

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

AND

IN THE MATTER of Intensification Planning Instrument Proposed
Plan Change 78: Intensification (**PC78**) to the
Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part (**AUP**)

JOINT WITNESS STATEMENT IN RELATION TO:

Hearing Topics:

017A Walkable Catchments - General

017B Walkable Catchments – General Methodology

017E Walkable Catchments – Metropolitan Centre Methodology

017G Walkable Catchments – Rapid Transit Stop Methodology

014J Height – Rapid Transit Intensification Response

Expert conferencing held on	17 and 18 April 2023
Venue	Online
Independent facilitator	Ian Munro (Lead) Les Simmons
Secretariat planner	Wayne Siu

1. Attendance

- 1.1. The list of participants is included in the schedule at the end of this Statement.
- 1.2. The experts acknowledge that "walkable catchments" are not a matter that sit entirely within any one field of expertise. This conference includes experts from a range of technical backgrounds, notably planning, economics, landscape, urban design, heritage architecture, and economics. The different areas of expertise means that some experts have approached the issues differently to others, and such differences, where relevant to a matter of disagreement or agreement stated within this JWS, will be addressed in expert evidence.

2. Basis of attendance and Environment Court Practice Note 2023

- 2.1. All participants agree to the following:
 - a) The Environment Court Practice Note 2023 provides relevant guidance and protocols for the expert conferencing session;

- b) They will comply with the relevant provisions of the Environment Court Practice Note 2023;
- c) They will make themselves available to appear before the Independent Hearing Panel;
- d) This statement is to be filed with the Independent Hearing Panel and posted on the Council's website.

3. Matters considered at conferencing – agenda and outcomes

3.1. General comments relating to walkable catchments as planning metrics.

Amendments to text of Chapter G2 Walkable Catchments

- (a) **Greg Osborne and Robert Speer**, consider that Chapter G2 Walkable catchments should be amended to cross-reference and to reflect Policy 4 of the NPS-UD in terms of the presence of qualifying matters. **Greg Osborne** is of the view that giving effect to this would not affect the mapping of any Walkable Catchment but would affect the decision on what zones are the most appropriate.
- (b) **Craig McGarr, Cam Wallace, Daniel Shaw, David Wren, Emma Bayly, Mark Vinall, Matt Lindenberg, Phillip Brown, Rebecca Sanders, Rachel Morgan, Ross Cooper, Simon O'Connor, Tom Morgan** disagree and consider that qualifying matters should not be used as the basis of determining the most appropriate zones. These experts consider that walkable catchments and the zones within them should be determined on merit and that any qualifying matters be separately determined and justified.
- (c) **David Mead** disagrees with Greg Osborne as he does not consider a cross-reference to Policy 4 of the NPS-UD is necessary.
- (d) **Ryan Bradley** is comfortable with Greg Osborne's view as he considers that amending the text in Chapter G2 to include a cross-reference to Policy 4 of the NPS-UD would not change the Council's approach to determining walkable catchments and the most appropriate zones.

3.2. When considering walkable catchments as an urban planning tool, key issues to be addressed are:

3.2.1 The experts agree that walkable catchments are widely used in New Zealand and that several general or typical characteristics can be described without taking away from the opportunity of any individual walkable catchment to warrant a bespoke / different outcome. Key characteristics that the experts identified are:

- (a) Walkable catchments are very familiar to land use and transport planning, having been associated with centres-based planning and urban intensification (including providing a framework for built form, character, social interaction, and urban identity). The existing Regional Policy Statement e.g. B2.4.1, B2.2.1 illustrates this.
- (b) They provide for accessibility, choice, and amenity that are appealing as a lifestyle choice for many in the community and environmentally better transport opportunities.
- (c) Their historic association has been with an 'average person's' 5 or 10 minutes walk but this has generally been measured in practice by a 400m/800m distance. More recently, evidence has shown that some people are willing to walk distances much greater than 800m. Relevantly, different groups within the community have different abilities, and can walk at different speeds or walk different distances, and their decision to walk can be affected by different characteristics.

- (d) Walkable Catchments are a nuanced metric affected by many variables and which are greatly affected by their geographic extent. Measuring walkable catchments can be challenging, specifically in terms of the intersection between a walkable distance and the configuration of cadastral boundaries and land ownership.
- (e) How far people will walk will be influenced by the qualities and characteristics of the route. Both of these can be expected to change over time.
- (f) How far people will walk is also influenced by the qualities and characteristics of the destination, noting also that the walkable catchment destination could also be the origin of further trips. Both of these can be expected to change over time.
- (g) In general, as distance of the walk increases the proportion of the population likely to be willing to undertake that walk decreases, but this is a very case-sensitive and variable issue to quantitatively measure.

3.2.2 Notwithstanding the above, as a result of the experts' discussion **Alastair Cribbens, David Mead, Doug Fairgray, Robert Speer, and Ryan Bradley** identified, in their opinion, a concern that if walkable catchments are too great or too small, the ability to achieve a high quality compact urban form can be undermined. **Craig McGarr, Ross Cooper, Mark Vinall, Tom Morgan, Philip Brown, Jethro Joffe, Daniel Shaw, Penny Anson, Barry Kaye, Rachel de Lambert, Cam Wallace, Rachel Morgan, Rebecca Sanders, Peter Neeve, and Simon O'Connor** disagree with this.

