

I hereby give notice that a hearing by commissioners will be held on:

Date:	Monday 21 to Thursday 24 August 2023
	Monday 28 to Thursday, 31 August 2023
	Monday 4 to Thursday, 7 September 2023
	Monday 11 to Thursday, 14 September 2023
Time:	9.30am
Venue:	ТВС

HEARING REPORT – VOLUME THREE

FIVE NOTICES OF REQUIREMENT

AIRPORT TO BOTANY BUS RAPID TRANSIT CORRIDOR

THE SUPPORTING GROWTH ALLIANCE (AUCKLAND TRANSPORT AND WAKA KOTAHI NZ TRANSPORT AGENCY)

COMMISSIONERS

Chairperson Commissioners David Wren Alan Pattle Basil Morrison

> Bevan Donovan KAITOHUTOHU WHAKAWĀTANGA HEARINGS ADVISOR

Telephone: 09 890 8056 or 021 325 837 Email: <u>bevan.donovan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</u> Website: <u>www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</u>

Note: The reports contained within this document are for consideration and should not be construed as a decision of Council. Should commissioners require further information relating to any reports, please contact the hearings advisor.

WHAT HAPPENS AT A HEARING

Te Reo Māori and Sign Language Interpretation

Any party intending to give evidence in Māori or NZ sign language should advise the hearings advisor at least ten working days before the hearing so a qualified interpreter can be arranged.

Hearing Schedule

If you would like to appear at the hearing please return the appearance form to the hearings advisor by the date requested. A schedule will be prepared approximately one week before the hearing with speaking slots for those who have returned the appearance form. If changes need to be made to the schedule the hearings advisor will advise you of the changes.

Please note: during the course of the hearing changing circumstances may mean the proposed schedule may run ahead or behind time.

Cross Examination

No cross examination by the requiring authority or submitters is allowed at the hearing. Only the hearing commissioners are able to ask questions of the requiring authority or submitters. Attendees may suggest questions to the commissioners and they will decide whether or not to ask them.

The Hearing Procedure

The usual procedure for a hearing is:

- **the chairperson** will introduce the commissioners and will briefly outline the hearing procedure. The Chairperson may then call upon the parties present to introduce themselves. The Chairperson is addressed as Madam Chair or Mr Chairman.
- The Requiring Authority (the applicant) will be called upon to present their case. The Requiring Authority may be represented by legal counsel or consultants and may call witnesses in support of the application. After the Requiring Authority has presented their case, members of the hearing panel may ask questions to clarify the information presented.
- **Submitters** (for and against the application) are then called upon to speak. Submitters' active participation in the hearing process is completed after the presentation of their evidence so ensure you tell the hearing panel everything you want them to know during your presentation time. Submitters may be represented by legal counsel or consultants and may call witnesses on their behalf. The hearing panel may then question each speaker.
 - Late submissions: The council officer's report will identify submissions received outside of the submission period. At the hearing, late submitters may be asked to address the panel on why their submission should be accepted. Late submitters can speak only if the hearing panel accepts the late submission.
 - Should you wish to present written evidence in support of your submission please ensure you provide the number of copies indicated in the notification letter.
- **Council Officers** will then have the opportunity to clarify their position and provide any comments based on what they have heard at the hearing.
- The **requiring authority** or their representative then has the right to summarise the application and reply to matters raised. Hearing panel members may ask further questions. The requiring authority's s reply may be provided in writing after the hearing has adjourned.
- The chairperson will outline the next steps in the process and adjourn or close the hearing.
- The hearing panel will make a recommendation to the Requiring Authority. The Requiring Authority then has 30 working days to make a decision and inform council of that decision. You will be informed in writing of the Requiring Authority's decision, the reasons for it and what your appeal rights are.



FIVE NOTIFIED NOTICES OF REQUIREMENT TO THE AUCKLAND COUNCIL UNITARY PLAN BY THE SUPPORTING GROWTH ALLIANCE (AUCKLAND TRANSPORT AND WAKA KOTAHI NZ TRANSPORT AGENCY)

	TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE NO.
VOLUME ONE		1 - 12
Reporting officer's	report	13 - 286
Appendix One	Auckland Council Specialist Reviews	287 - 640
VOLUME TWO		641 - 652
Appendix Two	Section 92 Requests and Responses	653 - 844
Appendix Three	Summaries of Submissions by NoR	845 - 956
Appendix Four	Sumbmissions and Local Board Views Attachment four is contained in volumes three, four and five	
Appendix Five	Suggested Condition Sets NoR1 to NoR4a; NoR4b	957 - 1134

Trevor Mackie, Planner (consultant)

Reporting on proposed Notice of Requirements – see page 10 for full details.

REQUIRING AUTHORITY: THE SUPPORTING GROWTH ALLIANCE (AUCKLAND TRANSPORT AND WAKA KOTAHI NZ TRANSPORT AGENCY)

VOLUME THREE

1135 - 1146

SUBMITTERS - NOR 1 - BUS RAPID TRANSIT - BOTANY TO RONGOMAI PARK (AUCKLAND TRANSPORT):	
Page 1147	Xu Yajun
Page 1149	Kawaljeet Singh
Page 1151	Litao Chen
Page 1153	Eddie Cheok
Page 1155	Balwinder Singh
Page 1156	Ugan Naidoo
Page 1157	Roger Dundang
Page 1158	P Thambirajah & T Paskaranandavadivel
Page 1160	Kamlesh Rana & 33 Signatories



Monday 21 to Thursday 24 August 2023, Monday 28 to Thursday 31 August 2023, Monday 4 to Thursday 7 September 2023 and Monday 11 to Thursday 14 September 2023

Page 1199	BPG Developments Limited
Page 1205	Mr Aisea Sasalu
Page 1207	Theresa Tusa
Page 1209	Vanessa Phillips
Page 1263	Huaxiu Wang
Page 1265	Tanaz and Rustom Turel
Page 1270	Kathleen Waller
Page 1272	Danny Charanjit Singh
Page 1276	Rajnish Kalsi
Page 1278	Kindercare Learning Centres Limited
Page 1311	Mr Modher Adnan Abdulrazak Barakat and Mrs Yessar Ahmed Ali Barakat
Page 1319	National Mini Storage Limited
Page 1324	Anil Rodrigues
Page 1326	Business East Tamaki
Page 1330	Samir Chalabi
Page 1333	Taruna and Saurabh Tiwary
Page 1335	Heather Haylock
Page 1385	TIM Nominees Limited and The Saint Johns College Trust Board
Page 1409	Phisan Charoenmongkhonwilai
Page 1411	Samantha Searle
Page 1413	Paul Reyneke
Page 1467	Matthew Cheeseman
Page 1521	Maureen Irwin
Page 1575	Laura Unasa
Page 1629	Emerson Cheeseman
Page 1683	Tasman Accounting trustee Ltd
Page 1687	Jamie Khang Nguyen
Page 1691	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Page 1694	Mohammad Meraj
Page 1696	Kim Bloom
Page 1698	Telecommunications Submitters
Page 1705	Kāinga Ora Homes And Communities
Page 1730	Watercare Services Limited
Page 1734	Ministry of Education - Te Tāhuhu o te Mātauranga
Page 1738	Selemena Afamasaga
Page 1739	Paul Street, on behalf of Street Properties Limited.
Page 1741	Te Akitai Waiohua Waka Taua Trust



Monday 21 to Thursday 24 August 2023, Monday 28 to Thursday 31 August 2023, Monday 4 to Thursday 7 September 2023 and Monday 11 to Thursday 14 September 2023

LATE SUBMITTERS NOR 1 - BUS RAPID TRANSIT - BOTANY TO RONGOMAI PARK (AUCKLAND TRANSPORT):	
Page 1743	East Tamaki Investments Limited
Page 1752	Beale Partnership
Page 1759	Howard Property Limited
Page 1768	Ormiston Centre Ltd

VOLUME FOUR

1773 - 1784

SUBMITTERS - NOR 2 - NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT: RONGOMAI PARK TO PUHINUI STATION (IN THE VICINITY OF PLUNKET AVENUE) (AUCKLAND TRANSPORT):		
Page 1785	Josh Tiro	
Page 1787	Pengxiang Huang	
Page 1789	Neha Singh	
Page 1791	Ram Chandar	
Page 1792	Manjinder Singh Birk	
Page 1793	Rawandeep Kaur	
Page 1794	Lokesh Gera	
Page 1795	Monish Anish Prasad	
Page 1797	SPG Manukau Limited	
Page 1825	Jude Manoharan	
Page 1827	Maki Joseph-Tereroa and Makea-Rupe Tereroa	
Page 1829	Lynette Henderson	
Page 1831	Duncan and Sandra Loudon	
Page 1837	Simran Krishna	
Page 1839	Aneeta Krishna	
Page 1841	Ashok Krishna	
Page 1843	Murdoch Newell Management Limited	
Page 1854	The Legends Property Limited	
Page 1859	Kamlesh Rana & 33 Signatories	
Page 1898	Ormiston Centre Ltd	
Page 1901	Renaissance Apartments Body Corporate 316863	
Page 1906	Auckland University of Technology	
Page 1914	Minister of Education	
Page 1921	BPG Developments Limited	
Page 1926	Ben Schollitt	
Page 1928	Savitri Devendra	
Page 1930	Aaron Chand	



Monday 21 to Thursday 24 August 2023, Monday 28 to Thursday 31 August 2023, Monday 4 to Thursday 7 September 2023 and Monday 11 to Thursday 14 September 2023

Page 1032	Dannie Ha
Page 1934	Australasia Branch Office of Jehovah's Witnesses
Page 1935	Reena Rani
Page 1937	Risha Kumar
Page 1939	Ramon Lopez
Page 1940	Alice Anne Lopez
Page 1941	John Isaac Subhashni Devi Sadd
Page 1942	Simran Krishna
Page 1944	Minakshi Mohanlal
Page 1946	Avisha Mohanlal
Page 1948	Business Manukau
Page 1959	Kmart NZ Holdings Limited
Page 1962	Van Den Brink 652 Limited
Page 1968	A.M. Self Limited
Page 1974	Sandeep Kumar
Page 1976	McAlvin Sembrano
Page 1978	Scentre (New Zealand) Limited
Page 1980	Z Energy Limited
Page 1987	Bunnings Limited
Page 1990	Chalmers Properties Ltd
Page 1993	Fa'ana Campbell
Page 1998	PSPIB/CPPIB Waiheke Inc
Page 2001	Auckland Body Corporate Limited
Page 2005	General Distributors Limited
Page 2008	JOLT Charge (New Zealand) Limited
Page 2011	Heather Haylock
Page 2061	Harvey Norman Properties NZ Ltd and Harvey Norman Stores Pty NZ Ltd
Page 2073	Kotare Trust
Page 2074	Mitre 10 Holdings Limited
Page 2080	Phisan Charoenmongkhonwilai
Page 2081	Mr Martyn Chalmers and Mrs Nurhayati Chalmers
Page 2090	Centuria Capital (NZ) Limited
Page 2097	Joo Han Song
Page 2099	Su Me Lee
Page 2101	Vaine Tutai Richard
Page 2103	Christian Lewis Sims
Page 2105	Danny Charanjit Singh
Page 2114	Mr Shane Robert Haylock



Monday 21 to Thursday 24 August 2023, Monday 28 to Thursday 31 August 2023, Monday 4 to Thursday 7 September 2023 and Monday 11 to Thursday 14 September 2023

Page 2119	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Page 2122	Puhinui School
Page 2125	Abhisekh Mohanlal
Page 2127	Avisha Mohanlal
Page 2131	Roy Sembrano
Page 2137	Andrea Mead & Dr Stephanie Mead
Page 2142	Eke Panuku Development Auckland
Page 2153	Quadrant Properties Ltd
Page 2156	Arena Williams MP
Page 2171	Telecommunications Submitters - Chris Horne
Page 2178	Kāinga Ora Homes And Communities
Page 2203	Watercare Services Limited
Page 2207	Ministry of Education - Te Tāhuhu o te Mātauranga
Page 2211	Firdosh and Kashmira Siganporia
Page 2212	Selemena Afamasaga
Page 2213	Gordon Barthow
Page 2214	Te Akitai Waiohua Waka Taua Trust

VOLUME FIVE

2218 - 2229

SUBMITTERS - NOR 3 - NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT: BUS RAPID TRANSIT –
PUHINUI STATION (IN THE VICINITY OF PLUNKET AVENUE) TO SH20/20B
INTERCHANGE (AUCKLAND TRANSPORT):Page 2230VarinderPage 2231Karishma PinterPage 2233Colin Brent RobinsonPage 2235Parvinder singh

Page 2237	Ronil Prasad
Page 2239	Ganpat Patel
Page 2241	Bhaveshbhai Ramanbhai Patel
Page 2243	Hsin Mila Cheung Tsai
Page 2251	Adelante Holdings
Page 2252	John Hansford
Page 2257	Kamlesh Rana & 33 Signatories
Page 2296	Birgitta Sherley Prom
Page 2298	Wiri Business Association Inc
Page 2308	Manukau Auto & Tyre Centre
Page 2309	Jasvinder Singh and Harmeet Kaur Sokhi



Monday 21 to Thursday 24 August 2023, Monday 28 to Thursday 31 August 2023, Monday 4 to Thursday 7 September 2023 and Monday 11 to Thursday 14 September 2023

Page 2311	Lee mee THEN
Page 2312	Jehovah's Witnesses – Manukau Kingdom Hall Trust
Page 2313	Reena Rani
Page 2315	Michelle Joy Te Hira
Page 2320	KiwiRail Holdings Limited
Page 2322	Avisha Mohanlal
Page 2324	Minakshi Mohanlal
Page 2326	Anwar Ali Family Trust
Page 2329	Alex Herkes
Page 2330	Anahera Edmonds
Page 2333	Heather Haylock
Page 2389	Shane Robert Haylock
Page 2394	Puhinui School
Page 2397	Mr Rajesh Kumar Sachdeva & Sunita Sachdeva & Ripul Sachdeva
Page 2405	Abhisekh Mohanlal
Page 2407	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Page 2414	Quadrant Properties Ltd
Page 2417	Arena Williams MP
Page 2425	Telecommunications Submitters - Chris Horne
Page 2432	Kāinga Ora Homes And Communities
Page 2457	Watercare Services Limited
Page 2461	Ministry of Education - Te Tāhuhu o te Mātauranga
Page 2465	Te Akitai Waiohua Waka Taua Trust
Page 2466	Satnam Bhatt

LATE SUBMITTERS NOR 3 - NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT: BUS RAPID TRANSIT – PUHINUI STATION (IN THE VICINITY OF PLUNKET AVENUE) TO SH20/20B INTERCHANGE (AUCKLAND TRANSPORT):

