on forage crops above a historical baseline
- expanding area of dairy support above a historical baseline.

10 This cap is based on research and dairy industry advice that there are diminishing economic returns with nitrogen fertiliser application over 200kg N/ha/year. The dairy sector’s national average is about 150 kg N/ha, although higher in some areas such as Canterbury which had an average of 222 kg N/ha in 2017-18.
### Appendix 2: Alignment of substantive changes to the Action for Healthy Waterways package with Auckland Council’s submission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal area</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Alignment with submission</th>
<th>Proposed central government actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phosphorus Attribute</td>
<td>The phosphorus attribute (DRP) will not have a national bottom line. DRP will be required to improve or at least be maintained at current state.</td>
<td>Auckland Council supported in principle the introduction of a DRP bottom line. However, it did not support the inclusion of the proposed national bottom line as proposed and sought further investigation and recognition that these are not achievable in Auckland due to naturally occurring geology and stream types. These submission points have been addressed in the changes made to this attribute.</td>
<td>Further work is being undertaken by central government to determine alternative approaches. The results will be reported back to the Minister for the Environment and the Minister of Agriculture within 12 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sediment Attributes</td>
<td>Significant modifications have been made to the sediment attributes since consultation. The key changes are: <em>the timeframes and statistics of assessment for both attributes</em> <em>simplification of both attributes’ classification systems</em> <em>changes to the monitoring indicator for the attributes</em> <em>including consideration of naturally soft-bottomed streams</em> <em>amending bottom lines for both attributes to reflect the above changes.</em></td>
<td>Auckland Council supported in principle the introduction of sediment attributes nationally and recognised the range of work that is being undertaken in the Auckland region to reduce sediment. Council’s science staff helped MFE with national direction and guidance for sediment, especially around ease of attribute implementation. Council did not support the inclusion of the proposed national bottom lines for suspended fine sediment and sought clarification about where they are not achievable in the Auckland region due to naturally occurring geology and stream types. Specific key submission points were: <em>the time period for sediment attribute assessments and the associated implications</em> <em>the alignment of assessment periods for different attributes</em> <em>clarity about the unit of measurement for the attributes</em> These submission points have been addressed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Nitrogen</td>
<td>The existing nitrogen toxicity attributes have been strengthened since consultation. The key changes include: <em>establishing a cap on the use of synthetic nitrogen fertiliser with a review required by 2023</em> *DIN levels will be required to improve or at least be maintained at current state. *enable regional and unitary councils to</td>
<td>Auckland Council supported in principle the introduction of a DIN attribute to manage nitrogen for effects other than toxicity. However, it sought further investigation and consideration of the implications of introducing a DIN bottom line on catchments with horticultural activities in comparison to urban and other rural catchments. Specific key submission points were: *whether the national bottom line for DIN should apply to catchments where the value of food supply may be higher than achieving an environmental stream outcome.</td>
<td>The appropriateness of a DIN bottom line will be reassessed in 12 months, with the benefit of a thorough review of the environmental and economic implications. If such a national bottom line were to be adopted, it would most likely be with exceptions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal area</td>
<td>Changes</td>
<td>Alignment with submission</td>
<td>Proposed central government actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock exclusion through permanent fences and riparian setback</td>
<td>Ungrazed setbacks of at least three metres will be required from margins of waterways. Existing permanent fences will not need to move to comply with riparian setback requirements. Some of the proposed stock exclusion requirements in hill country will be managed through FW-FPs rather than centrally set rules to reflect the diversity of landscapes, farm systems, and freshwater ecosystems. FW-FPs and regional rules may contain more stringent requirements.</td>
<td>Auckland Council supported in principle the exclusion of stock from water bodies as a simple and effective initial step to improve water quality. Council supported the original proposed five-metre setback – this has now been reduced to three metres. Submission points that have been addressed include: • allowing flexibility to ensure practical solutions to exemptions, such as for site constraints • ability for regional and unitary councils to apply more stringent requirements through regional rules and FWFPs. Submission points relating to the exclusion of stock from estuaries and other coastal wetlands have not been addressed directly (but option to manage under more stringent regional rules).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshwater farm plan (FW-FP)</td>
<td>The process for developing mandatory and enforceable FW-FP regimes has been further developed, and their introduction will be phased in with a focus on early and targeted rollout of FW-FPs to highly nitrogen-impacted catchments – for example those in Franklin.</td>
<td>Auckland Council supported the use of Freshwater Farm Plans (FW-FPs) as an effective and flexible tool Submission points on a targeted implementation and clarity on FW-FPs as a regulatory tool have been addressed.</td>
<td>Programmes to provide additional capacity and capability of qualified farm advisors and auditors to be implemented and led by central government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim intensification controls</td>
<td>Interim intensification controls will include a 2024 sunset clause, greater flexibility in low-risk catchments. These will not apply to vegetable production and will not apply to irrigation except where irrigation is for dairy.</td>
<td>Auckland Council supported, in principle, restricting further intensification of rural land use as a measure to reduce pollution entering waterways. Submission points on flexibility for farming operations that are low-risk activities or take place in a low-risk catchment have been addressed. Submission points on consenting and administrative burden controls will place on both landowners and regional and unitary councils have not been addressed.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 3: Timeframes for implementing the Action for Healthy Waterways package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframes</th>
<th>What will happen?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within 3 years</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ongoing policy work</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (2020 - 2023)                   | • Consider whether there should be national bottom lines for dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN) and dissolved reactive phosphorus (DRP), that accounts for natural variation between different river types, in the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management  
  • Address fair allocation and Māori rights and interests in freshwater  
  • Develop the operational requirements for freshwater farm plans  
  • Develop greater central oversight of the performance of the freshwater management system and council performance  
  • Review and make improvements to Overseer (an online software tool to improve nutrient management on farms).  
|                               | **Within 5 years**                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| (2023-2025)                    | **Stock exclusion for cattle, pigs and deer in:**  
  • Low-slope areas  
  • Some hill country wetlands  
  • All areas where there are intensive practices.  
  • Minimum 3m setbacks from rivers and streams  
  • Mandatory and enforceable freshwater farm plans in place across most farms  
  • Requirements for real-time measuring and reporting of data on water use enter into force in two, four and six years  
  • A new planning process for freshwater – faster and nationally consistent regional plans  
  • New or updated regional plans are notified by 2024, setting out how the region will implement the new National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management over coming decades – i.e. to give effect to Te Mana o te Wai with an emphasis on ecosystem health, reinforced by the addition of new attributes, achieve national bottom lines and community objectives over the long term, and set out the rules needed to do this.  
|                               | **From 5 years to a generation**                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|                               | • Mandatory and enforceable freshwater farm plans in place for all commercial farms  
  • Communities work towards meeting the requirements of their freshwater plans (different requirements for each region/area)  
  • Freshwater is recovering and on track to meet national bottom lines and community aspirations.  