3.3. **Implications of the NPS-UD on walkable catchments as an urban planning tool**

The experts agree that the NPS-UD presents the following differences in how to plan and use walkable catchments than has been the typical or general experience described above in 3.2.

- (a) The NPS-UD sets a minimum height of at least 6 storeys within at least a walkable catchment and does not provide for a granular/stepped down approach inside the catchment for buildings below 6 storeys.
- (b) The NPS-UD requires walkable catchments to be measured from the outer edge of city centre and metropolitan zones rather than a central point.
- (c) The NPS-UD requires the incorporation of walkable catchments thinking into resource management plans.
- (d) The MFE's guidance encourages walkable catchments to be measured on a consistent real-world basis of actual routes walked, noting that historically a Euclidean dimension was used on occasion (i.e., a precise jagged or irregular shape mapped following real-world routes rather than an abstract drawn circle).

Rapid Transit Stops

3.4. **How should Rapid Transit stops be interpreted for the purpose of PC78?**

- 3.4.1 The experts recognise that there will be instances where a RTS walkable catchment overlaps with other walkable catchments. It is likely that in such instances integration of those overlaps will be necessary but that the format of the PC78 Topics and conferencing does not readily allow for that. The experts record that individual opinions will be provided to the IHP as part of the expert evidence process.
- 3.4.2 The experts agree that key or unique attributes of Rapid Transit stops relevant to walkable catchment planning include:

- (a) Unless the RTS is within a centre, RTS are less likely to provide for the range of goods and services at the station. At least some of the RTS are currently configured as Park and Ride/Drop of points rather than as destinations/places of exchange.
- (b) The RTS does not have a zone and the NPS-UD specifies that walkable catchments must be measured from the relevant RTS entrance. The PC78 s32 documentation maps each of the Council's identified RTS and the entrances that it has identified. The experts agree that entrances do not need further analysis or justification and that it is the outer extent of catchments that is more relevant to the experts. In relation to any existing or planned RTS sought by submitters but not identified by the Council in the notified PC78, relevant details including entrances will be identified in the relevant expert evidence.
- (c) The urban context around RTS is much more varied than those of centres e.g. it ranges from inner isthmus through to outer greenfield areas.

Should any 'existing' services beyond the Rapid Transit Network (rail, busway) be included as a Rapid Transit service for the purpose of PC78?

- 3.4.3. The list of Council identified existing RTS is found in section 3.2.10 of the s32 'Implementation of Policy 3' evaluation report. Noting Williams Ave Bus Station (eastern busway) is operational and has been included as a RTS.
- 3.4.4. **Cam Wallace and Rebecca Sanders** consider that Devonport ferry terminal, and the northwestern busway stations at Lincoln Road, and Te Atatu should be included as a RTS. **Luke Elliot, Alastair Cribbens, and Ryan Bradley** disagree that Devonport ferry terminal could be considered a RTS due to the NPS-UD wording referencing road or rail and the frequency of services. They also disagree with the inclusion of the busway stations because they do not consider that the bus priority/bus lanes are sufficiently separated from other traffic to qualify under the terms of the NPS-UD.
- 3.4.5. **Daniel Shaw, Barry Kaye, Ross Cooper, Mark Vinall, Matt Lindenberg, and Philip Brown** consider that Onehunga and Te Papapa Stations should be included as a RTS. They also consider that some of the isthmus arterial bus priority routes could also qualify as RTS but that this is an ongoing investigation and will be addressed in expert evidence. **Luke Elliot, Alastair Cribbens, and Ryan Bradley** disagree that Onehunga and Te Papapa rail could be considered a RTS due to the NPS-UD language around the frequency of services. They also disagree with the inclusion of the isthmus arterial bus priority routes because they do not consider that the bus priority/bus lanes are sufficiently separated from other traffic to qualify under the terms of the NPS-UD as well as in many cases the bus lanes are not permanent/operational 24-hours.
- 3.4.6. **Barry Kaye** identified that the Kingsland, Morningside and Mt Eden stations are identified by the Council as RTS but sit within the Auckland Light Rail Corridor exclusion area. **Luke Elliot** confirmed that there are also parts of the identified walkable catchments of other RTS which also fall within the exclusion area (i.e. Grafton Station).

Should any 'planned' or other stops be included as Rapid Transit stops?

- 3.4.7. The list of council identified planned RTS is found in section 3.2.11 of the s32 'Implementation of Policy 3' evaluation report.
- 3.4.8. **Cam Wallace and Rebecca Sanders** consider that the Westgate busway station should be included as a planned RTS. **Luke Elliot** disagrees as he does not consider that the

bus priority/bus lanes are sufficiently separated from other traffic to qualify under the terms of the NPS-UD.