Page 2470	Anita Singh & Ramandeep Singh
-----------	-------------------------------

SUBMITTERS - NOR 4A - NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT: BUS RAPID TRANSIT - SH20/20B INTERCHANGE TO ORRS ROAD (AUCKLAND TRANSPORT):

Page 2472	Tunicin Investments Limited and Airface Limited
Page 2478	Kamlesh Rana & 33 Signatories
Page 2517	Alan James Steele
Page 2520	Altrend Properties Limited
Page 2525	Avisha Mohanlal



Monday 21 to Thursday 24 August 2023, Monday 28 to Thursday 31 August 2023, Monday 4 to Thursday 7 September 2023 and Monday 11 to Thursday 14 September 2023

Page 2531	Minakshi Mohanlal
Page 2533	New Zealand Storage Holdings Limited
Page 2539	Wiri Oil Services Limited (WOSL)
Page 2545	Heather Haylock
Page 2586	Phisan Charoenmongkhonwilai
Page 2587	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Page 2590	Abhisekh Mohanlal
Page 2592	Telecommunications Submitters - Chris Horne
Page 2599	Fernbrook Property Ltd
Page 2602	Kāinga Ora Homes And Communities
Page 2627	Watercare Services Limited
Page 2631	Ministry of Education - Te Tāhuhu o te Mātauranga
Page 2635	Auckland International Airport Limited
Page 2639	Te Akitai Waiohua Waka Taua Trust

SUBMITTERS - NOR 4B - NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT: ALTERATION TO DESIGNATION 6717 STATE HIGHWAY 20B – STATE HIGHWAY 20 TO AUCKLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT (WAKA KOTAHI NZ TRANSPORT AGENCY):

,	
Page 2642	Wendy Jane Rodger
Page 2644	Kamlesh Rana & 33 Signatories
Page 2683	Maya Krishna Goundar
Page 2684	Heather Haylock
Page 2725	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
Page 2728	Telecommunications Submitters - Chris Horne
Page 2735	Fernbrook Property Ltd
Page 2738	Watercare Services Limited
Page 2742	Ministry of Education - Te Tāhuhu o te Mātauranga
Page 2746	Auckland International Airport Limited
Page 2750	Te Akitai Waiohua Waka Taua Trust

LATE SUBMITTERS NOR 4B - NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT: ALTERATION TO DESIGNATION 6717 STATE HIGHWAY 20B – STATE HIGHWAY 20 TO AUCKLAND INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT (WAKA KOTAHI NZ TRANSPORT AGENCY):

Page 2752	Altrend Properties Limited
-----------	----------------------------



Monday 21 to Thursday 24 August 2023, Monday 28 to Thursday 31 August 2023, Monday 4 to Thursday 7 September 2023 and Monday 11 to Thursday 14 September 2023

LOCAL BOARD COMMENTS ON ALL NOR'S		
Page 2758	Howick Local Board	
Page 2760	Otara Papatoetoe Local Board	
Page 2766	Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board	



Monday 21 to Thursday 24 August 2023, Monday 28 to Thursday 31 August 2023, Monday 4 to Thursday 7 September

2023 and Monday 11 to Thursday 14 September 2023

NoR 1 - Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

NoR lodged by Auckland Transport for a new designation to widen Te Irirangi Drive between Botany and Rongomai Park to provide for a Bus Rapid Transit corridor and walking and cycling facilities.

Key features of the proposal include:

- a dedicated Bus Rapid Transit corridor, centre-running along Te Irirangi Drive
- Bus Rapid Transit stations at Smales Road, Accent Drive, and Ormiston Road Botany Junction Shopping Centre
- walking and cycling facilities on both sides of the corridor
- swales and wetlands
- reas for construction related activities including yards, site compounds, and bridge and structure works.

NoR 2 - Notice of Requirement: Rongomai Park to Puhinui Station (in the vicinity of Plunket Avenue) (Auckland Transport)

NoR lodged by Auckland Transport for a new designation to widen a number of existing roads to provide for a Bus Rapid Transit corridor and walking and cycling facilities. Key features of the proposal include:

- a dedicated Bus Rapid Transit corridor, centre-running for the majority of the corridor along Te Irirangi Drive, Great South Road, Ronwood Avenue, Manukau Station Road, Lambie Drive, and Puhinui Road. West-running on Davies Avenue along the edge of Hayman Park
- Bus Rapid Transit stations at Dawson Road, Diorella Drive, Ronwood Avenue, Manukau Station, and the corner of Lambie Drive and Puhinui Road Station.
- walking and cycling facilities on both sides of the corridor
- priority access for fire engine movements across the Bus Rapid Transit corridor at Papatoetoe Fire Station
- new signalised intersections at Mitre 10 and Bunnings Warehouse, Lambie Drive and Ronwood Avenue, and Puhinui Road and Plunket Avenue
- swales and wetlands
- areas for construction related activities including yards, site compounds, and bridge and structure works.

<u>NoR 3 - Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit – Puhinui Station (in the vicinity of Plunket Avenue) to SH20/20B Interchange (Auckland Transport)</u>

NoR lodged by Auckland Transport for a new designation to widen the existing Puhinui Road between Plunket Avenue and east of the SH20/SH20B Interchange to provide for a Bus Rapid Transit corridor and walking and cycling facilities.

Key features of the proposal include:

- a dedicated Bus Rapid Transit corridor, centre-running along Puhinui Road connecting to the Puhinui Station concourse via a new Bus Rapid Transit bridge structure
- a Bus Rapid Transit station at Puhinui Station
- walking and cycling facilities on both sides of the corridor
- walking and cycling facilities will be provided along Cambridge Terrace, Bridge Street and Kenderdine Road
- wetland



• areas for construction related activities including yards, site compounds, and bridge and structure works.

<u>NoR 4a - Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - SH20/20B Interchange to Orrs</u> <u>Road (Auckland Transport)</u>

NoR lodged by Auckland Transport for a new designation to widen Puhinui Road between the SH20/SH20B Interchange and Orrs Road to provide for a Bus Rapid Transit corridor and walking and cycling facilities.

Key features of the proposal include:

- a dedicated Bus Rapid Transit corridor, centre-running on Puhinui Road through to the Manukau Memorial Gardens intersection (approximately 600m west of SH20/SH20B Interchange); and south running to Orrs Road
- walking and cycling facilities on southern side of the corridor
- swales
- area for construction related activities including yards, site compounds, and bridge and structure works.

<u>NoR 4b - Notice of Requirement: Alteration to Designation 6717 State Highway 20B –</u> <u>State Highway 20 to Auckland International Airport (Waka Kotahi NZ Transport</u> Agency)

NoR lodged by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency to alter Designation 6717 State Highway 20B - State Highway 20 to Auckland International Airport. The alteration is from the SH20/SH20B Interchange to Manukau Memorial Gardens.

Key features of the proposal include:

- to provide westbound lanes to Auckland Airport
- walking and cycling facilities
- a ramp from SH20B onto SH20 for southbound traffic while enabling a Bus Rapid Transit corridor.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Xu yajun

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: Yajunxu55@gmail.com

Contact phone number: 02102413956

Postal address:

18 Srah Place East Tamaki Auckland 2013

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we support the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

My house is located in the corner of Junction Road, currently my life is adversely affected by noise pollution from the cars on the road. We can not fall asleep until 2300hours every day. So if widening the road by taking my land, our life will be seriously affected by this. Therefore, From the bottom of my heart, I do not want my land taken by the government. However, as I know, Public work Act gives the Crown to acquire land for public works, what can I do? Also, Rapid transit corridor would benefit to many people who work at airport and Manucau area in the future, therefore, I would like to support the Notice of Requirement.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: I need to know how much land would be taken, how much compensation I will get, what is the process if I sell my house a few years?

Submission date: 15 March 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.

Have your say on Auckland Council's annual budget 2023 and 2024.		
	?	

CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Kawaljeet singh

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: kawalnz2@gmail.com

Contact phone number: 0204556837

Postal address: 53 te irirangi drive clover park Manukau Manukau 2019

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

There's hyge public park in front of our house why not take the land from park instead and i can sew all day buses are empty nobodu uses them and same applies for cycle lanw

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: They can use the public park property that is in front of our house instead of kicking us out we just bought our house last year in may

Submission date: 15 March 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Litao Chen

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: lee_chen74@hotmail.com

Contact phone number: 0212078351

Postal address: 16 Ardkeen Place, East Tamaki Auckland 2016

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

When the building process starts, my concerns are related to the issues below: - Will my property and land be protected? - Will a privacy concern be addressed in the sense that there will be an invasion of land; Also, while the building process is commencing, will there be compensation to address any noise complaint should it arise? - Due to the way the project is proposed, the fence is within the range of the project. Will this be rebuilt? Also, if so, would this new fence be built higher than the initial fence, as this raises a privacy concern? - As the building process is in progress, should the new bus route start to exude the property/land amount (which was initially stated in the letter)? Will we be compensated for the use of our property/land?

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we are neutral to the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

We will support the public, but we need our property and land to be protected as we pay for our property and land.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: we need more clear details on this building project and support from Auckland council before the project starts.

Submission date: 26 March 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.

Have your say on Auckland Council's annual budget 2023 and 2024.			
	2		

CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: EDDIE CHEOK

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: ecbh888@yahoo.co.nz

Contact phone number: 0275667898

Postal address: 3 KANTURK CLOSE EAST TAMAKI AUCKLAND 2013

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

Our property is located at 39 Kellaway Drive, although officially the address is recorded as 3 Kanturk close, East Tamaki. The garage to the house and the house frontage (main door) faces kellaway dr/Te Irrirangi drive as can be seen from the attached documents. The property can only be accessed via kellaway drive (both car and walk in) as with the properties adjacent to ours. Kellaway drive itself is only a narrow driveway (5.3 metres wide) and mainly serves the properties along the street. It is my understanding that kellaway drive is affected in facilitating the expansion to include a dedicated bus rapid transit corridor which includes walking and cycling facilities from Botany through Manukau to the Airport. Our concerns are as follows:- 1) Given that kellaway drive is narrow and is the only access to our property (and that of the adjacent properties), I am stretched to understand how any proposed plan could still allow the owners to access their properties safely and privately and we have yet to be provided with more detailed plans of what the future access to our property will look like. 2) Kellaway drive mainly serves the residents of the street and is therefore quiet, safe and 'private'. Thoroughfare traffic are rarely seen in the street. 3) Two of the occupants of the property (my parents) are in their 90s and require a wheelchair to move around. During the course of construction, access to the property will be extremely inconvenient to these old folks. Additionally, there are times when ambulance services are required and we enquire what facilities will be provided that will allow for quick and easy access to the property. 4) We are most concerned that the value of the property will be adversely affected by the proposed plan and enquire how the owners of the property will be compensated for any potential loss in value.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: We would like Auckland Council to provide further details of the proposed plan and what the alternative access for our property would look like. We would also like Auckland Council to respond to the matters/concerns raised above. A face to face meeting with a representative would be most helpful.

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.

Have your say on Auckland Council's annual budget 2023 and 2024.			

CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Balwinder Singh

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: seehranirmal@gmail.com

Contact phone number:

Postal address: 13 Brittas Place East Tamaki Auckland 2016

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

The reason for my views are that me and my family have been here for a long time and we dont feel like leaving our house. This will effect our property negatively. We do not have any plans of leaving this house this is why we do not want this project to go ahead.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: yes we do seek some recommendation.

Submission date: 2 April 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? No

Declaration

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Ugan Naidoo

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: usr@xtra.co.nz

Contact phone number:

Postal address: 2 Franco Lane East Tamaki Manukau 2016

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are: NOR 4b

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are: I am concerned that we lose our privacy and are now exposed directly to the main road.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: I want to see final drawings of the artist impressions of Franco Lane.

Submission date: 3 April 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? No

Declaration

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Roger Dundang

Organisation name: T

Full name of your agent: Roger Dundang

Email address: rdundang@yahoo.co.nz

Contact phone number:

Postal address: rdundang@yahoo.co.nz Manukau City Manukau City 2104

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are: Kept the environment as it is now

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: Affect many livelihood around the areas

Submission date: 30 March 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? No

Declaration

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.

P Thambirajah & T Paskaranandavadivel 213 Te Irirangi Drive Flat Bush Auckland 2019

Re: Airport to Botany Rapid Transport Proposal

To Auckland City Council,

As noted in the letter dated 10th March 2023, the land that is proposed to be redesignated is 732 square meters for all 6 properties (213, 211, 209, 207, 205, 203 Te Irirangi Drive). This area is a unique shared accessway to the 6 properties, through which there is access from the main road to the house in a safe manner. The changes that have been proposed will negatively affect this and compromise safe access to the properties.

It is not clear in the draft proposal where the road footpath and fencing (to avoid the road noise) will be placed. This could impact the house boundary and this information is not available in the proposal.

With the draft proposal the road will be closer to the house and therefore there will be increased traffic noise and vibrations.

For the property 213 Te Irirangi drive, there is an electric gate with brick and steel fencing. In addition, the parking to the property is on an inclined slope. The proposed redesignation seems to affect the fencing and therefore additional work needs to be performed to rectify the house boundary and safe access to the property. In the draft proposal limitations will be placed on the property and therefore will impact the property value. There is no mention of compensation for the redesignated area (732 square meters).

We have been advised that this proposal/project could take up to 15 years. This has caused a significant mental burden and is not fair to be placed for such a long period of time, as it will adversely affect the health, mental wellbeing, and quality of life. For the above reasons we are not in favour of the proposal.

Regards,

Paskaranandavadivel Thambirajah

Nalayini Paskaranandavadivel

5 April 2023

Planning Technicians Plans and Places Auckland Council Private Bag 92300 Auckland 1142

Dear Sir

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

In response to Auckland Council letter dated 10 March 2023.

We are the residents on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and will <u>object</u> to <u>destination process</u> on our property/ properties. There are many reasons that the vulnerable residents will impact from this construction and the livelihood and wellbeing of the residents will be lost.

The Auckland transport failed to provide a proper consultation with the residents of Puhinui road. The only two letters as dated received by the residents and Auckland transport neglected proper process.

There was one of the so-called 'community engagement' summaries in 2019 we found by digging through many layers of documents online. The residents of Puhinui road were not consulted or any information been shared.

The AT has failed to inform the affected residents and the owners were shocked when they received a letter that our property is at risk. It is a very unfair process and AT only consulted the general public and received only their opinion to increase the in favour of the project. AT has failed to door knock and spoke to the affected individuals.