Memorandum

15 July 2020

To: Planning Committee, Local Board Chairs

Subject: Auckland Unitary Plan appeals and review proceedings - update

From: Corina Faesenkloet, Principal Solicitor

Contact information: corina.faesenkloet@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose

1. To provide a further update on the outstanding appeals and judicial review proceedings on the Council’s decisions on the Independent Hearings Panel (IHP) recommendations on the Auckland Unitary Plan.

Summary

2. This memorandum clearly sets out:
   (a) each of the appeals and judicial review proceedings on the Council’s decisions on the Independent Hearings Panel (IHP) recommendations on the Auckland Unitary Plan, that remain outstanding;
   (b) any hearings that have taken place, where the Council is awaiting a decision; and
   (c) any hearing dates that are still to take place in 2020.

Context

3. The last update was provided to the Planning Committee on 4 February 2020. Since that date some Environment Court and High Court hearings have taken place, and the Council has been advised of some further upcoming IHP and Environment Court hearing dates.

Discussion

4. As at today’s date, the following appeals (or judicial review proceedings) remain to be resolved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellant/Applicant</th>
<th>Reference number</th>
<th>Matter at issue</th>
<th>Hearing date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cabra Rural Developments</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000189</td>
<td>Rural subdivision provisions</td>
<td>10 June 2020</td>
<td>Awaiting decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 June 2020 (Environment Court)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cato Bolam Consultants Ltd</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000207</td>
<td>Rural subdivision provisions</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Awaiting decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason, David</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000207</td>
<td>Rural subdivision provisions</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Awaiting decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithies Family Trust</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000212</td>
<td>Rural subdivision provisions</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Awaiting decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appellant/Applicant</td>
<td>Reference number</td>
<td>Matter at issue</td>
<td>Hearing date</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakara Investments Ltd</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000216</td>
<td>Rural subdivision provisions</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Awaiting decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiata Properties</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000234</td>
<td>Rural subdivision provisions</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Awaiting decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra Nova Planning Limited</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000248</td>
<td>Rural subdivision provisions</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Awaiting decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franco Belgiorno-Nettis (Judicial Review)</td>
<td>CIV-2019-404-2810</td>
<td>Zoning and height controls applying to two blocks of land in Takapuna</td>
<td>29 June 2020</td>
<td>Awaiting decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 June 2020</td>
<td>(High Court)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J and F Gock</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000199</td>
<td>Rehearing - location of Rural Urban Boundary in relation to the Pukaki Peninsula</td>
<td>20 July 2020</td>
<td>Environment Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookby Quarries Limited</td>
<td>ENV-2018-AKL-000150</td>
<td>Significant Ecological Areas overlay - Brookby Quarry</td>
<td>27 July 2020</td>
<td>Environment Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Eastern Investments Limited and Heritage Land Ltd</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Court of Appeal directed IHP to make a new recommendation on: (1) whether the Albany 5 Precinct should be adopted; and (2) whether the land in Sub-Precinct B should be zoned Business - Mixed Use</td>
<td>September 2020</td>
<td>(Independent Hearings Panel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Eastern Investments Limited and Heritage Land Ltd</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000213</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Environment Court)</td>
<td>Appeal is currently on hold pending the determination of the related proceedings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next steps**

5. The Council is awaiting decisions in relation to items 1-7 and item 8 in paragraph 4 above. These decisions, and a summary of the outcome, will be provided to the Committee when the Council receives them.

6. Hearings have been scheduled in relation to items 9, 10 and 11 in paragraph 4 above.

**Attachments**

There are no attachments.
Memorandum

To: Planning Committee, Waitakere Local Board
Subject: Update on the current status of the city centre programme
From: Barry Potter – Director of Infrastructure and Environmental Services
Contact information: Emma Cowie – Relationship Advisor, Infrastructure and Environmental Services  
Emma.Cowie@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose
1. To provide an update on the current status of the city centre programme.

Summary
- The city centre programme will deliver on the outcomes of the City Centre Masterplan, including providing an accessible, people-centric and vibrant city centre.

- The delivery of the programme is well underway:
  - The City Rail Link project is on track to open Albert Street and lower Queen Street by December 2020. Piling work has started on the southern end of Albert Street.
  - Construction on the Downtown Programme is approximately 60 per cent complete.
  - The Midtown Programme is in the planning phase with business case and design underway.
  - In the uptown area, Karangahape Road enhancement construction is approximately 45 per cent complete.
  - America’s Cup (AC36) infrastructure is on track for the targeted completion date and is running under budget.