3.4.9. **Alastair Cribbens and Matt Lindenberg** consider that the Eastern Busway stations at Pakuranga, Edgewater, and Gossamer Drive should be included as planned RTS noting the designations/resource consents for these have been notified. **Ryan Bradley and Luke Elliot** agree on the basis that a Notice of Requirement/resource consent have been notified and they have been fully funded in the RLTP, except for the Pakuranga Station because its location, in their opinion, has not been settled.

3.4.10. **Matt Lindenberg and Elaine Chen** also consider that any station on a route where a Notice of Requirement has been lodged, including the Botany to Airport route, should be included as RTS for the same reason as the Eastern Busway Stage 2. They will elaborate and confirm these in expert evidence. **Ryan Bradley and Luke Elliot** disagree with this position, because of the language in the NPS-UD referring to projects needing to be identified in a RLTP.

3.5. Methodology for Rapid Transit stop Walkable Catchments

For walking only, what should the Walkable Catchment for Rapid Transit stops be?

3.5.1. The experts agree that when applying walkable catchments of any distance the metric must be treated as a form of guideline or starting point. In all instances it will be necessary to 'fine tune' the edge of the catchment to coordinate with property boundaries, roads, and other real-world factors. The experts record that determining these edges will be a very fine-grained exercise advanced through expert evidence.

3.5.2. The experts, after discussing the issue together and in light of the range of submissions that have been made on the topic of walkable catchments, agree that for various reasons, including simplicity, consistency, familiarity, and practicality, that at least as a starting point, the following intervals be used when considering and mapping walkable catchments.

- a) 400m (historically associated with a 5min walk)
- b) 800m (historically associated with a 10min walk)
- c) 1200m (historically associated with a 15min walk)
- d) 1600m (historically associated with a 20min walk)
- e) 2000m (historically associated with a 25min walk)

3.5.3. The experts agree that because of the varied context of the RTS it is not necessary that they all have the same walkable catchment extent. The experts were not able to discuss or agree a framework to guide that consideration further and it will be advanced through expert evidence. **Ryan Bradley and Doug Fairgray** acknowledged that there are submissions seeking RTS walkable catchments less than the notified 800m. They have not reached a view on those and record that the variation of catchment described in this paragraph could include catchments both larger or smaller than was notified.

3.5.4. **Cam Wallace, Barry Kaye, Daniel Shaw, David Wren, Rachel Morgan, Rebecca Sanders, Simon O'Connor, Matt Lindenberg, Peter Neeve and Philip Brown** consider that different RTS will provide differing levels of access to services and journey time which should be reflected by increasing the extent of the corresponding walkable catchment and/or development heights and densities. **Alastair Cribbens** agrees but only to the extent that development height or densities can be increased but not the walkable catchment extent. **Doug Fairgray and Robert Speer** disagree to the extent

that they consider the walkable catchment of an RTS should be commensurate to the services provided and the nature of the catchment.

3.5.5.PC78 as notified provided a 800m walkable catchment from the entrance of those RTS that have been identified by the Council. Notwithstanding 3.5.1 and 3.5.2 above:

- (a) As at the time of the conference, no expert had identified a specific RTS that in their view should have walkable catchment less than 800m.
- (b) **Barry Kaye** considers that for at least those RTS proximate to centres, a walkable catchment being a ground truthed 15 min walk (likely to be approximately 1200m maximum) would be appropriate.
- (c) **Cam Wallace** considers that for at least the Britomart, Aotea, Karangahape, Mt Eden, Newmarket, Panmure, Otahuhu, and Puhinui RTS, walkable catchment should be at least 1200m. **Cam Wallace** noted that these RTS are all rail transfer stations offering superior accessibility.
- (d) **Philip Brown and Barry Kaye** consider standalone rail RTS on the Auckland Isthmus should have a walkable catchment of at least 1200m and that those that overlap or are adjacent with centres should be larger. Although at this time **Philip Brown** does not have an opinion on what those extents may be. **Simon O'Connor** agrees and considers that in addition the Smales Farm RTS should be included as a RTS suitable for an enlarged catchment.

For Rapid Transit stops should the Walkable Catchment distance be set based on other modes of transport beyond walking (e.g. cycling)?

3.5.6. The experts agree that the RTS catchments should be based on a walkable catchment.

The experts are aware that many people have access to alternative travel modes and that people within a walkable catchment would be able to use those to access an RTS faster than if they had walked.

What routes should a Walkable Catchment be based on (e.g., publicly useable roads only, or other spaces)?

3.5.7. **Ryan Bradley** advised the experts that the notified PC78 walkable catchments were based on public roads (but without confirmation that footpaths exist, and excluding motorways), public walkways such as where a footpath connects between two cul-de-sacs, routes through public spaces.

3.5.8. The experts agree that across all potential routes, in all cases, public safety and convenient usability (i.e. such as if extensive stairs exist) must be properly considered, noting that non-RMA plans and strategies may be used by the Council or others in parallel to the day-to-day administration of the Unitary Plan to improve existing routes.

3.5.9. The experts agree that public roads (excluding motorways) are the primary basis for measuring a walkable catchment but on the assumption that roads being included have pedestrian footpaths on at least one side (either existing or budgeted). **Ryan Bradley, Doug Fairgray, Barry Kaye and David Wren** disagree that pedestrian footpaths are a necessary requisite for a route being included in the measuring of a walkable catchment.