The costs for the project will be over 2 billion, but Auckland transport has undervalued the cost to win funding from the government. It's a cunning plan from day one when AT never worked on true figures and hardly contacted or get public views for this project.

Not many have or excess to internet and some have English speaking difficulty. AT is trying to take away people's pride and many family homes without even their consent and proper consultation. Many people are not even aware that AT is interested in their property and to replace it with Bus line.

1. Puhinui residents are not aware of any partners and key stakeholders: presentations, small group meetings and one-on-one meetings as required; • potentially affected property owners/occupiers and businesses within the programme area: mail drops/ flyer, community open days, online information, visualisation, and one-on-one meetings as required; and • general public: community open days, online information and visualisation as stated by Auckland Transport.

#09



- 2. We are appalled that AT seems to think we, as residents, have been 'consulted'. The maps used are very broad and general, and it is only with the benefit of hindsight that we can read them and see anything other than the bus lanes that have already been installed.
- 3. Apparently 'affected residents' only get few mails drop as dated above and chances to attend a couple of 'consultation' event via Teams. The businesses were meant to have had a 'drop in' from AT reps, though the ones we have spoken to have no recollection of such drop ins.
- 4. The dates shown on consultation was pandemic year and Residents were not able to go or get proper consultation. The residents of Puhinui road have just found out what they received those two letters from the Auckland Transport.
- 5. This is taking place in a city that's barely recovering from a global pandemic, where households have been hit by all types of hardships: physical, financial, emotional, etc. We residents worked hard and build a house and a family home for the future. Suddenly someone just want to wipe out our livelihood and future of our children and grandchildren.
- 6. It is unfair process AT. I am sure that there will be other means and ways to deal with this project without putting further hardship and mental and emotional stress to the residents. There is other alternative such as Cavendish Drive which is commercial and less destructive to the residential occupant.
- 7. Both Cavendish Drive and Puhinui road can be utilized and save hundreds of vulnerable families homes and same money can be used elsewhere.
- 8. Some houses were built within last four years, but the council or AT never informed the homeowners that their properties will be impacted in future. Very poor planning and lack of care has been seen.
- Puhinui Road has been constructed so many times. Poor planners at AT and it costs taxpayers and rate payers so much unnecessary spending. Hundreds of Pohutukawa were planted and then destroyed by the AT on recent construction. That money could have been used and spent elsewhere.
- 10. There are many family homes and new homes built for the families and grandchildren and even designed for home base businesses. ie: 154 Puhinui Road, 172 Puhinui road and many others. Having to relocate it will be detrimental to the families.
- 11. There is shortage of housing in Auckland particularly in South Auckland. Some residents have brand new homes and invest lots of money and they are devastated after hearing that their home will be taken away from them. If compensated how much, a compensation will not fix the emotional stress which will be a lifetime one.
- 12. The current roading and walkway is sufficient for the public. The buses on Puhinui road goes empty every 10 minutes. There are hardly any passengers in the bus. Why such a big investment

and waste of ratepayer's money. The money could be used for other more important things eg: Housing and heath. More facilities and parking at public hospitals.

- 13. The people and (Ratepayers) of Auckland need more housing and healthcare care including many other more important necessities. After the pandemic cost of living has gone skyrocketing and government intervention is imperative and funding is required. Funding needed for public safety from the government. It seems AT has no idea that other places contribution and funding is required rather than only focusing in roading. For the size of south Auckland population right now we have road to cater the population. Puhinui road doesn't require widening and it is unfair to take away homes from the vulnerable.
- 14. The bridge at the airport need widening and that should be a priority. Currently commutes facing difficulty to enter airport which is only two-line bridge. The AT planners should focus on more important issues right which is the bridge and other part of Auckland like harbour bridge.
- 15. There are some residents who operates businesses from home and those will immensely be affected. Relocating will be very costly and will impact on customers and their business. Most of us are just recovering from the Pandemic and AT has some came up some crocket ideas just before the next election.
- 16. There is other better planning can be possible with affecting the residents. At present Puhinui road is wide enough and used for the bus lines on each side and plus the cars etc. The walkway is wide enough to be shared with bike lines. The other alternative is that AT can purchase half mitre on both sides to allow the bike line separately. Some owners were told recently that only a metre of their land will be bought, there is mix and inaccurate information form the AT. This will be less costly, and the residents' properties can be saved the money could be used for other more important projects.
- 17. Therefore, market rate is not a fair since the homeowners will lose lifetime and interest for their lifetime. Whereas others who retain home and not affected still assessed at market rate. It will only fair to consider double the market rate to enjoy and purchase another property elsewhere. The government should change the law immediately under public act to stop taking properties and those affected for relocation. We don't live in communist country and our land should not be taken away by force.
- 18. The AT has already did road improvements on Puhinui Road during 2021-2022. It must have cost the taxpayers and rate payers millions of dollars. The road for the purpose is perfectly fine. Why AT would like to demolish the road and to redo it again. It is bad planning by AT. It has been a nuisance for many years of unnecessary constructions on this road.
- 19. There are few new homes are on build and why Auckland council gave permit to build. The new homes will be affected and the cost mount up for the homeowners.
- 20. Government should stop revisit the legislation and not to force homeowners to leave their loved home. In stream case if it became necessary to leave than government should pay double of the market value. This in ease the pressure and hardship on the homeowners to relocate or build a home for their future.

- 21. My family purchased a land on 154 Puhinui Road, Papatoetoe about 25 years ago and built a new 3-bedroom house. We worked hard and bought up our kids and we never thought of moving out. Kids grown up and in 2017 we re-built and extended brand new house. We invested quality products inside and outside the house because this is our family home.
- 22. We planned to live and basically die in this house. We never knew or thought of moving out from this house. Our grandchildren's future to stay closer to school, shopping, and office to run my business and to serve community as a JP for the past 25 years.
- 23. It devasting for my family once we received letter from AT. We never been consulted or been seen by any AT member. We are having a sleepless night as we get up in the morning and think that we going to lose our best home. We don't have any other property and put everything and life interest in this home.
- 24. It is very hard to buy a comparable house with a separate office nearby. Also, it will be difficult to get loan from the bank and many other factors. The other factors such as housing market and shortage. We rebuilt our house in 2017 and if we have to build with same spec it will cost more since the price of material has gone up.
- 25. After talking to AT once few weeks ago, I was advised that they will start purchasing houses around 2026-2027. It was a shock to us and since then we are very upset and worried. There was no proper consultation and AT and the planners are at fault and deceived us for having a proper consultation.
- 26. Recently we heard that one property is already bought by AT. I have been told property at 1/199 Puhinui road has been purchased by AT. The project hasn't been gone ahead or approved yet, why and how AT could purchase this property. It is matter of interest that how matters are hidden under the carpet. Where taxpayers' money is spent unnecessary. The residents are kept in limbo and the matter is not transparent. The public works Act is too old and need immediate revision.
- 27. It is evident from the recent comments from the public after the Stuff NZ news on 20th October 2022, that this project and destroying over 400 homes will be waste of taxpayers' money. Light rail will be sufficient to replace bus line with a track.

Hundreds of Auckland homeowners could lose land to busway project | Stuff.co.nz

- 28. Puhinui road is heavily populated with residents and school. It will be unsafe to build a motorway on this street. Whereas Te Irirangi Drive- straight through Cavendish drive -via Clendon Road will be better choice while it is more of a commercial area. The residents don't want a motorway and through heavily populated residential area on Puhinui road, considering Puhinui primary school and childcare facilities on Puhinui road.
- 29. The residents on Puhinui road are protesting to the Government /Auckland Council, Auckland Transport and Waka Kotahi NZ to refrain from taking our properties and our life interest.

- 30. Since the Puhinui residents came to know that they may lose their homes, so they will not do any home improvement. This street will look ugly, and they will not be able to get a true value on their property. The government should look at changing the Public Works Act so that in this case people are properly compensated if their properties are affected.
- 31. Having a happy family and a nest (House) for the family is very important to any individual. It the most expensive asset that one can have in a lifetime. No one would like their nest to be taken away so easily. It is cruel and greedy that AT and government to any individual. AT can afford to buy our homes but we poor citizens can't afford to build or buy same house elsewhere. We are getting old. Please don't destroy our hard-earned asset and our precious temple. Cost of relocation will be daunting and very stressful and costly. This news and project driving people towards mental illness.
- 32. There are many public and homeowners support to stop this impact and stress on well settled residents. The government should intervene and find some other alternative to concur this serious issue. Just STOP these and take off the designation on the property titles on our properties. We all are in extreme stress and having a sleepless night and some owners getting emotionally stressed because there are no counselling services were provided. AT will be responsible for homeowners illness.
- 33. We request government and Ministers to intervene and stop this project going forward and use other alternative route such as Cavendish Drive that was initially planned. And do not run a motorway in the middle of heavily populated residential homes and schools.
- 34. We have attached 33 signed objections to stop taking our nest away and stop designation process or make any changes.

Homeowner/ home business: Kamlesh Rana JP Immigration Adviser Marriage Celebrant

154 Puhinui Road, Papatoetoe Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: Ashok & Aneeta Krishna
Address: 85 Puhinui Road, Papatoetoe
Phone Number: 0211229969
Signature: And Auto

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

Or phone to pick: 0275267262

Page1610639

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name:	JOHN	SADD	

Care to VISIY

Address: 196 PUHINUI ROAD

Phone Number:_	0211272046

Signature:

JOHNNY ISAAC 22 @ gnail. Come

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION - TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON PUHINUI ROAD FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: KENENDRA SWAMY (JAMES)

Address: 2/179 RUMINUI ROAD, PAPATOETOE

Phone Number: 022 - 5263757

Signature: Aramy

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: MAXINE DEER

Address: 1/148 putinu Road productoe

Phone Number: 021-02492149

Signature:

Household of 4 Kids 14, 10,9,5 And Myself.

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe



The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: Jupphray Roun		
Address: 92 a puline	Roal	pop optoe toe
Phone Number: $\frac{0225300586}{2}$		
Signature:		
Please fill the above form, sign this petition and	either drop off in n	ny letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

Page 101069

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: <u>CHRIS HANS</u> Address: 2/187 PUHINUI RO Phone Number: OZI 566 787 Signature:

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe
The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name:	PHUONG

Address: 136 Puhinu Rd

Phone Number: 02/2521832

Signature:__

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: ABDU	IL SHARIF
Address: 205	PUHINUI RD
Phone Number:	0210587614
Signature:	that

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: ABDUL SHARIF

Address: 205A Putinui RD

Phone Number: 0210587614

Signature:

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: CHANDRA LATA SINGIT Address: 190A PUHINUI ROAD, PARATOETOE Phone Number: 02102489389 Car Signature:____

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: UDAY SINGH	
Address: 1901 PUHINUI ROAD, PAPATOE	TOE
Phone Number: 0211219151	
Signature:	

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s **On Puhinui Road** Papatoetoe

OBJECTION - TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON PUHINUI ROAD FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: Aaron chand

Address: 124 Puhinui road

Phone Number: 0211609813 Signature: Rand,

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: Avilash Chand

Address: 124 Puhinu, Road

Phone Number: 0210513716

Deland	
	Bland

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: <u>REGNA RANI</u> MANI

Address: 1/10.3 PUHINUI RD, PAPATOETOF

0277103007. Phone Number: 0278295022 Signature:

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

A note from a homeowner on Puhinui Road:

It was great meeting you in person to discuss the impact on the properties which are located on Puhinui Road. We are also residents which are being impacted by the future development. We have been living here since 2009 and it's truly shocking and unfortunate that we may lose our property which we have worked so hard to attain. This home has been our treasure and it hurts to be forced to give it.

I am wondering if the project is planned in the next 30 years, in which case I wonder why we are affected 25-30 years before it takes place. A similar situation happened to residents on Redoubt Road. I have heard that a few properties have been claimed 4-5 years back and there has still been no development. This resulted in the properties being rented now.

We do not want to face a similar situation. Why would we sell our properties at current market rates now when the property values are declining? Hypothetically, after 20-30 years from now, property values may increase, and development may still not have occurred. Resulting in our loss of our property for nothing and a loss. We are the ones being impacted by this heavily.

It does not make sense to be selling the property at current market rates as in the future the properties may be further developed. This would take away from possible investment opportunities for the homeowners and their future which relies on their property. We have future plans to develop our property for our children and grandchildren which is now at risk.

Relocation at current times is extremely difficult as the homes are extremely close to necessities daily. As most properties in Auckland are extremely expensive it would be near impossible to find a property at a similar calibre as the ones we own.

Regards,

Reena and Manjinder

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: Sandrep Kumar and Greeta Bhardwaj

Address: 3/89 Pubinui Road, Paratoetoe

Phone Number: 0211281831

Signature: Gecta / Dum?

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

Or phone to pick: 0275267262

#09

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: Rawandeer Kaur	
Address: 186 A Puhimui Road	Papabetre
Phone Number: <u> </u>	
Signature: <u><u><u>R-logus</u></u></u>	

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: Manjinder Singh Birk Address: 186 Pulini Road, Papatoete

Phone Number: 0212146922

Signature: Manjuck Sh 17 in

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: Crampet patel	
Address: 165 Puhinui Rd,	papetote
Phone Number: 021022600	547.
Signature:	

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: INIRAJ BHUTANI	J ABHA WALIA
Address: 119 PUHINUI RO.	- Papatoene
Phone Number: 0211005791	102102967474
Signature: KShulan DP	a Walia

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

Or phone to pick: 0275267262

#09

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION - TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON PUHINUI ROAD FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: Mohammed & E Sazia Khalil

Address: 264 2 264 a Pubinui Rd. Papatoetoe

Phone Number: 0 21027 38836 th. Signature:

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinul Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora Dairy shop owner.

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: Bhavesh Pater

Address: 284 Puhinyi Rd

Phone Number: 0211571719

Signature:_____B-PC+vC

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name:	MARI	E STUG	LMAN
Address:_	154	WYLLIE	RUAD
Phone Nu	mber: 🛈	но <mark>л</mark> 833	42

ABE Signature:

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: <u>Anny</u>	Bui			
Address: 219	Publini	Road,	Papat	Retue
Phone Number:	<u>92/ 630x</u>	9.83		
Signature:	K			

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

Or phone to pick: 0275267262

#09

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: JOHN HANSFORD

Address: 138 PUHINUI RD, PAPATOETOE

Phone Number: 09 - 2780386

Signature: J. C. Hanfel

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name:	J Goud L	
Address:	306 PUHINUI	R
Phone Nu	mber: 00729033	306
Signature	: Hout	

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: BAL KRISHNA	
Address: 2/199 PUTTINUI ROAD - PAPATOETOL	
Phone Number: <u>02/964090</u>	
Signature: Add	

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: LES & CAROLINE TANA-TEPANIA Address: 132 PUHINUI RD Phone Number: 021 79 2 0 25 Signature:

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: GIANG THILAMTRAN & TRUONG CONGNGUYEN

Address: 200 PUHENUL RD - PAPATOETOE.