- COVID-19 has impacted on the delivery of the programme, resulting in some delays to project completion and unbudgeted costs being incurred. Programmes have been impacted by up to eight weeks due to the lockdown and reduced productivity due to COVID-19 restrictions. Cost increases are still being negotiated with construction contractors.
  - Cost and programme impact for areas of the City Rail Link projects are being worked through by City Rail Link Limited. The completion date for the Albert Street and lower Queen Street urban realm is on track for December 2020.
  - The completion date for the Downtown Programme has been delayed to June 2021. An opportunity to save eight weeks of construction time is being progressed by closing the eastbound traffic lane on Quay Street between lower Hobson Street and the Queens Wharf entrance from August 2020 to February/March 2021 to enable completion by the end of April 2021.
  - There is limited impact on the Midtown Programme from COVID-19 as the majority of the programme is in the planning phase.
  - The completion of Karangahape Road enhancements has been delayed as a result of COVID-19 and additional work being undertaken. Construction is anticipated to conclude in April 2021.
Context

2. The city centre programme seeks to deliver on the outcomes of the City Centre Masterplan, including improving the vibrancy, accessibility, and attractiveness of the city centre, while leveraging off existing public and private investment including the City Rail Link.

Current status of the delivery programmes

3. The City Rail Link will enhance the capacity and performance of Auckland’s rail services and improve transport outcomes in Auckland. The C1 and C2 contracts are well advanced with the western side of Albert Street (Wyndham to Swanson Street) now open to the public with a widened footpath, improved amenities and new native trees. Construction of an enhanced public space in lower Queen Street is ongoing, with work in both areas to be completed by the end of 2020. The C3 Link Alliance contract piling works have started in the southern end of Albert Street and two major contracts, C5 and C7, are in negotiation.

4. The Downtown Programme will deliver a connected and accessible waterfront. The programme is currently under construction with physical works approximately 60 per cent complete. The southern footpath of Quay Street is substantially complete and opened to align with the opening of Commercial Bay in June 2020 alongside work on the north-eastern side of lower Albert Street. In the Ferry Basin, the first and second new ferry berths are operational with berths three and four expected to be in place by the end of the year. Over 400 metres of the existing 100-year-old Quay Street seawall has been strengthened. Construction on Te Wānanga (the new downtown public space) is nearing 50 per cent completion.

5. The Midtown and Uptown programmes deliver improved pedestrian and public spaces around key transport hubs and leverage off development opportunities from the City Rail Link and bus infrastructure.

6. The Midtown Programme is generally in the planning phase, with both the Victoria Street Linear Park and Wellesley Street projects in the detailed business case phase. Other projects including improvements to Federal Street and the Nelson Street slip-lane are at various stages within the design phase.

7. As part of the Uptown Programme, the enhancement of Karangahape Road is currently under construction with approximately 45 per cent of the physical works complete. A section of the Karangahape Road cycleway from Ponsonby Road to Day Street has been opened to the public. Improvements to the Myers Park underpass are currently in the design phase.

8. AC36 infrastructure delivers infrastructure for the America’s Cup event as well as legacy infrastructure for the city centre. The programme of works is approximately 90 per cent complete and is running on time and under budget.

Discussion

9. From 26 March 2020, with the commencement of COVID-19 Alert Level 4, our construction sites experienced a four-week lockdown period and lost further productive time due to the close-down and then recommissioning of sites.

10. The interruption to construction means that the completion date for many of our projects has been impacted. The ability to mitigate the impact on these construction programmes varies depending on the individual circumstances of each project.

11. Typically, there has been an unbudgeted increase in cost to all projects currently under construction, due to the additional work required to shut-down the sites and remobilise. These unbudgeted costs will put additional pressure on both project and organisational budgets.
Impact of COVID-19 lockdown on work programmes

12. City Rail Link
   - There are impacts on the cost and programme for areas of the City Rail Link project which are being worked through by City Rail Link Limited.
   - The completion date for the Albert Street and lower Queen Street urban realm is on track for December 2020.

13. Downtown Programme
   - Difficult ground conditions and technical challenges encountered by the Quay Street seawall works (jet grout piling and anchoring) and the recent COVID-19 Alert Level 4 lockdown have resulted in a programme delay of four months. As a result, the revised downtown programme completion date is June 2021.
   - An opportunity is being progressed to save eight weeks on the revised programme by closing the eastbound traffic lane on Quay Street, between lower Hobson Street and the Queens Wharf entrance, from August 2020 to February/March 2021. This would enable completion by the end of April 2021. This earlier delivery, which is strongly supported by local businesses and key stakeholders, will help aid Auckland’s recovery in a post COVID-19 environment as the council looks to bring life back into Auckland’s city centre.
   - An affordability review was completed in May 2020 and confirmed that forecast costs for the programme were within the available budget (excluding COVID-19 costs). Current guidance is that COVID-19 costs, estimated at approximately $6 million, need to be met from existing programme contingency.
   - Key risks for the downtown programme:
     - The approval of traffic management plans and mitigation of any associated adverse impacts remains an ongoing risk.
     - Funding COVID-19 costs from the existing budget puts the programme contingency at risk.
     - The risk that construction activity between December 2020 and March 2021 disrupts the AC36 event. The Downtown Programme team are collaborating with ATEED and the Joint Chief Executive Steering Group to develop a co-ordinated event management plan to ensure that construction activity won’t compromise the AC36 event.

14. Midtown Programme
   - There have been limited COVID-19 related delays and costs as the majority of the programme is yet to commence construction.
   - Work on the Victoria Street cycleway project is continuing, with completion now scheduled for August 2020 following the rationalisation of COVID-19 related delays.

15. Uptown Programme
   - The completion of Karangahape Road enhancements has been delayed as a result of COVID-19 and additional work being undertaken. Construction is anticipated to conclude in April 2021.

16. America’s Cup 36 (AC36) infrastructure
   - While COVID-19 lockdown has impacted on parts of the programme, there is no substantial impact on the expected construction completion.

17. The delivery of the city centre programme will continue to be important for the long-term prosperity of the city centre.

18. Staff will continue to work with contractors to expedite the programme where possible while managing programme costs in a prudent manner.
19. The council will continue to support retail businesses through periods of disruption with the implementation of specifically catered development response programmes which are being led by the relevant project teams. These programmes provide business support and mentoring, activate spaces, encourage clear wayfinding and promote local businesses.