3.5.10. **Don McKenzie, Peter Neeve, Cam Wallace, Daniel Shaw, Ryan Bradley, Ross Cooper, Philip Brown, Rebecca Sanders, Emma Bayly, Alastair Cribbens, Doug Fairgray, Matt Lindenberg, Elaine Chen, Morgan Shepherd, Penny Anson, and David Wren** consider that in addition, permanent and 24-hour publicly accessible routes not on roads (i.e. through a park) should also be included.

3.5.11. **Barry Kaye and Robert Speer** are not opposed to the consideration of permanent and 24-hour publicly accessible routes not on roads informing the determination of walkable catchments but that in the first instance the walkable catchments should be determined using only public roads. Reasons for this view include simplicity in calculating/measuring catchments and allowing for more flexible transport decision making by pedestrians, such as a decision to stop a walk along a street to instead catch a bus.

Are there any conditions that would limit an otherwise agreed Walkable Catchment distance (e.g., steep hills, crossing arterial roads, presence of qualifying matters) and if so, how?

3.5.12. As noted elsewhere in the Joint Witness Statement, the experts have expressed views on the need to ‘fine-tune’ the edge of catchments where they encounter real-world factors, and although not in terms of an agreed position, issues of the provision of footpaths and consideration of safety have also been acknowledged.

3.5.13. **Ryan Bradley** took the experts through the factors identified by the Council and set out in the PC78 s32 Policy 3 Implementation documentation (see Appendix 4 of the s32 documentation). These were:

- a) Severance (such as an arterial road), in the context of the time and opportunities that exist for pedestrian to cross the severance;
- b) Topography i.e. steep slopes (including a significant amount of steps) could reduce the catchment extent. The Council has not identified a specific metric for this factor;
- c) Block size to the extent that longer blocks reduce the appeal and likelihood of walking. The Council identified that blocks longer than 500m could create the disincentive to walking; and
- d) Environment and landuse mix to the extent that the more varied and engaging the walking experience, the more likely people are to walk.

3.5.14. In discussion with the experts **Ryan Bradley** confirmed his understanding that the walkable catchments in their various stages of development (i.e. ‘before’ and ‘after’ the above matters were taken into account) exist and could be made available to those experts on request. However, he was not in a position to confirm this, and it will need to be advanced by him and other relevant experts collaborating after the conclusion of the expert conferencing.

3.5.15. **Cam Wallace, Daniel Shaw, Gyanendra Datt, Rebecca Sanders, Emma Bayly and Don McKenzie** consider that the factors identified by Council and summarised in 3.5.13 above should not generally affect the walkable catchment extent and that it would only be in extreme or very rare circumstances that they would.

3.5.16. **Philip Brown, Peter Neeve, Craig McGarr, David Wren, Ross Cooper, Alastair Cribbens, Barry Kaye, and Matt Lindenberg** generally agree with 3.5.15, however consider that the factors identified by the Council could be relevant at the very outer

edge of a walkable catchment in determining the final configuration of what sites may fall in or out of the catchment.

3.5.17. **Ryan Bradley, Doug Fairgray and Robert Speer** are supportive of the factors identified and used by the Council.

3.5.18. Notwithstanding the recognised need for the edges of a walkable catchment to be ‘fine-tuned’ as identified elsewhere in this Joint Witness Statement, **Ross Cooper, Cam Wallace, Peter Neeve, and Robert Speer** consider that walkable catchment boundaries should be based on public land so as to avoid the environmental effects arising from blocks being bisected by potentially quite different planning methods. **David Wren, Philip Brown, Ryan Bradley, Daniel Shaw and Craig McGarr** disagree as this could become an uncertain and complex exercise that could substantially alter walkable catchments.

3.6. **What height standards should apply to buildings in Walkable Catchments around Rapid Transit stops, and why?**

3.6.1. **Don McKenzie** recorded that as a traffic engineer he has not expertise and no opinion on the question of building heights.

3.6.2. **David Mead** supports the notified PC78 in relation to ‘standalone’ RTS (e.g. where a RTS walkable catchment does not overlap with a relevant centre walkable catchment). He considers that a 6 storey standard represents a reasonable step up compared to current provisions, and in recognition of the existing residential context around those catchments. A 6 storey height is a known element which delivers on urban outcomes.

3.6.3. **David Mead** supports a centre specific analysis in each case for all those parts of a RTS walkable catchment that do overlap with a relevant centre walkable catchment. However, that would form part of the conferencing for the metropolitan centres and the city centres respectively.

3.6.4. To the extent that any changes in height limit from those notified in PC78 may be appropriate, **David Mead** explained a methodological preference that emphasises a gradient or transition in height from the urban core down to the edge. In at least most cases however, this would be a metropolitan or city centre issue and not a RTS issue.

3.6.5. **Rachel Morgan and Craig McGarr** identified that in addition to the ‘out of centre’ and ‘part of centre’ RTS contexts there is a third context being a RTS that already has existing zones (e.g. Mixed Use zone) enabling an urban, possibly 6 storey height, standard. These may also be suitable for height greater than the NPS-UD minimum.