Phone Number: 02108225414

Signature:

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: Party Markhe Walker

Address: 193 Turinari Ra

Phone Number: 3275147866

Signature: Phy Mark

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: LOKESH GERA

Address: 104A, PUHINUI ROAD PAPATOETOE, AUGUAND

Phone Number: 020415 77753

Signature: Doccesh

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: Shavon Howell

Address: 2/193 Rukinui Rel

Phone Number: 0212573469

Signature: S. Howeils

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION – TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: <u>Ja'ang</u>	Campbell
Address: <u>]48</u> A	Puhinui Road, Papatoetoe
Phone Number:	022 1990 187
Signature:	upbel

Please fill the above form, <u>sign this petition</u> and either drop off in my letter box At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

The Homeowner/s On Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

OBJECTION - TO STOP IMPACT ON PROPERTIES ON <u>PUHINUI ROAD</u> FROM AIRPORT TO BOTANY RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT.

Kia Ora

I am a resident and homeowner on Puhinui road, Papatoetoe and I will object Auckland Transport and Waka Kotaki NZ for any impact on our property now or in any future projects.

Name: Khan Magbool
Address: 2 Ranfurly Rol Papataetox
Phone Number: 022032 8440
Signature: Angbod

Please fill the above form, sign this petition and either drop off in my letter box

At:

154 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe

SUBMISSION ON A NOTIFIED NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT FOR DESIGNATION FOR BUS RAPID TRANSIT – BOTANY TO RONGOMAI PARK BY AUCKLAND TRANSPORT

Section 168(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991

To: Auckland Council, Plans and Places Private Bag 92300 Auckland 1142 Attention: Planning Technician

BPG DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED c/- Ellis Gould, Solicitors at the address for service set out below ("**the Submitter**") makes the following submission in relation to the notice of requirement lodged by **Auckland Transport** in respect of a designation in the Auckland Unitary Plan for the construction, operation and maintenance of an upgrade to Te Irirangi Drive between Leixlep Lane and Rongomai Park to provide for a Bus Rapid Transit corridor, walking and cycling facilities and associated infrastructure ("**the NoR**").

- The NoR is a component of the broader Airport to Botany Bus Rapid Transit Project which will provide an 18km dedicated, high capacity, reliable, and frequent bus rapid transit corridor and walking and cycling facilities (the "**Project**").
- 2. The Submitter will be directly affected by the Plan Change as it is responsible for managing properties at 123 Ormiston Road, 277 Te Irirangi Drive and 308 Te Irirangi Drive (the "Sites"), parts of which come within the designation boundaries. The Sites are owned by:
 - (a) Ormiston Road Holdings Limited (123 Ormiston Road);
 - (b) Te Irirangi Limited (277 Te Irirangi Drive); and
 - (c) Etcart Holdings Limited (308 Te Irirangi Drive).
- The Submitter and the registered proprietors of the Sites are not trade competitors of the applicant for the NoR and could not gain any advantage in trade competition through this submission.
- 4. The Submitter is not opposed in principle to the NoR, and supports the Project, but seeks to ensure that:
 - (a) There will be no long-term (i.e.: post-construction) adverse effects on access to and egress from the Sites or on activities that are undertaken on the Sites;

(b) Adverse effects on the operation of the Sites during the construction of the Project are avoided or minimised; and

- 2 -

- (c) There will be no adverse effects to the current car parking layout, configuration and quantity both during construction and long term.
- 5. The reasons for the submission are as follows:
 - (a) Unless the relief sought in this submission is granted, the NoR will:
 - (i) Not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources;
 - (ii) Not amount to and promote the efficient use and development of resources;
 - Be inconsistent with the purpose and principles in Part 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("RMA");
 - (iv) Generate significant adverse effects on the environment, and in particular, on the Sites; and
 - (v) Not warrant being confirmed by Council under section 171 RMA.

In particular, but without derogating from the generality of the above:

- (b) The Sites comprise:
 - The Botany Junction Local Centre at 277 Te Irirangi Drive and 123 Ormiston Road; and
 - (ii) The Botany South retail centre at 308 Te Irirangi Drive.
- (c) The Submitter is concerned that the proposed layout of the designation, as shown in the General Arrangement Plan submitted with the NoR, may create significant adverse effects on access to and egress from the Sites.
- (d) The Submitter understands that the NoR is not intended to cause any permanent changes to property access/egress (i.e.: all of the vehicle accesses to the respective Sites are to be retained) but this is not apparent from the General Arrangement Plan.
- (e) 277 Te Irirangi Drive and 308 Te Irirangi Drive are primarily accessed via Te Irirangi
 Drive, including by way of existing left in / left out entrances at the southern end of

277 Te Irirangi Drive and the northern end of 308 Te Irirangi Drive ("**the LILO** entrances"):

- The General Arrangement Plan appears to indicate that the LILO entrances will be closed and not reinstated.
- (ii) In contrast, the NoR material indicates that, while the LILO entrances may be adversely affected by earthworks (from reforming and regrading works) during the construction phase of the Project, they will ultimately be reinstated.
- (iii) The Submitter seeks that the LILO entrances be clearly identified on the General Arrangement Plan as being reinstated and retained, and that conditions be imposed to ensure that there will be no long-term (i.e.: post construction) effects on them.
- (f) The General Arrangement Plan identifies amendments to the long-term layout of the intersections at:
 - Te Irirangi Drive and "Botany Way", which provides access to 277 Te Irirangi Drive and 123 Ormiston Road; and
 - (ii) Te Irirangi Drive and "Bishop Lenihan Place", which provides access to the 308 Te Irirangi Drive Site

which may compromise the use of those intersections by larger trucks.

- (g) Efficient vehicle access to and egress from the Sites is required to:
 - Ensure the operation and commercial viability of businesses located at the Sites.
 - (ii) Enable the businesses and services on the Sites to continue to provide functional benefits and urban amenity to occupants of the surrounding residential areas.
- Adverse effects on access to and egress from the Sites should be minimised as far as practicable during construction and avoided in the long term.
- (i) Adverse effects on the current car parking configuration and quantity need to be avoided both during construction and in the long term if the commercial activities and community services on the Sites are to continue to contribute to the social and economic wellbeing of the local community.

- #10
- (j) In addition to the more specific conditions set out below, the Submitter seeks inclusion of a condition which specifies that, once construction is complete, the extent of the designation will be reduced as soon as possible to include only those areas necessary for the permanent operation and maintenance of the proposed work, or mitigation of effects generated by it.
- (k) A construction traffic management plan has not been provided with the application. The designation should require that this be provided prior to commencement of the works and should include conditions which ensure that the works undertaken will not generate unnecessary and inappropriate adverse effects on the Site.
- 6. The Submitter seeks that the NoR be accepted <u>provided</u> conditions are inserted to address the following:
 - (a) That the designation be amended and conditions imposed on it to ensure that:
 - Direct vehicle access between Te Irirangi Drive and both 277 Te Irirangi Drive and 308 Te Irirangi Drive via the LILO entrances is reinstated and retained.
 - (ii) Direct vehicle access between "Botany Way" and both 277 Te Irirangi Drive and 123 Ormiston Road shall not be significantly altered and shall be retained in a form that enables an 11.5 metre truck to be accommodated following completion of construction.
 - (iii) Direct vehicle access between "Bishop Lenihan Place" and 308 Te Irirangi Drive shall not be significantly altered and shall be retained in a form that enables a 12.6 metre truck to be accommodated following completion of construction.
 - (b) That conditions are imposed on the designation to ensure that:
 - (i) There will be no long-term (i.e.: post construction) effects on any of the existing vehicle accesses serving the Sites and that those accesses will be retained largely in their current form following completion of construction.
 - Adverse effects on access to and egress from the Sites are minimised as far as practicable during construction.
 - (iii) There will be no adverse effects in respect of the current car parking configuration and quantity both during construction and in the long term.

- (iv) The extent of the designation is reduced as soon as possible once construction in the immediate vicinity of each Site is completed, so that the residual designation includes only those areas necessary for the permanent operation and maintenance of the proposed work, or mitigation of effects generated by it.
- (v) Prior to the commencement of construction in the vicinity of the Sites, a construction traffic management plan applying to the road network in the immediate vicinity of the Sites is:
 - Prepared by the requiring authority in consultation with the Submitter;
 - Provided to Council, along with details of the Submitter's observations and comments on the plan, if any; and
 - Approved by the Council.
- (c) Such other conditions, relief or other consequential amendments as are considered appropriate or necessary to address the matters outlined in this submission.

If the above relief is not accepted, the Submitter seeks that the NoR be declined.

- 7. The Submitter wishes to be heard in support of its submission.
- 8. If other parties make a similar submission, the Submitter would consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing.

DATED this 6TH day of April 2023

BPG DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED by its solicitors and duly authorised agents, Ellis Gould

D A Allan / C S S Woodhouse

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE: The offices of Ellis Gould, Solicitors, Level 31, Vero Centre, 48 Shortland Street, PO Box 1509. Auckland 1140, DX CP22003, Auckland. Telephone: (09) 307-2172, Facsimile: (09) 358-5215. Attention: Douglas Allan: <u>dallan@ellisgould.co.nz</u>

The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Mr Aisea Sasalu

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: iceman261091@gmail.com

Contact phone number: 02108893999

Postal address: 71 Te irirangi dr clover park Manukau city Auckland 2019

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

our family has lived at 71 te irirangi drive for close to 50 yrs .This address is the homestead or (FAMILY HOME) to (4 generations) of our family .my father Jione Sasalu on whos behalf i make this submission today , will be 80 in aug he has prostate cancer amongst other medical conditions ,he is comfortable where he is and feels secure in the place that he has and continues to call home for the last 48ish yrs. his wife /my mother past sadly 9 yrs back and the house holds memories of her for him and all of us ,. think it would be really coldhearted to remove a sick old man from his HOME in this his twilight years .

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: we want to know if its possible to save my fathers property

Submission date: 8 April 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? No

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.

We're turning your food scraps into clean energy.	
?	

CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.
The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Theresa Tusa

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: theresa.tusa08@gmail.com

Contact phone number:

Postal address:

2019

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are: Based on increased traffic and car parking issues associated with the planning and development.

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

The height, bulk, scale and design of the plan for a Bus Rapid Transit has an immediate impact on my household and neighbourhood. -there will be an increase in traffic to an already congested road. -no public parking will be available to allow for the Bus Rapid Transit. -increased traffic will have a significant negative impact on both the public and residents safety. Bus Stations will impact neighbouring properties (e.g. impacts on privacy, outlook, noise and disturbance, etc.).

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: If the planning and development of the Bus Rapid Transit goes ahead. -Please provide specific details on how residences will be impacted (e.g sq metres required from properties to allow for bus stations and the road extension). -specific timeline on proposed planning.

Submission date: 8 April 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? No

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of

requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Vanessa Phillips

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: vanessa.phillips.nz@gmail.com

Contact phone number: 021869271

Postal address: 12 Wando Lane East Tamaki Auckland 2014

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are: Project scope Walking and cycling networks Reduction in urban ngahere Increased flooding risk

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

The project has always been Airport to Botany - rapid transit network (RTN) (the project). The current RLTP highlights delivering a significant increase in rapid transit travel options (fast, frequent, high capacity bus and train services separated from general traffic). Walking and Cycling are not forms of rapid transit. These should not be included in this projects scope. An example of how the project has been described to stakeholders and the public is "The next stages to be delivered under this RLTP involve protecting the future A2B rapid transit corridor, between Auckland Airport and Botany via Manukau, and extending the new AirportLink bus to Botany via Te Irirangi Drive. Extending the AirportLink bus to Botany will be supported by bus interchanges and priority improvements along Te Irirangi Drive, with a move toward a rapid transit corridor in future decades." There is no mention of walking and cycling. Therefore, the stakeholders and public have been misled. Support was gained prior to the inclusion of walking and cycling. The consequences of including improved walking and cycling into the project scope is a significant increase in project costs, an enormous reduction in trees and the urban ngahere canopy coverage across this area, increased flooding risk and climate impacts, an increase in the urban heat and island effect, decreased visual amenity, loss of shade, decreased health and wellbeing to the public and decreased air quality. These impacts are significant and outweigh the benefits of pouring concrete in place of these trees for walking and cycling. There is already footpaths. It is legal for cyclists to ride on the roads. An alternative would be to incorporate a cycling network into the median strip of Ti Irirangi Drive where the RTN busway will go as this will have such few buses, at most, one every 15 minutes I assume and the road is very long and straight to the bus and cyclist will see each other. I don't believe this project has been transparent with making stakeholders aware of the impacts of including the improved walking and cycling networks into this project. It has been a late



addition and one I would deem as misleading after support for the project was gained. I am appalled decision makers have agreed to the destruction of thousands of trees to pour concrete to allow a better footpath / cycling path when this already exists. I don't agree with the statement that that is what public feedback has said. The public would not want improved walking and cycling networks by the destruction of thousands of trees. Should this project proceed unchanged, the inclusion of the walking and cycling aspect no longer adheres to Te-Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan, specifically Action Area N2 and Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy. The specific principals this violates is - Grow our rural and urban ngahere (forest) Action area N2: Grow and protect our rural and urban ngahere (forest) to maximise carbon capture and build resilience to climate change. And • Increase indigenous tree plantings in road corridors, parks and open spaces. Each CCO must work within Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Action Framework. I am not opposed to the RTN along the median strip of Ti Irirangi Drive and would like the project scope and the Notice of Requirement designation reduced to include only the median strip of land.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: Request the project scope is reduced to a rapid transit network - Airport to Botany. Oppose the inclusion of improved walking and cycling networks due to the destruction of thousands of trees to pour concrete to achieve this. Oppose the removal of trees lining Ti Irirangi Drive creating good canopy coverage and reduced flooding risks to nearby residents. Request the designation of the Notice of Requirement is restricted to the median strip along Ti Irirangi Drive only (and including any areas required for stations) as this is sufficient enough to complete the rapid transit network - Airport to Botany as per the original intent of the project.