**Next steps**

20. Staff will provide regular updates on the city centre programmes as the work progresses.
Memorandum  7 August 2020

To: Planning Committee

Subject: Auckland Unitary Plan update

From: John Duguid - General Manager Plans and Places

Contact information: john.duguid@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose
1. To inform the Planning Committee of decisions on plan changes to the Auckland Unitary Plan for the period 25 June to 30 July 2020.
2. To provide an update on the remaining Auckland Unitary Plan appeals.

Summary
3. Decisions on two plan changes were notified: PC 32: Avondale Jockey Club (Private) and PC 34: Special Character Statement for Special Character Areas Overlay – Howick Business.
4. Two requests for private plan changes were accepted by staff and will proceed to notification for submissions: Cledendon Kawakawa Road (Private) and Amendments to sub-precinct H – Flat Bush Precinct (Private).
5. There is no change to the number of appeals on the council’s decisions on the Independent Hearing Panel’s recommendations on Auckland Unitary Plan since the last update provided to the Planning Committee.

Context
6. The Planning Committee is responsible for guiding the physical development and growth of Auckland with a focus on land use, transport and infrastructure strategies and policies relating to planning, including the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP).
7. It may take up to two years to progress a council plan change from endorsement by the committee to bringing it back for final approval to become operative. This memorandum informs the committee of recent decisions made by the council’s independent hearing commissioners on council and private plan changes. It also informs the committee of decisions made by staff to accept private plan changes for notification.
8. There are few remaining appeals against the council’s decisions on the Independent Hearings Panel’s recommendations on the AUP.

Discussion
Plan change decisions by Independent Hearing Commissioners
9. Decisions were notified in respect of the following plan changes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan change</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Plan change purpose</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Decision date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PC 32: Avondale Jockey Club (Private)</td>
<td>Lot 1 DP 470450, Wingate Street, Avondale</td>
<td>Rezone a small portion of land from Special Purpose – Major Recreation Facility zone to Residential – Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>10 July 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan change | Location | Plan change purpose | Decision | Decision date
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
PC 34: Special Character Statement for Special Character Areas Overlay – Howick Business | Howick | Add a special character statement to Schedule 15 of the Auckland Unitary Plan. | Approved | 25 June 2020

Summary of plan change decisions by Independent Hearing Commissioners

PC 32: Avondale jockey Club (Private)
10. Plan Change 32 (Private) rezones land along the south-western corner (on Wingate Street) of the Avondale Racecourse, which the club identified as surplus to requirements. The club applied for subdivision consent in 2018 which was granted, and the rezoning follows the boundaries of the newly created lot. The change to the AUP includes:
   - the site is rezoned from Special Purpose-Major Recreation Facility to Residential – Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings;
   - the site will be removed from the Avondale Racecourse Precinct 1307; and
   - the Interface Control Area Boundary is moved to align with the new racecourse boundary.


PC 34: Special Character Statement for Special Character Areas Overlay – Howick Business
12. Plan Change 34 addresses two matters. The first is to add a special character statement for the existing Howick Business Special Character Area to Schedule 15 of the AUP. The second matter is to extend the Howick Business Special Character Area to include four additional sites. The buildings on these sites contribute to the special character values of the Howick Business Special Character Area.

13. Independent hearing commissioners approved Plan Change 32 with amendments. The decision amended the special character statement to:
   - correct minor errors in historical fact;
   - improve consistency of terms used;
   - clarify which features contribute to the overall character of the Howick Business Special Character Area; and
   - strengthen the special character statement in relation to Stockade Hill.

14. No other amendments were made.


Private plan change requests
16. The council must decide whether a private plan change request is adopted, accepted, rejected or dealt with as if it were a resource consent application. Decision-making is delegated to tier four planning managers. Where those managers consider the request does not raise any strategic issues and should be accepted for notification, they will exercise their delegation.
17. Delegation was exercised for the following private plan change requests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan change</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Plan change purpose</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Decision date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clevedon Kawakawa Road (Private)</td>
<td>272, 274 and 278 Clevedon Kawakawa Road, Clevedon</td>
<td>Enable the subdivision and development of 11 countryside living lots in a clustered arrangement on some 9.9ha of land.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>6 July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments to sub-precinct H – Flat Bush Precinct (Private)</td>
<td>Sub-precinct H within Flat Bush Precinct - Flat Bush School Road and McQuoids Road</td>
<td>Amend two development standards and make minor realignments to boundaries of sub precincts H, J and K and underlying zone boundaries</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>28 July 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remaining Auckland Unitary Plan appeals

18. The following appeals and judicial review proceedings remain:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appellant or applicant</th>
<th>Reference number</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Hearing date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cabra Rural Developments</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000189</td>
<td>Rural subdivision provisions</td>
<td>10 June 2020 11 June 2020 Environment Court</td>
<td>Awaiting decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cato Bolam Consultants Ltd</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-00207</td>
<td>Rural subdivision provisions</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Awaiting decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mason, David</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-00207</td>
<td>Rural subdivision provisions</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Awaiting decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Smithies Family Trust</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-00212</td>
<td>Rural subdivision provisions</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Awaiting decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Zakra Investments Ltd</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-00216</td>
<td>Rural subdivision provisions</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Awaiting decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Radiata Properties</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-00234</td>
<td>Rural subdivision provisions</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Awaiting decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appellant or applicant</td>
<td>Reference number</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Hearing date</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra Nova Planning Ltd</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-00248</td>
<td>Rural subdivision provisions</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Awaiting decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J and F Cock</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000199</td>
<td>Rehearing – location of Rural Urban Boundary in relation to the Pukaki Peninsula</td>
<td>20 July 2020 Environment Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookby Quarries Limited</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-000150</td>
<td>Significant Ecological Areas overlay – Brookby Quarry</td>
<td>27 July 2020 Environment Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Eastern Investments Ltd and Heritage Land Ltd</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Court of Appeal directed IHP to make a new recommendation on (1) whether Albany 5 precinct should be adopted; and (2) whether land in Sub-Precinct B should be zoned Business – Mixed Use</td>
<td>September 2020 Independent Hearings Panel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Eastern Investments Ltd and Heritage Land Ltd</td>
<td>ENV-2016-AKL-00213</td>
<td>Environment Court</td>
<td>Appeal is on hold pending the determination of the related proceedings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next steps**

19. If there are no appeals on the plan changes for which a decision has been made by the council’s independent hearing commissioners, the plan change will be brought to the committee for approval to become operative. If there are any appeals they will be dealt with in the manner agreed to by the Planning Committee at the meeting on 13 August 2020.
20. The private plan changes discussed in this memorandum will be notified within four months of the decision to accept them. Feedback will be sought from relevant local boards on the private plan changes after submissions close. Independent hearing commissioners will be appointed to hear any submissions and make the council's decision.