3.6.6. On the basis of the above discussion, and mindful of NPS-UD concept of a well-functioning urban environment, the experts agree that the height limits in at least some of the RTS walkable catchments should be subject to further investigation. Such investigation will need to occur as part of the preparation of expert evidence, however, in the interests of trying to promote the most consistent possible body of evidence to the IHP, the experts agree that the following principles can inform the setting of height limits for RTS walkable catchments:

- (a) Mismatch between demand and PC78 capacity in a specific area;
- (b) Contributes positively to a coherent gradation/transition in height and scale, and achieving a high-quality living environment within the RTS catchment;
- (c) Commensurate with regional accessibility in the context of the location of the RTS and the role and scale of services provided by the RTS in the network;

- (d) The proximity and accessibility of centres, employment, FTN, cluster of social infrastructure, and or public open space, to a RTS.
- (e) The land characteristics of the catchment (e.g. gradient, presence or lack of constraints);
- (f) The effects of land and building cost in terms of enabling affordable housing, promoting efficient use of land e.g. economic feasibility;
- (g) Consideration of the effects of increased capacity and scale on one location, in the context of the overall regional settlement pattern;
- (h) Zone and additional height overlay as instruments to achieve the outcome.

3.6.7. On the morning of Tuesday 18 April noting that the Council's key witness on building height **David Mead** was not present, a majority of the experts present considered a revision to what had been principle (e)(it included a reference to qualifying matters on Monday 17 April) was necessary. In respect of principle (e), **Robert Speer** considered that qualifying matters should also be included as a valid and relevant land characteristic when considering the setting of height limits. **David Mead's** position on the deletion of a reference to qualifying matters is unknown.

3.6.8. **Rebecca Sanders, Simon O'Connor, Barry Kaye, Ross Cooper, Alastair Cribbens, Penny Anson, Daniel Shaw, Matt Lindenberg, Cam Wallace, Philip Brown, Elaine Chen, Craig McGarr, David Wren, Tim Heath, Peter Neeve, and Gyanendra Datt**, in relation to principle (a) consider that the wording and the framing of the NPS-UD is such that it is not necessary to demonstrate a definitive capacity need or that there is a shortfall as a means of justifying height greater than 6 storeys, and that principle (a) should not be used as a means of limiting height above 6 storeys simply because no capacity shortfall exists. This was identified on the morning of Tuesday 18 April and the position of **David Mead** is unknown.

3.6.9. **Rebecca Sanders** is not supportive of principle (b) only in relation to the resource management necessity for a transition of height.

3.6.10. **Elaine Chen, Cam Wallace, Daniel Shaw, Matt Lindenberg, Barry Kaye, Craig McGarr, Rebecca Sanders, Ross Cooper, Simon O'Connor, Gyanendra Datt, Peter Neeve, Tim Heath, and Philip Brown** consider that the principles set out at 3.6.6 should be applied in a way that considers future outcomes as well as those that exist today. This was identified on the morning of Tuesday 18 April and the position of **David Mead** is unknown.

3.6.11. In respect of the principles identified at 3.6.6 the experts agree (except for **David Mead's** unknown position) that they are not an exclusive or fixed list or with a fixed ranking or weighting. The intent is that they contribute to a consistency in the analysis that the experts will undertake and present in their evidence. For some experts the principles will not always be seen as equally relevant and in some cases, experts will disagree on the correct outcome for a particular RTS.

3.7. **Within a Walkable Catchment for Rapid Transit stops, what zones could be used and why?**

3.7.1. **Ryan Bradley** explained that the Council having identified a walkable catchment, did the following:

- a) Rezone residential land not affected by a relevant qualifying matter to the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone (THAB).
- b) Retain all existing business zones but made sure through height standards that at least 6 storey height was achieved where no qualifying matters existed. **Ryan**

Bradley also identified he understood the same had occurred for special purpose zones but was unable to confirm at the conference.

- 3.7.2. **Ryan Bradley, Robert Speer, and Doug Fairgray** consider that the Council’s notified approach is generally the most appropriate (i.e. still allowing for case-by-case considerations to occur) but is supportive of additional flexibility of use on the ground floor of buildings, for the reason of encouraging land use flexibility without undermining commercial centres.
- 3.7.3. **David Wren, Matt Lindenberg and Philip Brown** agree with 3.7.2 except that in their view, qualifying matters should not determine the zone or height outcome.
- 3.7.4. **Cam Wallace, Rebecca Sanders, Barry Kaye, Alastair Cribbens, Peter Neeve, Ross Cooper, and Daniel Shaw** are supportive of the provision of additional ground floor flexibility in the THAB zone.