Submission date: 8 April 2023

Supporting documents howick-canopy-analysis-report-2021.pdf urban-ngahere-forest-strategy.pdf

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

Howick Local Board Ngahere Analysis Update 2021 Canopy cover changes with the 2013 to 2016/2018 LiDAR data

Urban Ngahere Strategy 2019 Knowing Programme



A summary of the urban environment in Howick

Approximately **142,700** residents Less than **1%** of canopy cover more than **30 metres** tall

Average canopy cover of

54% of canopy cover with no statutory protection

More than 230 local parks and 55 playgrounds

293 hectares of Significant Ecological Area

Two statistical areas - Shelly Park and Tuscany Heights - with more than **30%** canopy cover

> More than **70%** of total canopy cover on private land

across local board, including canopy cover of: 26% 8% 12% 17% on road reserves on other public land on private land

New zoning under Auckland Unitary Plan includes Mixed Housing Urban, Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings

1.8% of original indigenous vegetation cover remaining

Notable Tree records

1,123 hectares of urban forest in 2013, **remaining the same in 2016/2018**



Nearly 7,000 hectares of land

727

hectares of parks, including:

- Mangemangeroa Reserve
- Point View Reserve
- Murphys Bush

© 2021 Auckland Council Howick Local Board

Auckland Council disclaims any liability whatsoever in connection with any action taken in reliance of this document for any error, deficiency, flaw or omission contained in it.

Date: September 2021

ISBN 978-1-99-100252-5 (Print)

ISBN 978-1-99-100253-2 (PDF)

This document is licensed for re-use under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence.

In summary, you are free to copy, distribute and adapt the material, as long as you attribute it to the Auckland Council and abide by the other licence terms.



Contents

1.0	Preface		1			
2.0	O Introduction					
	2.1	Howick Local Board	2			
	2.2	Study Background	3			
	2.3	Data Collection	3			
3.0	3.0 Results and Discussion					
	3.1	Urban Canopy Cover Overview	4			
	3.2	Canopy Distribution across Howick Local Board	5			
	3.3	Urban Ngahere Canopy Height	8			
	3.4	Urban Ngahere Tenure	9			
	3.5	Urban Ngahere in Relation to Growth Pressures	10			
	3.6	Recommendations	13			
4.0	Acknowled	gements	14			
5.0	References		14			

1.0 Preface

Tāmaki-Makaurau / Auckland is New Zealand's largest city, and plantings of exotic and native trees have taken place as the region has developed. Early Māori settlers would have planted trees such as karaka, pūriri and tōtara to indicate a special place or to mark a celebration, while European settlers planted trees that were familiar and provided a sense of place. London Plane, English Oak, and European Lime trees were some of the earliest recorded plantings in Auckland. Settlers arriving from around the world commenced the history of Auckland's diverse and unique tree cover.

When European settlers arrived to Tāmaki-Makaurau / Auckland, the gullies of the isthmus were filled with raupō, edged with a varied growth of sedges and other moisture loving plants; and slopes of gullies covered with karamū and cabbage trees. By the late nineteenth century, much of the Auckland area was under cultivation with a large number of introduced plants. Along with residential development commencing in the mid-20th century, these actions have now reduced indigenous forest cover within the Howick Local Board to small fragments, primarily in local reserves.

The Howick Local Board has provided locally driven initiatives funding to Auckland Council's Principal Advisor Urban Ngahere (Forest) in the Parks, Sports and Recreation Department to develop an analysis of the tree cover in its area of responsibility. This update report is the result of a programme of work by Auckland Council involving detailed analysis of urban tree coverages on public and private land, aiming to identify opportunities to nurture, grow and protect urban trees in the local board area. The analysis work is directed by the Auckland Council's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy 2019, which has 18 key objectives to help Council and local boards to deliver a healthy ngahere for a flourishing future.



2.0 Introduction

2.1 Howick Local Board

The Howick Local Board covers approximately (c.) 7,000 hectares (ha) in eastern Auckland, located between the Tāmaki River to the west, the Mangemangeroa Stream to the east and the Redoubt Road ridge to the southeast. The population of the local board is approximately 142,700 residents.

Land-use within the board is very varied, with well-established (pre-1990) residential suburbs dominating the northern half of the board, newer and developing residential suburbs to the east and south, large retail centres at Botany Downs and Pakuranga Plaza, and a swathe of commercial and industrial land to the west, encompassing Highbrook Park and parts of East Tāmaki. Howick's southern and eastern boundaries extend just beyond the recognised rural-urban boundary into the adjacent rural regions around Brookby and Whitford, with the south-eastern spread of development butting up against the physical and regulatory limits imposed by topography and zoning.

Approximately 11% of the local board area is public parkland, with bush reserves containing pockets of remnant native forest. These reserves are predominantly



Urban forest around central Howick

located along Howick's eastern margins at the interface between the suburbs and the rural areas beyond and on the coastal fringe. Examples include Mangemangeroa Reserve, Point View Reserve, and Murphys Bush.

Large reserves for passive or active recreation, or a mixture of both, are distributed throughout Howick and include Barry Curtis Park, Lloyd Elsmore Park, Macleans Park (with substantial areas of native revegetation planting), Tī Rakau Park, Pigeon Mountain, Murvale Reserve (with an outstanding collection of early exotic plantings), and William Green Domain.

Large portions of the local board area are now zoned for development intensification under the Auckland Unitary Plan. The new zoning, including the Mixed Housing Urban Zone and the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone, now allows for smaller sections. Consequently, much of the urban forest is under a range of pressures from development, which could potentially lead to irreversible changes in urban forest cover (Brown et al., 2015).

An information graphic summarising local board details related to urban forest is provided at the beginning of this report.



The 'Rural-Urban Boundary' viewed from Point View Reserve, East Tāmaki Heights

2.2 Study Background

'Urban ngahere' ('urban forest') comprises all the trees within a city – including parks, coastal cliffs, stream corridors, private gardens and streets – both native and naturalised exotic species. For the purposes of this report, 'urban ngahere' is defined as all of the trees and other vegetation three metres or taller in stature within the Howick Local Board, and the soil and water systems that support these trees. This urban ngahere definition encompasses trees and shrubs in streets, parks, private gardens, stream banks, coastal cliffs, rail corridors, and motorway margins and embankments. It also includes both planted and naturally established plants, of both exotic and native provenance.

The scale of the tree and shrub cover across Auckland is sufficiently extensive on both public and private land to make a meaningful contribution to the liveability and sense of place for its residents. Benefits of the urban ngahere include:

Social

- Improve health and wellbeing
- Reduce the urban heat island effect
- Provide shade
- Enhance visual amenity

Environmental

- Enhance biodiversity
- Improve air quality
- Carbon sequestration
- Improve water quality

Economic

- Increase property values
- Reduce flood risk
- Reduce energy costs
- Reduce healthcare costs

Cultural

- Support education
- Local food growing
- Sustain and enhance maur
- Cultural heritage

The Auckland Unitary Plan offers various degrees of protection to urban ngahere and groups of trees meeting specific characteristics (e.g., pre-identified significance, vegetation by coasts or streams); however, other important urban ngahere assets have no statutory protection and can therefore be removed. The completion of a study in urban canopy cover in Howick is important to provide information on baseline tree distribution that future canopy cover measurements can be compared to. This baseline data also provides information on where there are pressures on canopy cover and opportunities for tree planting. Increases in canopy cover are also intended to contribute to other Auckland Council programmes such as Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan (Auckland Council 2019c).

2.3 Data Collection

Urban canopy cover across Auckland was mapped in 2013 (Auckland Council 2019b), and again in 2016/18 by use of LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging). Airborne LiDAR is an optical remote sensing technology that irradiates a target with a beam of light; usually a pulsed laser, to measure an object's variable distances from the earth surface. Two LiDAR data sets are covered in this report, collected in the years 2013 and 2016/2018. The second survey (2016/2018) had to be completed over two years due to unfavourable weather conditions that limited data quality. As these two LiDAR data sets provide a solid baseline for future comparative work, investigations into alternatives to LiDAR for mapping urban ngahere are currently underway.



New native restoration planting

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Urban Canopy Cover Overview

Based on the 2013 data set, urban ngahere covered 16% of the Howick Local Board area, including 6% of roads, 25% of public parks, and 17% of private land. Further information on the 2013 data has been provided in a baseline report (Howick Local Board Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report September 2019; Auckland Council 2019b). There was no net change in overall canopy cover based on the 2016/2018 data set (Table 1).

As an overview, the initial analysis contained in this report (in line with the knowing phase of the Auckland Urban Ngahere Strategy) shows that there are some obvious areas of urban ngahere concentration, while there are also areas that are lacking urban ngahere. The lowest cover (3-6%) tends to be in central/southern areas of the

local board (Botany Central/South, Redcastle, Ormiston North and Donegal Park), while the eastern parts of the local board, Shelly Park and Tuscany Heights, have the highest cover (more than 30%). Although the canopy cover in East Tāmaki is low (5%), the percentage of canopy cover >30 m tall is high compared to other statistical areas in the local board. Other suburbs with a relatively high level of tree cover are the older coastal suburbs of Shelly Park, Mellons Bay and Cockle Bay.

The 2016/18 LiDAR data indicates growth in canopy cover on road reserves and parks across the Howick Local Board, with a combined net increase in canopy cover of c.26 hectares. Conversely, there has been a net reduction in canopy cover of c.8 hectares on privately owned land. An example of this decrease has been observed on private land in Ormiston East, where canopy cover has shown a net reduction of 13 hectares since 2013.

Urban Local Board	Public open space		Private land		Roads		Other public land		Overall coverage	
	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018
Kaipātiki	63	64	25	25	12	14	33	34	30	30
Upper Harbour	50	52	29	30	11	13	10	11	27	28
Hibiscus and Bays	28	29	24	23	15	14	43	42	25	24
Puketāpapa	50	50	17	16	10	12	15	15	20	20
Albert-Eden	33	34	19	18	17	20	19	18	20	20
Ōrākei	25	25	20	19	14	16	20	20	20	19
Waitematā	42	43	16	15	15	17	11	10	19	19
Whau	34	34	17	16	12	13	12	12	17	17
Devonport-Takapuna	24	27	17	17	11	13	13	14	16	16
Howick	25	26	17	17	6	8	11	12	16	16
Henderson-Massey	30	32	14	14	7	8	11	12	15	15
Papakura	16	17	15	15	8	11	8	9	13	14
Manurewa	24	26	11	12	6	9	7	7	12	13
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	21	23	9	9	10	12	11	11	11	12
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	13	14	8	8	7	9	10	10	9	10
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	14	14	7	7	7	9	8	8	8	8

Table 1: Urban ngahere in Auckland's urban local board areas: data includes percentage cover (to nearest whole number) of urban ngahere for different land tenures, and the overall percentage cover of urban ngahere within each board, with a comparison between the 2013 and 2016/2018 data sets.

3.2 Canopy Distribution across Howick Local Board

The urban ngahere is not distributed evenly throughout the local board, as shown in **Figures 1 and 2**, which display variation by statistical area. Urban ngahere covers 16% of the Howick Local Board area as a whole. However, when excluding the rural parts of Howick and considering only the urbanised areas, the level of canopy cover is closer to 11%. This is a low figure for an urban area and well below the level of cover targeted within Auckland's Urban Ngahere Strategy. This strategy has a goal of achieving an average 30% canopy cover across all of urban Auckland, with no local board area having less than 15% cover (Auckland Council, 2019a).

The reliance on the rural fringe of Howick in raising its overall level of tree cover is highlighted by the fact that, despite making up less than a quarter of the board's land area, it contains nearly half of its urban ngahere cover. Small losses of rural land to urbanisation would be likely to have a disproportionate effect on the urban ngahere, both in terms of overall tree cover and by affecting a greater proportion of large trees.

Over half (51%) of the local board is covered in impervious surfaces, which presents an opportunity to plant urban ngahere, particularly in the road corridor, as a direct remedy. Trees are a well-known solution for stormwater management, as their extensive canopies and subsurface root systems are capable of capturing and pumping substantial amounts of water, providing cooling effects (Berland et al. 2017). Establishing trees within impervious surfaces will act to intercept rainfall before it reaches the ground and slows inflow rates. This has follow on benefits for stormwater management systems such as underground pipes and nearby waterways (Dwyer and Miller 1999). Opportunities exist for new tree planting in the road corridor which will assist in stormwater management by capturing stormwater flows via interception and infiltration. Trees and other 'green infrastructure' solutions, including rain gardens, permeable pavements, bioswales, and green roofs, are worth implementing at a greater scale and should be encouraged. There has not been a significant change in urban tree coverage on a local scale, as shown in **Figure 2**. In general, statistical areas of Howick have had only a minor net increase or minor net decrease in canopy cover. The only current concern may be Donegal Park, with already low tree coverage, had a minor net decrease in cover between the two data sets. Upon examination this appears to be attributed to small scale residential tree removal and trimming of larger trees.



Matanginui/Green Mount, East Tāmaki, Auckland





Figure 2: Spatial distribution of urban ngahere canopy within the statistical areas of Howick Local Board



3.3 Urban Ngahere Canopy Height

LiDAR data includes a height component, and this information was used to split the recorded canopy cover into different height categories: 3-5 metres; 5-10 metres; 10-15 metres; 15-20 metres; 20-30 metres; and taller than 30 metres. This data is representative of canopy cover height, rather than tree height, as each individual tree may be recorded in several categories.

The height class distribution of the urban ngahere canopy within Howick Local Board is displayed in **Figure 3**. In 2013, 26% of the canopy cover was between 3-5 metres tall, 40% 5-10 metres tall, and the remaining 34% was canopy taller than 10 metres. This distribution remained similar in the 2016/2018 data sets, although the percentage of canopy cover over between 3-5 metres tall increased to 32% of the forest canopy. This data shows only low presence of tall canopy cover within the local board area, with all canopy cover taller than 15 metres (including height categories 15-20 metres, 20-30 metres, and 30 metres plus) representing approximately 12% of the total urban ngahere canopy cover assessed and are mainly found in bush remnants and the rural fringes, particularly within East Tāmaki Heights and Flat Bush.

Research has shown that many of the benefits attributed to urban ngahere are disproportionally provided by larger trees (Davies et al. 2011, Moser et al. 2015). Large trees typically create more shade per tree due to a larger and wider canopy spread (Moser et al. 2015); intercept larger amounts of particulate pollutants and rainfall due to significantly larger leaf areas; contain more carbon and have higher carbon sequestration rates (Beets et al. 2012, Schwendenmann and Mitchell 2014, Dahlhausen et al. 2016).