21. Hearings on the remaining Auckland Unitary Plan appeals are scheduled as set out above. The council awaits decisions from the Environment Court and High Court on those matters for which hearings are concluded. Decisions will be reported to the committee when available. The Auckland Unitary Plan will hopefully be able to be made 'operative in full' by the end of the year/early next year.
Memorandum

7 August 2020

To: Planning Committee, Environment and Climate Change Committee and Local Board Chairs

Subject: The current costs of adding trees to the Auckland Unitary Plan’s Notable Tree Schedule (Schedule 10)

From: Teuila Young, Planner, Auckland-wide Unit, Plans & Places

Contact Information: teuila.young@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Purpose

This purpose of this memo is to provide you information about the approximate current costs, timeframes and processes associated with adding trees to the Auckland Unitary Plan, Schedule 10 Notable Trees Schedule. It identifies possible efficiencies to reduce these costs. It also advises on interim changes to our website.

Summary

The costs to council of adding trees into the schedule of notable trees have been calculated at $1484.00 per tree. This reflects the process steps and expertise required to support the plan change process necessary to enable the addition to trees into Schedule 10 of the Auckland Unitary Plan.

Possible methods for achieving cost efficiencies to this process have been considered however the costs will still remain largely unchanged.

Officers remain on track to report on this matter to Committee later this year so that consideration can be given to the timing of a full review of Schedule 10 in the context of resource constraints and priorities.

The council website will be updated to alert people to the fact that the nomination of a tree for protection does not automatically protect a tree and that a plan change is needed for this to occur. The website will then be updated again later this year once direction is received from Committee on the timing of a plan change to review Schedule 10.

Context

1. At the Environment and Climate Change Committee meeting on 21 July 2020, you requested a memo about the estimated $1500 cost for each tree included within the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP).

2. Prior to the creation of the AUP, each legacy council had its own schedule which listed heritage/notable trees or groups of trees. These were evaluated using different sets of criteria (depending on the council involved) at the time that they were included in the legacy district plans. As part of the development of the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (PAUP) these schedules were consolidated. 519 submissions were received seeking additions to the PAUP schedule and 60 submissions were received seeking deletions.

3. The decisions council made in response to the recommendations from the Independent Hearings Panel (IHP) added several trees to Schedule 10 and several trees were removed.

4. The PAUP submissions seeking additions to Schedule 10 remain in a database along with new nominations received since 2016 for trees to be added to the schedule. As at 5 August 2020, a
further 68 unsolicited nominations for trees to be added to the Schedule have been received. These are proposed to be considered as part of a future plan change process for additions to Schedule 10.

5. Since the AUP became operative, Schedule 10 has been amended once via plan change 29 (PC29). This only included correcting errors such as mapping (e.g. tree identification is mapped at the wrong location), incorrect information in the Schedule (e.g. address and/or legal description is incorrect, the number of trees is missing/incorrect, the botanical and/or common names are incorrect or do not align), or items missing from the schedule or included in error. This process is currently ongoing and the hearing of submissions on PC29 is scheduled for 18 September 2020.

6. At the time PC29 was approved for notification by the Planning Committee, it was resolved that nominations for additions and/or removal of trees do not form part of the plan change process.

7. Subsequently the Environment and Climate Change Committee noted (resolution ECC/2020/30) that staff will consider the timing of a full review of Schedule 10 – Notable Trees in the context of resourcing constraints and priorities and report back to Planning Committee.

Process, timeframes and cost

8. It is difficult to quantify the cost of scheduling trees because there are many contributing factors. For the purpose of this exercise it has been necessary to make some key assumptions. These are outlined below:

   - The scope of any potential future plan change is limited to additions of new trees to Schedule 10 and excludes the re-evaluation of existing listings.
   - There are no duplications in the 587 nominations.
   - The 587 nominations are all individual trees and there are no groups of trees proposed to be evaluated or scheduled through this process as this would increase the timeframes and resources associate with a future plan change. All 587 nominations would be evaluated and proceed through a plan change.
   - Council would not be publicly calling for new nominations as part of this process, as timeframes and resources would correspondingly increase.
   - Required Plans & Places staff and specialists have available capacity to complete this work. This assumption relies on the ability to recruit to the Heritage Arborist vacancy given Emergency Budget constraints.
   - That arboricultural consultants can be used to backfill the Heritage Arborist roles so they can undertake the review and assist where required.
   - Calculations are limited to the 587 items¹ for consideration. If many new nominations for both additions and removals were considered as part of this process, timeframes and resources would correspondingly increase.
   - Staff costs are taken from the mid-point of each role's salary band.

9. Based on the information provided in Attachment A, coupled with the assumptions applied to the data, the current cost to schedule 587 trees is $371,000 (including ongoing Schedule maintenance costs for up to 12 months – this includes input on consents, monitoring conditions, attendance at notified hearings). It is estimated that from start (Step 2) to finish (Step 6), the process of adding trees to Schedule 10 and making the plan change operative would take between 34 to 42 months. Based on this information, the estimated average cost of scheduling

¹ 519 additions to the schedule were requested through the PAUP process and 68 nominations for additions have been received since 2016
a single tree is currently $1484.00. It is important to note, that it would be both cost and time efficient if additions to Schedule 10 occurred by evaluating large batches of tree nominations at once rather than individually and the cost of scheduling “per tree” does not adequately reflect the scale of the process.