Metropolitan Centres

3.8. What are the key or unique attributes of Metropolitan Centres relevant to walkable catchment planning?

- 3.8.1. The experts agree that some of the metropolitan centres are spatially large (in terms of an internal dimension between the external zone edges) and socioeconomically significant destinations that provide for a very wide range of social, economic, and cultural opportunities. The consequences of these characteristics could support arguments both in favour of larger and also smaller walkable catchments.
- 3.8.2. The experts agree that the concentration of activities expected or existing within Metropolitan Centres is likely to attract more pedestrian visits than lower order centres or other destinations.
- 3.8.3. The experts acknowledge that there are currently 11 Metropolitan Centres and they vary substantially in terms of size, state of development and so on.
- 3.8.4. **Don McKenzie** additionally considers that at least many metropolitan centres exist in an already well or semi-intensified context and in some places, a very urban character. This means that some of the considerations of route availability and acceptability that applied to some of the less urbanised RTS catchments would not apply.

3.9. Methodology for Metropolitan Centre Catchments

For walking only, what should the Walkable Catchment for Metropolitan Centres be?

- 3.9.1. The experts agree that when applying walkable catchments of any distance the metric must be treated as a form of guideline or starting point. In all instances it will be necessary to ‘fine tune’ the edge of the catchment to coordinate with property boundaries, roads, and other real-world factors. The experts record that determining these edges will be a very fine-grained exercise advanced through expert evidence.
- 3.9.2. The experts, after discussing the issue together and in light of the range of submissions that have been made on the topic of walkable catchments, agree that for various reasons, including simplicity, consistency, familiarity, and practicality, that at least as a starting point, the following intervals be used when considering and mapping walkable catchments.
- a) 400m (historically associated with a 5min walk)

- b) 800m (historically associated with a 10min walk)
- c) 1200m (historically associated with a 15min walk)
- d) 1600m (historically associated with a 20min walk)
- e) 2000m (historically associated with a 25min walk)

3.9.3. The experts agree that because of the varied context of the Metropolitan Centres it is not necessary that they all have the same walkable catchment extent. The experts were not able to discuss or agree a framework to guide that consideration further and it will be advanced through individual witness's expert evidence.

3.9.4. PC78 as notified provided a 800m walkable catchment from the entrance of the edge of the Metropolitan Centre zones. Notwithstanding 3.9.1, 3.9.2, and 3.9.3 above:

- a) **Cam Wallace, Daniel Shaw, and Don McKenzie** consider that in light of their scale and significance (including as recognised in the Auckland Plan), Newmarket, Takapuna, Albany, Westgate, and Manukau centres should all have a walkable catchment of at least 1200m noting Cam Wallace has not at this time reached a final opinion on that matter.
- b) **Matt Lindenberg** agrees with Cam Wallace and Don McKenzie to the extent that he considers a 1200m walkable catchment should apply from the edge of all 11 Metropolitan centres.
- c) **Ryan Bradley, Matt Lindenberg, Robert Speer, Doug Fairgray, and Alastair Cribbens**, although not at this time having a final opinion on the appropriate extent of walkable catchment for any metropolitan centre, indicated general support for the principle of the walkable catchments going 'up' in terms of height limits (not a specific matter for this conference) rather than going 'out' in terms of distance.

3.9.5. The experts are not in a position whereby they can definitively confirm the maximum extent of metropolitan centre walkable catchment they could support. However, the greatest extent that any of the expert could identify as potentially supportable was approximately 1600m.

3.9.6. The experts were unable to express any further opinions or reach any further agreements because of the complexity of, and variability between, the Metropolitan Centres. This issue will be further addressed through expert evidence.

For Metropolitan Centres, should the Walkable Catchment distance be set based on other modes of transport beyond walking (e.g., cycling)?

3.9.7. The experts agree that the metropolitan centre catchments should be based on a walkable catchment. The experts are aware that many people have access to alternative travel modes and that people within a walkable catchment would be able to use those to access a metropolitan centre faster than if they had walked.

What routes should a Walkable Catchment be based on (e.g., publicly useable roads only, or other spaces)?

3.9.8. **Ryan Bradley** advised the experts that the notified PC78 walkable catchments were based on public roads (but without confirmation that footpaths exist, and excluding motorways), public walkways such as where a footpath connects between two cul-de-sacs, routes through public spaces.

3.9.9. The experts agree that across all potential routes, in all cases, public safety and convenient usability (i.e. such as if extensive stairs exist) must be properly considered, noting that non-RMA plans and strategies may be used by the Council or others in

parallel to the day-to-day administration of the Unitary Plan to improve existing routes.

- 3.9.10. The experts agree that public roads (excluding motorways) are the primary basis for measuring a walkable catchment but on the assumption that roads being included have pedestrian footpaths on at least one side (either existing or budgeted). **Ryan Bradley, Doug Fairgray, and David Wren** disagree that pedestrian footpaths are a necessary requisite for a route being included in the measuring of a walkable catchment.
- 3.9.11. **Don McKenzie, Cam Wallace, Daniel Shaw, Ryan Bradley, Philip Brown, Rebecca Sanders, Emma Bayly, Alastair Cribbens, Doug Fairgray, Matt Lindenberg, Elaine Chen, Penny Anson, and David Wren** consider that in addition, permanent and 24-hour publicly accessible routes not on roads (i.e. through a park) should also be included.
- 3.9.12. **Robert Speer** is not opposed to the consideration of permanent and 24-hour publicly accessible routes not on roads informing the determination of walkable catchments but that in the first instance the walkable catchments should be determined using only public roads. Reasons for this view include simplicity in calculating/measuring catchments and allows for more flexible transport decision making.