Additionally, trees are often less susceptible to careless or malicious vandalism by the general public once established; can be pruned to provide higher canopy clearance over roadways; carparks and pedestrian footpaths; typically contribute more to calming and slowing traffic on local streets than small trees; and absorb more gaseous pollutants. It is therefore an immediate priority to retain existing large trees across the local board area to ensure the positive benefits of these are not lost, as also emphasised in the Urban Ngahere Strategy (Auckland Council 2019a). The relatively high proportion of shorter canopy cover across the local board (32% 3-5m tall and 39% 5-10m tall) in the 2016/2018 data set, indicates a relatively recent surge of tree planting, assuming the smaller stature canopy corresponds to younger trees, rather than shrubs which are limited at their mature height. When grouped by land use type, it can be seen how the contribution of the trees in rural Howick skews the figures for the board as a whole, with this area containing approximately 50% less canopy cover under five metres tall as a proportion of overall cover than in urban Howick, and has nearly twice the proportion of canopy cover over ten metres tall.



Figure 3: Height class distribution of urban ngahere canopy across all land tenures within Howick Local Board

Ngahereagely http://www.astronomics.com/www.as

3.4 Urban Ngahere Tenure

The tenure of urban ngahere described in this report relates to the zoning and ownership of different land parcels within the local board. Publicly owned land is described as either 'public parks' or 'other public land' (e.g. schools, Council-owned property), trees in the road corridor/road reserves are described as 'street trees', and privately owned land (residential or commercial) is described as 'private land'.

The tenure distribution of urban ngahere canopy within the Howick Local Board is displayed in **Figure 4**. Nearly three quarters (74%) of the urban ngahere in Howick, much of which is unprotected, is located on private property. Public parks and other publicly owned land (e.g., schools) contain a similar proportion of urban ngahere, being 15% and 11% of the total urban ngahere cover, respectively.

Howick Local Board stands out in the regional data as having a very low degree of tree coverage (8% in 2016/18) within its road reserves (Table 1), which may reflect the relatively recent construction of a large part of the road network and, to some degree, poor planting choices and practices in the newer suburbs. This situation presents an opportunity for enhancing the urban ngahere by infill planting of carefully chosen street trees, that will provide benefits long term to local communities.

Planting may also be considered on rural roads, the canopy within which makes up only 2% of the rural tree coverage. With only 5% canopy cover on other public land



Figure 4: Tenure of urban ngahere canopy within Howick Local Board (2013 data set)

in rural parts of the local board, there may also be an opportunity to encourage planting within this category of land such as schools and colleges, where additional educational benefits may be gained.

In addition to having low levels of canopy cover, roads also exhibit generally small tree size, with only 13% being over ten metres tall, compared to 39% for parks. This reflects the more cramped growing environment within the road corridor (particularly below ground) and the more frequent cycling of tree stock as trees are regularly removed and replaced to allow for infrastructure works.

Public parks have the highest proportion of urban ngahere relative to area out of all the land tenures, as shown in **Figure 5**, followed by private land. There has been a minor net increase in urban ngahere canopy in public parks, as well as road reserves and other public land, between the two survey data sets. The percentage canopy cover of private land has stayed the same.

Public parks are good place to focus additional urban ngahere planting as they comprise approximately 10% of the local board land area and are widely distributed. In addition, public parks offer the best opportunities for long-term sustainable management of the urban ngahere due to the lower chance of conflict with future housing intensification.



Figure 5: Change in urban ngahere cover of different land tenures in Howick Local Board between 2013 and 2016/18

#13



3.5 Urban Ngahere in Relation to Growth Pressures

The Significant Ecological Area overlay (SEA; **Figure 6**) prioritises the areas of urban ngahere in Howick with the highest ecological value, providing a starting point for protection. With future development and urban intensification, however, SEA and other continuous areas of urban ngahere are at risk. Canopy cover in relation to the Auckland Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (Auckland Council 2017) forecasting areas of growth is shown in **Figure 7**.

There is increased pressure on the urban ngahere in Howick through a combination of greenfield development, lack of suitable growing space, and conflicts with infrastructure. An increase in urban ngahere cover in local parks and residential suburbs will provide more universal benefits as a greater number of people are likely to encounter the forest and connect to nature. Urban ngahere on public land provides opportunities to connect with communities, enhanced biodiversity, educational opportunities and helps to develop a sense of place.

The lack of scheduled notable trees in the southern half of Howick is another issue that may warrant investigation, as there may potentially be trees that have so far been overlooked but would meet the necessary standards for inclusion on the schedule. This may particularly be the case in parts of Flat Bush currently under development, where large, high value trees are scattered within former farmland and riparian margins.

Protecting existing and adding to the numbers of trees in the road corridor is an important and ongoing measure to retain and extend urban ngahere cover, as the tree cover in the road corridor is currently low. The importance of trees in the street environment is going to increase, and will, in time, incorporate the only accessible trees for some residents.

To this end, the Howick Local Board is encouraged to work with Auckland Council to readdress the current rules for tree and vegetation protection, especially in relation to highlighting the importance of large trees and the multiple benefits they offer to the local community.



Notable trees, Howick, Auckland



Figure 6: 2016/18 Canopy Height & Significant Ecological Areas





3.6 Recommendations

The assessment of urban tree cover in the Howick Local Board presented in this update report aims to assist in the knowing phase of the Auckland Urban Forest Strategy. The analysis of existing tree cover distribution, structure, tenure, and protection, provides the local board with a basis for determining where to focus efforts in improving urban ngahere cover during the growing phase, to be initiated in the near future.

Recommendations for future urban ngahere management to the Howick Local Board include:

- Prioritise the efforts of the Howick Urban Ngahere Action Plan 2021 to plant new trees in parks and streets
- raise awareness of the current rules for tree and vegetation notable Tree overlay
- strengthen local funding initiatives to engage with, educate, and support private owners of land featuring valuable trees

- set an initial goal of achieving a minimum of 15% urban ngahere cover within the fully urban portion of Howick
- initiate tree planting where possible in unused corners or edges of parks, including the designation of the former Greenmount landfill as a reserve
- identify parks containing playgrounds with low tree shading (e.g., Simon Owen Place Reserve and Monash Park) and obtain funding for large grade specimen trees to plant
- prioritise tree planting in predominantly industrial/ commercial suburbs with low canopy cover, e.g., East Tāmaki, Huntington Park, Clover Park and Highland Park.

The metrics of the canopy analysis will be used to help inform and prioritise the efforts of the Howick Urban Ngahere Action Plan. The action plan highlights the areas to plant new trees and sets out the process to fund, implement, and find ways to protect and nurture existing ngahere on public and private land.



Palm avenue planted along Te Irirangi Drive, East Tāmaki, Auckland





4.0 Acknowledgements

The following parties are acknowledged for their roles in the preparation of this document:

- Content prepared by Carolina Stavert and Jessica Reaburn (Wildland Consultants Ltd).
- Technical advice and peer review completed by Howell Davies (Principal Advisor Urban Ngahere (Forest), Community Services – Parks, Sports & Recreation, Auckland Council).
- Data and GIS-based figures prepared by Grant Lawrence (Research and Evaluation Unit, Auckland Council).
- Photographs supplied by Auckland Council and Wildland Consultants Ltd.
- Graphics and formatting completed by Q Brand Builders.

The authors would also like to thank the Howick Local Board for their support and direction during the development of this report and its content.

5.0 References

Auckland Council (2017). Auckland Future Urban Land Supply Strategy. <u>https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.</u> <u>nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plansstrategies/topic-based-plans-strategies/housing-plans/</u> <u>Documents/future-urban-land-supply-strategy.pdf</u>

Auckland Council (2019a). Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy. Published by Auckland Council's Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department, March 2019. <u>https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/</u> <u>plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plans-</u> <u>strategies/topic-based-plans-strategies/environmental-</u> <u>plans-strategies/Documents/urban-ngahere-forest-</u> <u>strategy.pdf</u>

Auckland Council (2019b), unpublished. Howick Local Board Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report September 2019. Prepared for the Howick Local Board Locally Driven Initiatives – Ngahere Work Programme: Year 1 Knowing Phase.

Auckland Council (2019c). Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan. Developed from Auckland's Climate Action Framework consultation summary published by Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department, June 2019. <u>https://www.aucklandcouncil.</u> govt.nz/environment/Documents/te-taruke-a-tawhiriauckland-climate-plan.pdf

Beets, P. N., M. O. Kimberley, G. R. Oliver, S. H. Pearce, J. D. Graham and A. Brandon (2012). *Allometric Equations for Estimating Carbon Stocks in Natural Forest in New Zealand.* Forests 3: 818-839.

Berland, A., Shiflett, S.A., Shuster, W.D., Garmestani, A.S., Goddard, H.C., Herrmann, D.L. and Hopton, M.E. (2017). *The role of trees in urban stormwater management.* Landscape and Urban Planning 162: 167-177.

Brown, M. A., Simcock, R. and S. Greenhalgh (2015). Protecting the Urban Forest. Landcare Research Manaaki Whenua Policy Brief No. 13 (Issn: 2357-1713).

Dahlhausen, J., P. Biber, T. Rötzer, E. Uhl and H. Pretzsch (2016). *Tree Species and Their Space Requirements in Six Urban Environments Worldwide.* Forests 7: 111-130.

Davies, Z. G., J. L. Edmondson, A. Heinemeyer, J. R. Leake and K. J. Gaston (2011). *Mapping an urban ecosystem service: quantifying above-ground carbon storage at a citywide scale.* Journal of Applied Ecology 48(5): 1125-1134.

Dwyer, M.C. and Miller, R.W. 1999. *Using GIS to assess urban tree canopy benefits and surrounding greenscape distributions.* Journal of Arboriculture 25(2): 102-107.

Moser, A., T. Rötzer, S. Pauleit and H. Pretzsch (2015). Structure and ecosystem services of small-leaved lime (Tilia cordata Mill.) and black locust (Robinia pseudoacacia L.) in urban environments. Urban Forestry and Urban Greening 14: 1110-1121.

Schwendenmann, L. and N. D. Mitchell (2014). *Carbon accumulation by native trees and soils in an urban park, Auckland.* New Zealand Journal of Ecology 38 (2): 213-220.

Wilcox, M., D. (2012). Auckland's Remarkable Urban Forest. Epsom, Auckland, Auckland Botanical Society.





Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy



He Mihi

Nau mai e te hā o Tāne, Whakatau mai e te oranga o Tāne.

Tīkina mai te ate rahirahi o te Tāone nui o Tāmaki Makaurau hei whakaniko anō ai i te whenua tapu; ko tō whaea, ko Papatūānuku.

Kia toro ake ōna hua me ōna pai kia tauawhia e tō matua e Rangi-nui e tū iho nei, kia rongohia anō te tīhau a ngā manu, me te kētete a ngā pēpeke.

Kia wawara anō te reo o ngā rākau kua roa e ngū ana ki te wao kōhatu e tāwharau nei i ngā maunga tapu o tō whenua taketake.

Tane-o-te-waiora,

Tāne-whakapiripiri,

Tāne-nui-a-rangi, tukua mai anō tō ihi, tukua mai anō tō mana.

Māu e kitea anō ai he awa para-kore e rere ana, he hau mā e kōrewarewa ana, he taiao hauora e takoto ana.

Kia hipokina anō e tō korowai kākāriki te tāone nui kia whiwhi ko mātou, kia whiwhi te ao katoa.

He whakatupu ngātahi i te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau e matomato ai te hua ā ngā rā e tū mai nei

Together, growing Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki Ħakaurau

Tāne let your breath pervade all, may your life-essence be ever-present.

Reclaim the very heart of Auckland city and adorn once again the hallowed ground; that is your mother, Papatūānuku.

May all that is fruitful and good reach skyward to the embrace of your father Rangi-nui on high so the chorus of birds may be heard again, and the splendid symphony of insects in response.

Bring with you the sounds of rustling trees that have long stood silent to this concrete jungle that bounds the sacred mountains of your primal domain.

Tāne-purveyor of life,

Tāne-provider-of-shelter,

Tāne-source-of-all-knowledge, bestow us again with your wonder, and grace us with your prestige.

By you, we will again realise fresh waterways, pure air, and a healthier environment.

Garb the city with your verdant cloak that we, your heirs might benefit, and so too, the whole world.





Kupu whakataki Foreword

A healthy urban ngahere (forest) enriches our communities, our local economies and our natural environment. Auckland cannot become a world-class city without one.

Whether you are from Takanini or Takapuna, Herne Bay or Henderson, trees and vegetation are valuable to all of us. They clean our air and stormwater, cool and beautify our urban spaces and bring nature to our doorsteps. Developed in partnership with tangata whenua, the strategy gives voice to an important role trees play in the mauri of the land. They provide a wide range of measurable benefits that make our lives healthier, happier and more gratifying.

How can we protect what we value in the face of a growing and urbanising population, rising inequality, and the major impacts of invasive pests and climate change? How do we maintain and enhance the richness that our urban ngahere provides? How do we align our efforts?

This is precisely why we have developed a strategy for Auckland's urban ngahere. It delivers on the vision for our future Auckland, ensuring each one of us – and future Aucklanders - have access to the tangible benefits provided by a vibrant, green city.

The strategy ensures that when Auckland Council, corporate partners, community groups and each one of us plants or maintains a tree, our collective efforts truly add up to something – contributing towards increasing our average canopy cover from 18 to 30 per cent. Likewise, the strategy helps target our efforts to grow the urban ngahere where it's scarce - as in parts of South Auckland - so that all local board areas have at least 15 per cent canopy cover.

This strategy provides an overarching vision and 18 high level actions under three main themes, Knowing, Growing and Protecting but doesn't provide all the answers or deliver the vision. We will need to work with each of you and across all local boards to tailor specific and unique approaches to implementation that respond to the local context, harnessing and building local talents, partnerships and resources along the way.

I invite you to join me. Let's work together to grow, protect and maintain our valuable urban ngahere for a greener and greater Auckland for all of us.

Councillor Penny Hulse Chair, Environment and Community Committee





Kei te puku Contents

1.	A sti	rategic plan for Auckland's urban ngahere (forest)	8		
	1.1.	What is Auckland's urban ngahere?	10		
	1.2.	Benefits of Auckland's urban ngahere	14		
	1.3.	Current policy context for our urban ngahere	20		
2.	Curr	ent status of our urban ngahere	22		
	2.1.	Distribution of canopy cover	23		
	2.2.	Height distribution			
	2.3.	Level of protection			
3.	Curr				
	3.1.	A growing population and urban intensification			
	3.2.	Climate change			
	3.3.	Pressure on water infrastructure			
	3.4.	Pests and diseases			
4.	Strategic framework				
	4.1.	Vision	41		
	4.2.	Objectives	42		
	4.3.	Mechanisms	42		
	4.4.	Principles			
5.	Stra	50			
	5.1.	Knowing outcomes	51		
	5.2.	Growing outcomes	53		
	5.3.	Protecting outcomes	54		
	5.4.	Mechanism outcomes	55		
6.	Implementation framework				
	6.1.	Urban ngahere strategy collaboration	57		
	6.2.	Funding and partnerships	58		
	6.3.	Area specific implementation	58		
	6.4.	High level actions	59		
7.	Refe	rences	62		





Tagata Way, Māngere.