10. Tree schedules are highly dynamic and are not as easily maintained as other AUP schedules which are static (e.g. Outstanding Natural Landscapes Overlay Schedule, Outstanding Natural Features Overlay Schedule) meaning that they fall further out of date over time. This is because (given the large number of properties it affects) subdivision, development and consents for removal/alteration as well as emergency works affect the description of listings on the Schedule. Updates will therefore be required, and errors will still be identified from time to time given the number of listings contained in the Schedule. To update Schedule 10 requires a plan change at cost to the ratepayer and the larger the number of items on the Schedule the more complex a maintenance plan change would have to be. These changes cannot be addressed through any other process.

11. If the decision was made to invite submissions on trees that may merit inclusion in the Schedule, this could precipitate a review of the current Schedule 10 listings. This would substantially increase the cost and timeframe required to deliver the plan change (that initially only sought to add trees) significantly. Given that a number of the current scheduled trees would not meet the criteria under the AUP (i.e. weed species or damaged/dead tree) it is also possible that the number of currently scheduled trees would be reduced. New nominations would also not have immediate legal effect (i.e. no immediate protection) under s. 86B of the RMA so those trees would be under threat of removal until a decision on the plan change is publicly notified.

12. Potentially, there are two council grants available to assist with the ongoing maintenance of notable trees on private property, the individual Local Board grants and Regional Historic Heritage grant. However, the funding criteria for the Local Board grants is at their discretion and may not include scheduled trees as a priority for funding. Funding is available for notable trees under the Regional Historic Heritage grant however, it is important to note that this grant has been oversubscribed.

Possible efficiencies

13. Possible methods for achieving cost and time efficiencies for future additions to Schedule 10 have been considered below:

- Approaching other areas of council for assistance, such as Consents and Community Facilities arborists to reduce the external cost for consultants. However, consultants would still be required if the scope of the plan change extended beyond the addition of 587 existing nominations. The process would require the timeframes outlined in paragraph 9 above.

- Creating a system prioritising the 587 nominations by only considering against a single criterion (as per the evaluation form found on page 11 of Attachment B). For example, limiting evaluation out in the field to only those which have heritage significance as indicated by the nominator. In terms of heritage specialist time these could be evaluated in conjunction with other work being done on site. This approach could possibly create cost and time savings in the evaluation of nominations stage when addressing heritage significance. However, it would not affect the cost of the remaining steps in the schedule 1 process. Also, assessing trees against a single criterion would potentially not provide a robust assessment and other criteria would need to be assessed moving forward and thus the cost and time would be multiplied for each assessment criterion.

- Undertaking the work in tranches as opposed to one large plan change. This would still require a process which may be inefficient as it would require several plan changes over the course of several years and may likely be perceived as unfair in terms of which trees are scheduled first when compared with other equally meritorious trees. The cost and time of the process would be multiplied by the number of plan changes required to
schedule the nominated trees. Piecemeal reviews may also not provide an opportunity to be more strategic in addressing the unequal distribution of tree cover across the region.

- General tree protection. Currently the schedule protects an extremely small number of trees in comparison to what general tree protection could. RMA reform Panel recommendations are silent on the matter of general tree protection (and s76(4A)) and whether the new system should specifically rule out the use of the general tree protection district rule.

14. The costs per tree of scheduling will remain high even after the consideration of possible efficiencies. As mentioned in paragraph 7, on 21 July 2020 the Environment and Climate Change Committee resolved that a report on the full review of the Notable Trees Schedule 10 be provided to the Planning Committee. It is likely that that report will be taken to either the October or November 2020 Planning Committee meetings. That report will provide a fuller consideration of all alternatives alongside a full review of Schedule 10.

Current nomination webpage

15. Currently the Auckland Council website contains nomination information required to nominate a tree or group of trees to be scheduled. It does not outline the timeframe it takes to complete this process. It also does not state that trees or groups of trees are not given automatic protection when they are nominated, though this information is provided in the guidance document (Attachment B). Please see Attachment C for the current wording on the website. A interim amendment is to be made to this wording to alert people to the delays between their nominations being received and a change being made to the AUP (including the Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plan). Longer term, once the Planning Committee resolve a way forward in relation to the notable trees schedule, further changes to the text can be made to the website.

16. The following wording is proposed to be inserted on the webpage:

> Please note that the nomination process does not afford automatic protection. Any new trees or groups of trees nominated for inclusion to the schedule need to go through a full process under the Resource Management Act via a Plan Change, and this is quite a significant process which involves professional assessment and a public submission process. Any nominated tree or groups of trees need to meet specific criteria for protection, which include features such as botanical significance, amenity or historic value. There is currently no plan to initiate a plan change that enables the public to nominate new trees for inclusion on the Schedule, although there may a process like that in the future. Completing the nomination form would be a positive course of action for you to take so that we have the details of the tree (or group of trees) on file should a plan change to add trees to the Schedule of Notable Trees be commenced.

Next steps

17. A report on a full review of Schedule 10 Notable Trees Schedule will be reported back to Planning Committee in either October or November.

18. The Notable Trees web page will be updated to include wording which reflects the delay between nominations of trees or groups of trees and scheduling. This change will be made by the end of this month.

Attachments

Attachment A: Process, timeframes and cost of adding trees to Schedule 10 spreadsheet
Attachment B: Guidance for Nominating a Notable Tree for Evaluation
Attachment C: Current Auckland Council webpage regarding Notable Tree nominations
Attachment D: Resource consent fee schedule associated with Notable Trees
Memorandum

To: Planning Committee

Subject: National Policy Statement on Urban Development

From: Eryn Shields – Team Leader Aucklandwide Planning
John Duguid – General Manager Plans and Places

Contact information: john.duguid@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz 027 203 2844

Purpose

1. To provide the Planning Committee with an update on the recently gazetted National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS UD).