Are there any conditions that would limit an otherwise agreed Walkable Catchment distance (e.g., steep hills, crossing arterial roads, presence of qualifying matters) and if so, how?

- 3.9.13. As noted elsewhere in the Joint Witness Statement, the experts have expressed views on the need to ‘fine-tune’ the edge of catchments where they encounter real-world factors, and although not in terms of an agreed position, issues of the provision of footpaths and consideration of safety have also been acknowledged.
- 3.9.14. **Ryan Bradley** took the experts through the factors identified by the Council and set out in the PC78 s32 Policy 3 Implementation documentation (see Appendix 4). These were:
- a) Severance (such as an arterial road), in the context of the time and opportunities that exist for pedestrian to cross the severance;
 - b) Topography i.e. steep slopes (including significant amount of steps) could reduce the catchment extent. The Council has not identified a specific metric for this factor;
 - c) Block size to the extent that longer blocks reduce the appeal and likelihood of walking. Council identified that blocks longer than 500m could create the disincentive to walking; and
 - d) Environment and landuse mix to the extent that more varied and engaging the walking experience, the more likely people are to walk.
- 3.9.15. In discussion with the experts **Ryan Bradley** confirmed his understanding that the walkable catchments in their various stages of development (i.e. ‘before’ and ‘after’ the above matters were taken into account) exist and could be made available to those experts on request. However, he was not in a position to confirm this, and it will need to be advanced by him and other relevant experts collaborating after the conclusion of the expert conferencing.

- 3.9.16. **Cam Wallace, Daniel Shaw, Gyanendra Datt, Rebecca Sanders, Emma Bayly and Don McKenzie** consider that the factors identified by Council and summarised in 3.9.14 above should not generally affect the walkable catchment extent and that it would only be in extreme or very rare circumstances that they would.
- 3.9.17. **Philip Brown, Peter Neeve, Craig McGarr, David Wren, Alastair Cribbens, and Matt Lindenberg** generally agree with 3.9.16, however they consider that the factors identified by the council could be relevant at the very outer edge of a walkable catchment in determining the final configuration of what sites may fall in or out of the catchment.
- 3.9.18. **Ryan Bradley, Doug Fairgray and Robert Speer** are supportive of the factors identified and used by the Council.
- 3.9.19. Notwithstanding the recognised need for the edges of a walkable catchment to be ‘fine-tuned’ as identified elsewhere in this Joint Witness Statement, **Cam Wallace and Robert Speer** consider that walkable catchment boundaries should be based on public land so as to avoid the environmental effects arising from blocks being bisected by potentially quite different planning methods. **David Wren, Philip Brown, Ryan Bradley, Daniel Shaw and Craig McGarr** disagree on the basis of what could become uncertain and complex exercise that could substantially alter walkable catchments.
- 3.10. **Within a Walkable Catchment for Metropolitan Centres, what zones could be used and why?**
- 3.10.1. **Ryan Bradley** explained that the Council having identified a walkable catchment, did the following:
- a) Rezone residential land not affected by a relevant qualifying matter to the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings zone (THAB)
 - b) Retain all existing business zones but made sure through height standards that at least 6 storey height was achieved where no qualifying matters existed. **Ryan Bradley** also identified he understood the same had occurred for special purpose zones but was unable to confirm at the conference.
- 3.10.2. **Ryan Bradley, Robert Speer, and Doug Fairgray** consider that the Council’s notified approach is generally the most appropriate (i.e. still allowing for case-by-case considerations to occur) but is supportive of additional flexibility of use on the ground floor of buildings, for the reason of encouraging land use flexibility without undermining commercial centres.
- 3.10.3. **David Wren, Matt Lindenberg and Philip Brown** agree with 3.10.2 except that in their view, qualifying matters should not determine the zone or height outcome.
- 3.10.4. **Cam Wallace, Rebecca Sanders, Alastair Cribbens, and Daniel Shaw** are supportive of the provision of additional ground floor flexibility in the THAB zone.
- 3.10.5. **Daniel Shaw** considers that in addition to the THAB or Business – Mixed Use zone, the use of a special purpose zone would also be appropriate on a case-by-case basis.
- 3.10.6. **Rebecca Sanders** considers that in addition to the THAB or Business – Mixed Use zone, the use of the Metropolitan Centre zone itself would be appropriate on a case-by-case basis.

4. PARTICIPANTS TO JOINT WITNESS STATEMENT

- 4.5. The participants to this Joint Witness Statement, as listed below, confirm that:

- a) They agree that the outcome(s) of the expert conferencing are as recorded in this statement; and
- b) They agree to the introduction of the attached information – Refer to items 3.1 – 3.10 above; and
- c) They have read the Environment Court’s Practice Note 2023 and agree to comply with it; and
- d) The matters addressed in this statement are within their area of expertise; and
- e) As this session was held online, in the interests of efficiency, it was agreed that each expert would verbally confirm their position to the Facilitator and this is recorded in the schedule below.