1111



He mahere rautaki mō te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau A strategic plan for Auckland's urban ngahere (forest)

When Tāne went to the heavens – so the story goes – he was enraptured by the tūī that lived in his brother Rehua's hair. Tāne desperately wanted to bring the tūī back to earth but he was told he must first plant trees to provide food. So Tāne introduced trees to our world and, three years later when the kahikatea blossomed, Tāne's wish came true. The tūī came to live with him.

When it comes to trees, the message is much the same. If we plant trees now, in time, we create value for our communities. We might even hear the dawn chorus – $e k\bar{o} i te ata – once again within urban Auckland.$

Auckland is growing and changing rapidly. To accommodate this, Auckland Council has committed to a strategy of urban intensification to increase housing density, deliver the benefits associated with a compact urban form and limit the negative impacts linked with continued outward growth. Successful development requires careful planning; intensification and growth need to complement the protection and planting of trees and vegetation to create liveable neighbourhoods. Trees and vegetation also provide a range of services required for Auckland to function and thrive. These include enhanced stormwater management, air pollution removal, improved water quality, cooling to reduce the urban heat island effect, and ecological corridors to connect habitats and improve biodiversity.

Our urban ngahere faces a number of pressures. Alongside the need for urban development, amendments to the Resource Management Act (RMA) came into effect in 2015, lifting blanket tree protection in urban areas. As a result, the vast majority of trees on private urban properties are no longer protected. Threats from pests and diseases, as well as the impacts of climate change are further challenges. If we want to continue to benefit from the services provided by our urban ngahere it is essential that we better understand its status and value and plan to protect and grow it. Our urban ngahere has the mauri (life force) to care for us but needs our help to be sustainable and healthy.





1.1 He aha te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Mākaurau? What is Auckland's urban ngahere?

Auckland's urban ngahere is the realm of Te Waonui o Tāne (the forest domain of Tāne Mahuta) and consists of the network of all trees, other vegetation and green roofs – both native and introduced – in existing and future urban areas.

It's important to recognise the urban ngahere as more than just trees and vegetation. Urban ngahere captures the interconnected whakapapa (genealogy) of all living things to the wider ecosystem. It consists of a complex network weaving through public and private land, and includes the water, soil, air and sunlight that support it. It also involves people, wildlife and the built environment – all of which impact upon, or are impacted by, the urban ngahere. The urban ngahere has its own mauri (life force) but also depends upon a range of conditions and relationships to support its health, growth and survival.

Auckland's urban ngahere is diverse; it includes trees and vegetation in road corridors, parks and

open spaces, natural stormwater assets, community gardens, living walls, green roofs and trees and vegetation in the gardens of private properties. The urban ngahere, like the pōhutukawa fringing Auckland's coastline, is an important part of Auckland's identity and natural heritage and shapes the fabric of the landscape. Trees also help distinguish our heritage places and areas, such as Albert, Western and Myers Parks, early cemeteries, for example, Symonds Street and Waikumete, and the settings of properties, including Monte Cecilia and Alberton. In addition, Auckland's scheduled character areas often feature memorial plantings and early street plantings.





Examples of Auckland's urban ngahere:

Parks and open space





Potters Park, Mt Eden

Orewa Beach

Street trees and road corridors



Franklin Road, Ponsonby

Federal Street shared space

Private gardens



Island Bay, Birkdale

Blockhouse Bay





Native forest

Natural stormwater assets



Te Auaunga Awa / Oakley Creek

Green roofs and living walls



The University of Auckland green roof

Private residential green roof





Tī Kōuka / Cabbage tree

Kererū / New Zealand pigeon

Rain garden, Wynyard Quarter





Ngā painga o te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau Benefits of Auckland's urban ngahere 1.2

The range of social, environmental, economic and cultural benefits that urban trees deliver is well-documented, with cities increasingly recognising the financial value of the services they provide. The USDA Forest Service estimated that trees in New York City provide US\$5.60 in benefits for every US\$1 spent on tree planting and care.¹ Growing and protecting our urban ngahere is essential to maintain and enhance the broad range of services it provides:



Improve health and wellbeing

Reduce the urban heat island effect

Provide shade

Enhance visual amenity



Enhance biodiversity

Improve air quality

Carbon sequestration

Improve water quality Increase property values

Reduce flood risk

Economic

Reduce energy costs

Reduce healthcare costs

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #13urau



Support education

Local food growing

Sustain and enhance mauri

Cultural heritage

Page 292357 15



Improve health and wellbeing

Research has shown that access to trees and nature can reduce stress, improve mental health and promote wellbeing² whilst tree lined streets have been shown to encourage walking.



Reduce the urban heat island effect

The cooling effect of trees, as a result of evapotranspiration, reduces the urban heat island effect³ and enhances Auckland's resilience to an increasing number of hot days (>25°C), one of the projected impacts of climate change.



Provide shade

Trees shading school grounds, playgrounds, public spaces, and cycling and walking routes provide relief from the sun and protect people from harmful ultraviolet (UV) radiation, in turn reducing the risk of heat stroke, sunburn and melanoma.



Enhance visual amenity

Trees can visually enhance a street, the character of an area and foster neighbourhood pride. They add beauty, soften harsh urban environments and screen unsightly views.

Environmental



Enhance biodiversity

A healthy urban ngahere enriches biodiversity and provides opportunities for connected habitats that support wildlife.



Improve water quality

Trees intercept rainwater and reduce the amount of pollutants being washed from hard surfaces into the stormwater system and watercourses. Increasing canopy cover will also contribute towards fewer storm water overflows from our combined sewer/stormwater systems and therefore lower levels of water pollution in our harbours and streams.



Carbon sequestration

Trees reduce carbon dioxide (CO₂) in the atmosphere through sequestering carbon in new growth. One tonne of carbon stored in wood is equivalent to removing 3.67 tonnes of CO2 from the atmosphere.



Improve air quality

Trees improve air quality by removing air pollutants, such as particulate matter, and absorb gases harmful to human health. A 2006 study estimated that Auckland's urban trees remove 1320 tonnes of particulates, 1230 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide and 1990 tonnes of ozone.⁴

Economic



healthcare costs

Improving air quality and enhancing health and wellbeing will reduce the need for healthcare and associated costs.



flood risk

An increase in canopy cover would intercept an increased volume of rainwater; reducing and slowing urban runoff and placing less pressure on stormwater systems. International studies show that trees intercept 15 to 27 per cent of the annual rainfall that falls upon their canopy, depending on a tree's species and architecture.⁵



Increase property values

Studies have shown that mature street trees increase residential property values and attract buyers and tenants.



Reduce energy costs

Well-positioned trees provide shade and reduce cooling requirements and associated energy costs in buildings.

Cultural



Tree nurseries and planting projects promote environmental awareness and provide opportunities to encourage and facilitate learning.



The cultural benefits of Auckland's urban ngahere are diverse and priceless. Native forest is important to mātauranga Māori (knowledge and understanding), and trees create a cultural connection to place and history.



Sustain and enhance mauri

Mauri is a life force derived from whakapapa (genealogical connections and links to ecosystems), an essential element sustaining all forms of life. Mauri provides life and energy to all living things, including our urban ngahere, and is the binding force that links the physical to the spiritual worlds.⁶ Mauri can be harmed if the life-supporting capacity and ecosystem health of our urban ngahere is diminished. Protecting and growing our urban ngahere will sustain and enhance its mauri.



Local food growing

Planting fruit trees and establishing community orchards provides people with access to fresh fruit. Maintaining and harvesting fruit trees can connect and strengthen communities.



The cultural significance of Auckland's urban ngahere

The urban ngahere is an important part of Tāmaki Makaurau / Auckland's cultural heritage. Remnants of native forest represent traditional supermarkets (kai o te ngahere), learning centres (wānanga o te ngahere), the medicine cabinet (kapata rongoā), schools (kura o te ngahere) and spiritual domain (wairua o te ngahere).⁷ Trees also represent landing places of waka (canoe) and birth whenua (to Māori, it is customary to bury the whenua or placenta in the earth, returning it to the land).

Many of Auckland's trees provide a visible reference to the city's history and development. European settlers planted London plane trees along streets in the 1860s which have now grown to create grand tree-lined avenues in the city centre and the adjoining suburbs of Ponsonby, Freemans Bay and Grey Lynn. Bishop Selwyn, New Zealand's first Anglican Bishop, is reported to have brought hundreds of Norfolk Island pine seedlings to Auckland in 1858-60. Many of the mature Norfolk Island pines now in Auckland, such as those at Mission Bay, are likely to have been grown from these seedlings.8

A TAKE P LOUP AS





Page **1239**¹⁹

Te horopaki ā-kaupapa here mō ā tātou ngahere ā-tāone ināia tonu nei 1.3 Current policy context for our urban ngahere

Auckland's plans and polices recognise and reference the value of trees and vegetation to varying degrees but do not provide a clear framework for the management of Auckland's urban ngahere. A range of plans and polices influence our urban ngahere (Figure 1) – explicitly and implicitly – yet urban ngahere objectives are only incidental to other considerations, such as green growth, climate change, indigenous biodiversity, and encouraging

sport and recreation. In the past, this contributed to a situation in which Auckland's urban ngahere was managed and maintained through piecemeal initiatives rather than in a strategic and holistic way. This strategy consolidates and builds upon existing directives that support our urban ngahere and sets out a clear framework to protect and grow Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future.



Figure 1 – Key plans, strategies and guidance documents that influence Auckland's urban ngahere

The central city from above - London plane trees on Greys Avenue and Vincent Street (bottom left) and trees in Myers Park (bottom right) and Albert Park (top right).



Figure 2 – Average percentage canopy cover of urban ngahere (3m+ height) in Auckland suburbs – based on analysis of the 2013 LiDAR survey.

Te tūranga a ō tātou ngahere ā-tāone ināia tonu nei Current status of our urban ngahere

2.1 | Te hora o te uhinga rākau Distribution of canopy cover

Analysis of data from the 2013 LiDAR survey found that Auckland's urban area has just over 18 per cent canopy cover, with 10,130 hectares of canopy cover belonging to trees over three metres tall. This varied across different land types, with urban ngahere on 11 per cent of Auckland's road area, 24 per cent of public land, and 18 per cent of private land.

Figure 2 illustrates that Auckland's urban ngahere is distributed unequally throughout the city, with lower levels of canopy cover in southern suburbs, and relatively high canopy cover in northern and western parts of the city. Auckland's three leafiest suburbs are Titirangi, which adjoins the Waitakere Ranges (68 per cent canopy cover), Wade Heads (57 per cent) and Chatswood (55 per cent), where

What is LiDAR?

LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) is used to examine the surface of the Earth through collecting data from a survey aircraft. It measures scattered light to find a range and other information on a distant target. The range to the target is measured using the time delay between transmission of a pulse and detection of a reflected signal. This technology allows for the direct measurement of three-dimensional features and structures and the underlying terrain. The ability to measure the height of features on the ground or above the ground is the principle advantage over conventional optical remote sensing technologies such as aerial imagery.

LiDAR data itself does not provide information on the status of Auckland's urban ngahere, further analysis of the data is required to create a tree canopy layer and quantify the distribution and height of the urban ngahere.

historically the landform was unsuitable for development. Unequal canopy cover distribution is particularly apparent at a local board area level (see Figure 3). The local boards with the lowest canopy cover are Māngere-Ōtāhuhu (eight per cent) and Ōtara-Papatoetoe (nine per cent). The local board with the highest canopy cover is Kaipātiki with 30 per cent canopy cover, two-thirds of which is in public open spaces.

The majority of Auckland's urban ngahere – 61 per cent – is located on privately-owned land. The remaining 39 per cent is on public land, with seven per cent on Auckland Council parkland, nine per cent on road corridors, and 23 per cent on other public land, such as schools (see Figure 4).

An aerial view of unequal canopy cover



80 r 70 60 Percentage (%) 50 40 30 20 10 Waitemata Whau Orakei Kaipatiki Puketapapa Albert - Eden

Figure 3 - canopy cover on different land tenures by local board area.



Figure 4 – proportion of canopy cover on different land ownership types (2013 LiDAR survey).






Why the unequal distribution?

There are a number of reasons for the difference in tree cover across the region, including land ownership (public/private), land use (urban/industrial/agricultural), geography and legal protections (eg Significant Ecological Areas and notable trees). Historically, the type of development and street layout also influenced the funding and space available for tree planting. For example, in areas developed for social housing, there was typically a low level of investment in tree planting, resulting in relatively few street trees. The age of a suburb can also be a factor, for example trees planted close to the city centre in the early days of Auckland's development have now matured (eg in Ponsonby). More recently, prior to the amalgamation of the region's councils into Auckland Council, some legacy council areas had active tree planting programmes.





Trees in private gardens, a significant contribution to our urban ngahere, Ponsonby.



2.2 | Te hora tū teitei Height distribution

The 2013 LiDAR survey reveals that tall trees are rare in our urban ngahere; only six per cent of the urban ngahere is over 20 metres in height, the majority, 64 per cent, is less than 10 metres (see Figure 5). This is partly due to the species that make up the urban ngahere and their height at maturity. In addition,

trees over 20 metres in height need to be in the right place to allow for growth and are likely to be at least 60 years old. Historically, most mature trees were removed as land was cleared for agriculture and Auckland developed.



Figure 5 – Percentage of urban ngahere across different height classes.

When it comes to trees, size does matter!

Benefits are disproportionally greater for larger trees. For example, big trees provide more shade because of their larger, wider canopy spread; their greater leaf areas and more extensive root systems intercept larger amounts of rainfall and stormwater; they absorb more gaseous pollutants, have higher carbon sequestration rates, and typically contribute more to calming and slowing traffic on local streets than small trees. Larger trees also usually have few or no low branches to interfere with activity at ground level, especially if pruned to provide higher canopy clearance over roads, public space and pedestrian footpaths.





2.3 | Te paerewa āraitanga Level of protection

Just 50 per cent of Auckland's urban ngahere has some degree of statutory protection. A high level of protection applies to urban ngahere in Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) which account for 62 per cent of all protected forest (although SEAs capture only about one-third of Auckland's total urban ngahere). A moderate level of protection is provided to urban ngahere in outstanding natural features or landscapes, open space conservation zones, coastal yards, riparian yards and lake protection zones. Some protection is provided to urban ngahere in coastal natural character areas or open space informal recreation zones. A low level of protection is given to urban ngahere in open space active recreation zones and road corridors.