Summary

The NPS UD was gazetted by the government on 20 July 2020. It comes into force on 20 August 2020 with ongoing timeframes for implementation. The purpose of the NPS UD is to require councils to plan well for growth and ensure a well-functioning urban environment for all people, communities and future generations.

As a high growth, tier 1 local authority, Auckland Council is subject to a suite of directive policies related to planning for growth. There are a number of actions the council must undertake with implications at the strategic, plan making and regulatory levels. The NPS UD may also have financial implications.

Key issues include the:

- need to enable development in locations, and at a scale, not currently identified in the Auckland Plan or provided for in the Auckland Unitary Plan
- need to initiate significant changes to the Auckland Unitary Plan within the next two years
- likely impacts on existing character, amenity and other values and potential community concern and opposition
- methodology for the required Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment and ongoing monitoring requirements
- implications if insufficient development capacity is identified in the Auckland Plan and/or the Auckland Unitary Plan
- potential financial implications both capex and opex
- potential implications of policies relating to development proposals that are not planned for or anticipated in existing planning documents such as the Auckland Plan or the Auckland Unitary Plan
- potential for ambiguity in relation to interpretation and implementation - some key terms are not well defined and new policy and planning concepts are introduced
- removal of minimum off-street car parking standards from the Auckland Unitary Plan.
Context

2. National policy statements (NPSs) allow the government to prescribe objectives and policies for matters of national significance that are relevant to sustainable management under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The NPS UD was gazetted by the government on 20 July 2020. It is part of the urban planning pillar of the Government’s Urban Growth Agenda. It provides direction to ensure housing capacity is provided in accessible places, close to jobs, community services, public transport and other community amenities.

3. The previous NPS on Urban Development Capacity 2016 (NPS UDC) required councils to improve planning processes to enable more development capacity. It has been replaced by the NPS UD. The council made a submission on the Proposed NPS UD.

4. To support productive and well-functioning cities, the government considers it important that regional policy statements (RPSs) and regional and district plans provide adequate opportunity for land development for business and housing to meet community needs. The NPS UD aims to improve the responsiveness and competitiveness of land and development markets. In particular, it requires local authorities to provide sufficient infrastructure ready development capacity, so more homes can be built in response to demand.

5. The government considers that three of the NPS UD’s provisions are key, as follows.
   o The intensification policies (Policies 3, 4 and 5) seek to improve land-use flexibility in the areas of highest demand – areas with good access to jobs, community services and public transport.
   o The responsive planning policy (Policy 8) seeks to improve land-use flexibility by ensuring local authorities have particular regard to plan changes that would add significantly to development capacity as they arise.
   o The removal of minimum off-street parking standards in district plans (Policy 11) seeks to improve land use flexibility in urban environments. It considers this will allow more housing and commercial developments, particularly in higher density areas where people do not necessarily need a car to access jobs, services or amenities. Urban space can then be used for higher value purposes than car parking. Developers will still provide car parking in many areas, and must still provide accessible car parking, but the number of car parks will be expected to be driven by market demand.

6. The NPS UD categorises urban local authorities into three tiers based on population size and growth rates. This approach allows the most directive policies to be targeted towards the largest and fastest growing urban centres, where the greatest benefits will be realised. Auckland Council is identified in tier 1, along with Hamilton, Tauranga, Wellington and Christchurch.

7. The NPS UD specifies that the council must involve hapū and iwi in the preparation of RMA planning documents and future development strategies. It also states that the council must provide opportunities for Māori involvement in decision making on resource consents, designations, heritage orders and water conservation orders.

Discussion

8. The NPS UD includes eight objectives and 11 policies that councils are required to implement.

9. The NPS UD also sets out 37 actions that councils must undertake to give effect to the objectives and policies. The actions identify specific matters, often contributing to the achievement of more than one objective. This memo addresses the interrelated actions based on the initial and ongoing implementation requirements. Specific timeframes for implementation are set out in the following table.
Initial Implementation - Objectives

10. All objectives apply from 20 August 2020. These will need to be incorporated into all decision making relating to urban development, including the future updates of the Auckland Plan, the Long-term Plan, Annual Plans, the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) and resource consents.

Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment

11. Tier 1 and 2 local authorities must prepare a Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment (HBA) for their urban environment to inform the 2024 Long-term Plan. There are several assessments that need to be completed in advance of the HBA, so they can contribute to the final report. The HBA is required to:
   - analyse the affordability and competitiveness of the housing market and the impact of planning decisions and infrastructure on that market
   - estimate demand for housing and business land, by type and location, in the short (zero to three years), medium (three to ten years) and long term (ten to 30 years)
   - quantify development capacity for housing and its feasibility and what is reasonably expected to be realised in the short, medium and long term
   - provide the basis for ‘bottom lines’ for sufficient housing development capacity
   - quantify development capacity for business land and its suitability in the short, medium and long term
   - quantify any insufficiencies in development capacity for housing or business land, and whether the shortfalls are due to planning or infrastructure constraints.

12. The findings from the HBA then inform the council’s planning documents. The council must ensure that it provides sufficient development capacity for housing and business land, including a competitiveness margin. If insufficient development capacity is identified, the council must notify the Minister for the Environment, change the AUP to increase capacity, and consider other options to increase capacity.

13. The council must also use the information from the HBA to produce a housing bottom line. A housing bottom line is the amount of development capacity that is sufficient to meet demand, plus the competitiveness margin. The housing bottom line must be inserted into the AUP.
Future Development Strategy

14. The Future Development Strategy (FDS) is intended to form the basis for integrated, strategic and long-term planning. The FDS should contribute to the council setting the high-level vision for accommodating urban growth over the long-term and achieving well-functioning urban environments. It should also identify strategic priorities to inform other development (such as AUP zoning and plan changes) and funding related decisions (such as Long-term Plan outcomes and the Regional Land Transport Plan). The FDS should set a high-level approach for how and where sufficient development capacity, to meet growth needs over the next 30 years, will be provided.