4.6. Confirmed online 17 and 18 April 2023

Expert’s name and expertise	Party	Expert’s confirmation (refer para 4.1)
Alastair Cribbens (Planning)	Waka Kotahi	Yes – participated in all items
Barry Kaye (Planning)	Ockham	Yes - did not participate in items 3.8, 3.9 and 3.10
Brian Putt (Planning)	Civic Trust Auckland, St Marys Bay Association	Yes - 3.1 – 3.4, 3.5 (except 3.5.4), 3.6.7 – 3.6.11, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, and 3.10
Bryce Hall (Transport engineering)	Freemans Bay and St Marys Bay Association	Yes - Did not participate in items 3.5 (except 3.5.4), 3.6.7 - 3.7.11, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9 and 3.10
Cameron Wallace (Urban Design)	Fletcher Residential, Oyster Management Limited, Stride Property Limited, Investore Property Limited	Yes – participated in all items
Craig McGarr (Planning)	Generus Living Group, Summerset Villages (Parnell) Limited, Century Group. Dilworth Trust Board	Yes – participated in all items
Daniel Shaw (Planning)	Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	Yes – participated in all items
David Mead (Planning)	Auckland Council	Yes – did not participate in items 3.5 (except 3.5.4), 3.6.7 - 3.7.11, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9 and 3.10
David Wren (Planning)	Domain Gardens Development Limited	Yes – participated in all items but did not participate in any discussions relating to eastern busway, Airport to Botany, and Drury RTS’
Don McKenzie (Transport)	Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	Yes – participated in all items with transportation expertise limited to walking matters and not height or urban design matters

Elaine Chen (Urban Design)	Kainga Ora	Yes – participated in all items
Emma Bayly (Planning)	Dalkara GP Limited, Hugh Green Limited	Yes – participated in all items
Greg Osborne (Planning)	Auckland International Airport	Yes - participated for items 1, 2 and 3.1 only
Gyanendra Datt (Planning)	New Zealand Real Estate Limited	Yes – did not participate in item 3.7
Jeffro Joffe (Planning)	Ockham	Yes – did not participate in items 3.4 – 3.10
Luke Elliot	Auckland Transport	Yes - did not participate in items 3.5 (except 3.5.4), 3.6.7 – 3.6.11, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, and 3.10
Penny Anson (Planning)	Bledisloe Property Group Limited, Build Rich, Excel Bloom Et Al	Yes – participated in all items
Mark Vinall (Planning)	30 Hospital Road Limited Partnership, Bill Patterson, Ken Wickenden and Richard Wilburn, Cornwall Park Trust Board, Piper Properties Consultants Limited, Shundi Tamaki Village Limited, Templeton Group, Winton Land Limited	Yes – did not participate in items 3.5 (except 3.5.4), 3.6.7 – 3.6.11, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, and 3.10
Matthew Lindenberg (Planning)	Kainga Ora	Yes – participated in all items
Morgan Shepherd (Planning)	Samson Corp and Sterling Nominees	Yes – did not participate in items 3.8, 3.9, and 3.10
Philip Brown (Planning)	The Coalition for More Homes	Yes – participated in all items
Phil Osborne (Economist)	Kainga Ora	Yes – did not participate in items 3.5 (except 3.5.4), 3.6.7 – 3.6.11, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, and 3.10
Rachel de Lambert (Landscape and Visual)	Auckland Thoroughbred Racing	Yes – did not participate in items 3.3 – 3.10
Rachel Morgan (Planning)	Fletcher Residential, University of Auckland	Yes – did not participate in items 3.5 (except 3.5.4), 3.6.7 – 3.6.11, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, and 3.10
Rebecca Sanders (Planning)	Foodstuffs, Goodman Nominee (NZ) Limited, Kiwi Property Group, Southpark Corporation, Viaduct Harbour Holdings Limited, Oyster Management Limited, Stride Property Limited, Investore Property Limited	Yes – participated in all items
Robert Speer (Planning)	Eden Epsom Residential Protection Society	Yes – participated in all items
Ross Cooper (Planning)	Auckland Thoroughbred Racing, 30 Hospital Road Limited Partnership, Bill Patterson, Ken Wickenden and	Yes – did not participate in items 3.9.7 – 3.9.10, and 3.10

	Richard Wilburn, Cornwall Park Trust Board, Piper Properties Consultants Limited, Shundi Tamaki Village Limited, Templeton Group, Winton Land Limited	
Ryan Bradley (Planning)	Auckland Council	Yes – participated in all items
Simon O'Connor (Planning)	Brett Carter Family Trust	Yes – did not participate in items 3.8, 3.9, and 3.10
Tom Morgan (Planning)	30 Hospital Road Limited Partnership, Bill Patterson, Ken Wickenden and Richard Wilburn, Cornwall Park Trust Board, Piper Properties Consultants Limited, Shundi Tamaki Village Limited, Templeton Group, Winton Land Limited	Yes - did not participate in items 3.5 (except 3.5.4), 3.6.7 – 3.6.11, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, and 3.10
Yu Yi (Planning)	MMBB Family Trust	Yes – did not participate in items 3.1 – 3.6