15. The FDS is required to:
   - respond to the findings of the HBA in terms of demand for and supply of housing and business land
   - integrate planning decisions with infrastructure and funding decisions
   - spatially identify where development capacity is provided and what additional infrastructure is provided considering other inputs including constraints on development.

Plan Changes – Out-of-sequence developments, Intensification, Car Parking

16. Councils must be responsive to privately initiated plan changes that would add significantly to development capacity and contribute to well-functioning urban environments. This policy means the council must be responsive, regardless of whether the development proposal is planned for or anticipated in the Auckland Plan or the AUP. It applies to development proposals in both greenfield and brownfield locations. The council is very familiar with responding to proposals of this nature, however the supportive provisions in the NPS UD could have implications.

17. Councils are required to initiate changes to the AUP to give effect to the NPS UD intensification policies. The NPS UD provides for greater intensification, including increased building heights in centres. This is intended to provide increased land-use flexibility and more competitive land markets in urban areas – for both existing urban and greenfield developments.

18. The intensification policies require greater building heights and changes to Auckland’s form in locations not anticipated by the AUP. The following table summarises these policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Implementation timeframes</th>
<th>Implementation requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>Plans must give effect to the intensification policies as soon as practicable and not later than two years after the NPS-UD commencement date.</td>
<td>Provide for and enable the benefits of urban intensification through regional policy statements and district plans (e.g., insert objective(s) to ensure they support intensification).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>Plans must give effect to the intensification policies as soon as practicable.</td>
<td>City centre zone – enable building heights and density to realise as much development capacity as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>Plans must give effect to the intensification policies as soon as practicable.</td>
<td>Enable building heights and density commensurate to the level of accessibility and relative demand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metropolitan centre zone – enable building heights of at least 6 storeys.

Walkable catchments – enable building heights of 6 storeys within walkable catchments of rapid transit stops, city centre zones and metropolitan centre zones.

All other locations – enable building heights and density commensurate to the level of accessibility and relative demand.
19. Councils are also required to initiate changes to the AUP to remove minimum off-street car parking requirements. The stated purpose of this is to enable more housing and commercial developments, particularly in higher density areas. Developers may still choose to provide car parking in many areas, but they will determine the number of car parks. The council must make this change to the AUP without following the usual statutory process of submissions, further submissions and a hearing.

20. The car parking policy does not impact on the following:
   o rules and engineering standards that set minimum dimensions for vehicle manoeuvring and car parking spaces, or where parking for vehicles other than cars is required, such as loading bays, drop-off areas, bus, bike and other mobility parking
   o managing the effects of car parking such as visual effects, stormwater and effects on adjacent uses. Local authorities can continue to manage these effects in ways such as avoiding or managing surface level or front yard parking, and screening parking areas from adjacent activities.
   o rules and other standards held under other statutes and regulations (such as the Building Code) as it relates to car parks, accessible car parking and fire service vehicle access.
   o rules which set the minimum rates of accessible car parks.
   o rules which set maximum off-street car parking rates.

Heritage and Character

21. The NPS UD allows for intensification to not be provided in certain circumstances. These are called “qualifying matters”. They include matters of national importance (under section 6 of the RMA) where building heights or density provisions contained in the NPS UD may not apply. This includes historic heritage.

22. There is also the ability under the qualifying matters to identify any other matter. Other matters could include amenity and the quality of the environment, being matters contained in section 7 of the RMA. These may therefore include special character areas and notable trees.

23. To be a qualifying matter the NPS UD requires an assessment of the impact of limiting development capacity for that area. To be “any other matter”, further site-specific analysis is required to confirm that the height or density provisions contained in the NPS UD should not apply in identified areas.

Monitoring

24. Councils must also monitor a range of indicators in relation to each of their urban environments. These requirements are summarised below.
25. In addition to these monitoring requirements, when preparing or changing the AUP where it affects urban development, the council must use evidence about land and development markets (including any relevant HBAs) to assess the impact of different options for urban development in the relevant section 32 and 32AA evaluation reports. Tier 1 councils have additional monitoring requirements in that they must monitor the proportion of development capacity that is realised in higher-density zones. This is to ensure that the outcomes described by the zone objectives (such as an identified residential density) are being achieved.

Resource consents

26. Under s104 of the RMA, the council is required to have regard to any relevant provisions of a NPS when considering an application for a resource consent. The NPS UD comes into force on 20 August 2020. However only a limited number of objectives and policies immediately become a relevant consideration for resource consent decision making. As the council meets the various NPS UD implementation timeframes, different aspects will need to be considered in resource consent decision making.

Next steps

27. There are no immediate policy decisions required from the council to begin the implementation of the NPS UD. The first discernible effects arising from this will be seen in some resource consents and decision making about plan changes (both council and privately initiated changes).

28. However, there are significant policy and implementation issues that are presented by the NPS UD. An initial workshop is planned with the Planning Committee to receive presentations from staff and discuss issues including the:
   - need to enable development in locations, and at a scale, not currently identified in the Auckland Plan or provided for in the Auckland Unitary Plan.
   - need to initiate significant changes to the Auckland Unitary Plan within the next two years.
   - likely impacts on existing character, amenity and other values and potential community opposition.
   - methodology for the required Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment and ongoing monitoring requirements
   - implications if insufficient development capacity is identified in the Auckland Plan and/or the Auckland Unitary Plan.
   - potential financial implications both capex and opex.
   - need to be responsive to development proposals, regardless of whether they are planned for or anticipated in existing planning documents such as the Auckland Plan or the Auckland Unitary Plan
   - potential for ambiguity in relation to interpretation and implementation - some key terms are not well defined and new policy and planning concepts are introduced
   - removal of minimum off-street car parking standards from the Auckland Unitary Plan.

This is not an exhaustive list, and it is expected that following further consideration of the NPS UD, additional issues and detailed actions will be identified. The implications of the NPS UD flow through to many other aspects of the council’s policy and planning cycle.