The Notable Trees Schedule in the Unitary Plan is another form of protection. This schedule contains nearly 3000 items (representing some 6000 trees and groups of trees), the majority of which were 'rolled over' from legacy council schedules as part of the Unitary Plan process.

The proportion of protected urban ngahere varies widely from suburb to suburb, much like the level of urban ngahere canopy cover:

- Suburbs with large patches of indigenous ngahere that have been designated as Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) tend to have a high level of urban ngahere canopy cover and a high level of protection (eg Chatswood, Birkenhead and Titirangi).
- Leafy suburbs where the urban ngahere is dominated by exotic and native trees in private backyards (eg Remuera, Epsom and Mt Eden) have moderate to high canopy cover but a low level of protection.
- Some suburbs have a low level of urban ngahere canopy cover, but a relatively high proportion of the canopy cover has some form of protection (eg Māngere, Wiri and Manukau).
- A number of suburbs that have experienced recent urban growth currently have a low level of urban ngahere canopy cover and protection (eg Northpark, Golflands, Howick, New Lynn and New Windsor).







A Pin Oak being lowered into position by a mobile crane and planted at Britomart Place in approximately the 1950's. Credit: Robert Hepple

The Pin Oak pictured above in 2018 – now protected and on the Notable Trees Schedule. This tree is the central feature of a busy intersection, visually contributing to the local streetscape and visible from Quay Street, Beach Road, Anzac Avenue and Fort Street. It is also notable as a solitary specimen of a species that is not well represented in the locality.





Ngā pēhitanga o ināianei, anga atu anō hoki Current and future pressures

Te tupu haere o te tātai tāngata me 3.1 ngā whakakīkītanga āhua tāone A growing population and urban intensification

Auckland is experiencing unprecedented growth and is projected to grow substantially into the future. Around 1.66 million people currently live in Auckland; over the next 30 years this number could grow by another 720,000 people to reach 2.4 million. Auckland will need many more dwellings, possibly another 313,000, in addition to new infrastructure and community



facilities. Development will be focused within existing and future urban areas within the urban boundary (see Figure 6) and this will put significant pressure on the urban ngahere. Much of this growth will occur in existing urban areas through intensification; as land is redeveloped, unprotected trees are at risk of being removed to maximise the developable area of a site.





Figure 6 – Anticipated development in existing and future urban areas as outlined in the Development Strategy (2018).



Without properly recognising the value of trees and understanding the benefits they provide; urban growth is likely to occur at the expense of the urban ngahere. However, urban development and intensification also present opportunities to green our city – to plant and grow our urban ngahere and create new green urban environments in areas set to be urbanised over the next 30 years. Future urban areas are outlined in Auckland's Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (2017) and the Development Strategy (2018). These areas cover around 15,000 hectares, with the potential to accommodate approximately 137,000 dwellings and 1400 hectares of new business land.

3.2 | Te takahurihanga o te huarere Climate change

Climate change threatens our urban ngahere through changing seasonal rainfall patterns, more severe weather events, and increased susceptibility to pests and diseases. Auckland is projected to

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #13urau

Urban regeneration within the existing city limits, such as the implementation of the City Centre Waterfront Refresh Plan and redevelopment plans for suburbs, presents an opportunity to retrofit green spaces and replace lost trees. The benefits of keeping established trees and the opportunities for these to complement and add value to new developments needs to be recognised. Where development occurs around trees, implementing a best practice approach to tree protection significantly increases their survival rate.

experience increased occurrence of drought and reduced soil moisture. This requires us to better understand the threats to our urban ngahere and what can be done to protect it.



Ngā taimahatanga kei runga i ngā whakahaere ā-wai Pressure on water infrastructure 3.3

Auckland's water infrastructure is vital to ensure that Aucklanders have clean water to drink and use, that wastewater is disposed of safely, homes, businesses and infrastructure are protected from flooding, and waterways and harbours are healthy. Population growth is putting all components of Auckland's water infrastructure under pressure. At the same time, this infrastructure is ageing and needs to be managed to ensure its continued performance. Climate change will place additional pressure on water infrastructure as the frequency and intensity of storm events is predicted to increase.

The Auckland Plan 2050 sets a clear direction to use Auckland's growth and development to protect and enhance the environment.⁹ This includes a focus on using green infrastructure to deliver greater resilience, long-term cost savings and quality environmental outcomes.¹⁰ The Auckland Unitary Plan emphasises the use and enhancement of natural hydrological systems and green infrastructure during development to address pressures on stormwater infrastructure.¹¹ This strategic direction and focus on using green infrastructure provides an opportunity to grow Auckland's urban ngahere.

What is green infrastructure?

Green infrastructure is a strategically planned network of natural and semi-natural areas designed and managed to deliver multi-functional benefits such as stormwater management, water purification, filtration of airborne pollutants, space for recreation and climate mitigation and adaptation. Auckland's urban ngahere is an integral part of our green infrastructure network.



3.4 Ngā mate orotā me ngā mate urutā Pests and diseases

Animal pests and weeds threaten the urban ngahere, including the precious native forest remnants that are found in pockets on public and private land. Possums eat leaves, buds, flowers and young shoots, while weeds like climbing asparagus and monkey apple, smother or out-compete valued species.

Plant diseases are a serious threat to the future of our urban ngahere. Kauri dieback is causing localised extinctions, Dutch elm disease has been in Auckland for many years now, myrtle rust has also reached Auckland and is a risk to pohutukawa, bottlebrush, eucalyptus, and willow myrtle, all common street trees in central Auckland. Climate change is expected to create more favourable conditions for plant diseases to establish and spread. Successfully managing the urban ngahere means these threats must be understood and addressed, if we do not take sufficient action to address these threats, we place our urban ngahere at greater risk. Actions include pest and disease control, using a mix of species and, where possible, disease resistant variants of susceptible species in new plantings, and





by responding quickly and effectively to new and emerging threats. To better understand and address kauri dieback and myrtle rust, Auckland Council is working with central government agencies, Crown Research Institutes and academia.



Te tarāwaho rautaki Strategic framework

The strategic framework consists of a vision, three main objectives (Knowing, Growing and Protecting), two key mechanisms for delivering these objectives (Engage and Manage), and a set of nine supporting principles (Figure 7).





Page **1249**39

A flowering põhutukawa variety.

He whakatupu ngātahi i te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau e matomato ai te hua ā ngā rā e tū mai nei

Together, growing Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future

4.1 | Te tirohanga whānui Vision

Our vision is that Aucklanders are proud of their urban ngahere, that Auckland has a healthy and diverse network of green infrastructure, that it is flourishing across the region and is celebrated, protected, and cared for by all. The urban ngahere is equally distributed across our communities and brings significant benefits to the city. It contributes to our resilience, enhances stormwater management, delivers energy savings, supports biodiversity, and improves health outcomes and quality of life for all Aucklanders. Expanding and improving the urban ngahere is enabled through strong, collaborative partnerships across Auckland. Communities, government, businesses and citizens work together to make our urban ngahere flourish.

We will know we have been successful when we have:

 increased canopy cover across Auckland's urban area



- enhanced the associated social, environmental, economic and cultural benefits
- addressed unequal distribution of canopy cover through increasing canopy cover in neighbourhoods with previously low levels of cover
- increased the network of green infrastructure on public land
- improved linkages between green spaces by establishing ecological corridors
- effectively engaged with private landowners to support a thriving urban ngahere on private land
- planted diverse tree and plant species on public land
- shared knowledge of our urban ngahere
- instilled a sense of pride in Aucklanders for their urban ngahere.



Ngā whāinga Objectives 4.2



Auckland needs to know the status of its urban ngahere, the extent, number and distribution of trees, as well as their size, health and condition. Understanding the social, environmental, economic and cultural value of Auckland's ngahere and quantifying the benefits it provides will support better informed, strategic decisionmaking about its management and growth.

Growing

Auckland needs to grow its urban ngahere to multiply these benefits and address distributional inequity. By expanding and enriching its urban ngahere, Auckland will maximise the social, environmental, economic and cultural benefits that trees, shrubs and other vegetation bring to an urban environment.



Protecting existing ngahere is crucial to safeguarding the added values and benefits mature trees provide. Caring for saplings is critical for ensuring older trees are replenished before the end of their life, our urban ngahere grows over time, and publicly-funded planting is successful.

Ngā tikanga whakahaere Mechanisms 4.3

To achieve these objectives, Auckland Council needs to engage and manage.



Engage with partners and stakeholders – with mana whenua, residents, private landowners, community organisations and the private sector to ensure the urban ngahere is well managed, its benefits are well recognised and that growing and protecting the urban ngahere on public and private land is widely supported.



Manage the city's urban ngahere on public land through coordinated planning, strategic planting, smart and innovative urban design while facilitating best practice standards for work on and around trees through maintenance contracts.



Page **1325**⁴³



4.4 Ngā mātāpono Principles

1. Right tree in the right place

It's important to consider growing conditions and their impact on proposed tree species, soil type, drainage, slope, sunlight access, the presence of pests and weeds and the potential current and future impacts of proposed tree species on the nature and function of a place. Growth rate and size of a proposed tree species at maturity should be basic considerations in determining suitability for a specific site. Planting the right tree in the right place is an important factor in minimising future maintenance requirements and costs.



Figure 8 – Consider the context of the site and plant the right tree in the right place

2. Preference for native species

The Auckland Unitary Plan encourages the use of indigenous trees and vegetation for roadside plantings and open spaces to recognise and reflect cultural, amenity, landscape and ecological values. Planting exotic trees may be appropriate in some cases, eg where there is a need for deciduous trees to provide solar access in winter, or fruit trees to establish community orchards. Exotic trees may also be suitable for cultural or heritage reasons in specific locations.





3. Ensure urban forest diversity

Planting a range of species increases the urban ngahere's resilience to the impacts of diseases, pests, and climate change. Planting a diverse range of species will ensure only a portion of the urban ngahere will be affected as diseases and pests tend to be limited to a certain tree species or genus. It is also important to maintain genetic diversity for each species to support better resilience, for example through our seed collection programme. Planting trees with varying lifespans helps to avoid a large-scale decline in numbers as trees with similar lifespans reach the end of their lives.

4. Protect mature, healthy trees

The benefits provided by trees become exponentially greater as they mature. It's also more cost effective to care for mature trees, as this typically costs less than planting and caring for new trees. The only way to replace a 40-year-old tree is to spend 40 years caring for a new tree.

People often have strong emotional connections to landmark, mature trees in their neighbourhoods, and are more likely to mourn the loss of a large tree. Additionally, some native species, such as kākā, and bats, prefer taller trees and their presence can significantly improve the biodiversity value of an area.







5. Create ecological corridors and connections

The urban ngahere is home to a range of ecological groups, such as birds , insects, moths and butterflies. It brings nature into urban environments, a place where the majority of Aucklanders (90 per cent) live and spend most of their time. It can also provide ecological corridors for species migrating through urban environments (see Figure 9). Connecting Auckland's urban ngahere, particularly remnant natural areas, to create ecological corridors and connections between green spaces is important to enhance biodiversity.

6. Access for all residents

The unequal distribution of canopy cover across Auckland needs to be addressed when new plantings are planned. Considerations include the delivery of urban ngahere benefits, public demand for a higher canopy cover and physical access to the urban ngahere in a local area.



7. Manage urban forest on public and private land

Around 61 per cent of Auckland's urban ngahere canopy is on privately-owned land, with 39 per cent on public land. However, many of the benefits of trees are realised beyond private property boundaries and by many more people than just individual landowners. A loss of urban ngahere on private land is also a loss for the city. While there are opportunities for Auckland Council to grow and protect the urban ngahere on public land, the overall status of the urban ngahere is, to a large degree, dependent on the decisions of private landowners. Managing Auckland's urban ngahere requires private landowners' support and cooperation. Engagement is crucial and is one of two key delivery mechanisms for the proposed strategic framework.



8. Deploy regulatory and non-regulatory tools

Auckland Council has a range of regulatory tools to protect the urban ngahere, such as rules relating to Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs), the schedule of Notable trees, and rules to limit the extent of vegetation removal in sensitive environments, like streams and coastlines. These regulatory tools apply to trees and vegetation on private properties. However, since amendments to the Resource Management Act (RMA) came into effect in 2015, lifting blanket tree protection in urban areas councils depend mainly on non-regulatory tools to control the removal of trees and vegetation on private properties. Examples include landowner advice and assistance with tree care and planting, community education and outreach programmes, and raising awareness of the value and benefits of the urban ngahere.



9. Manage the whole lifecycle of urban trees

Achieving the long-term vision to grow Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future not only depends on planting more trees and vegetation but also looking after them during their lifecycle. New plantings may not be able to flourish (or even survive) without ongoing aftercare and maintenance. Investing in maintenance and proactive management will yield greater long-term benefits, as well as ensure money is well spent, with less wastage and repeated effort.



Figure 9 - the potential for ecological connections across urban and rural landscapes (adapted from Meurk & Hall, 2006¹²)



48





Ngā hua ā-rautaki Strategy Outcomes

The strategy outcomes are underpinned by an implementation framework and high level actions outlined in the next section.

5.1 | Te mōhio ki ngā mea ka hua Knowing outcomes

To better understand the status and value of Auckland's urban ngahere.

Improved knowledge will assist us to make more informed and strategic decisions on how to manage our urban ngahere.

The knowing outcomes will give us a better understanding of the status and trends of important indicators, such as canopy cover, height and age distribution and species diversity across both public and private land. Understanding these factors will enable us to better evaluate and understand the value of our urban ngahere. i-Tree Eco software¹³ could present an opportunity to do this, however at present additional research is required to fully adapt i-Tree data and analysis to a New Zealand context.

A better understanding of the trends and status of the canopy cover can direct planting efforts to where the most value can be realised. Potential future impacts and pressures on Auckland's urban ngahere, such as climate change and new pests and diseases, can also be better managed and minimised.

Table 1 – Knowing outcomes

Objective	Outcomes
Knowing	Better understanding of the status and trends on private and public land over time.
	Better understanding of the diverse values and benefits of Auckland's urban forest.
	Better understanding of existing and future risks and pressures.





Figure 10 - unequal canopy cover at a local board level (2013 LiDAR survey)



5.2 Te whakatupu i ngā mea ka hua Growing outcomes

To grow Auckland's urban ngahere and grow it more equitably.

Growing our urban ngahere will increase the average canopy cover and also provide a fairer distribution of the urban ngahere and associated benefits across Auckland (see Figure 10).

We can grow our urban ngahere and increase resilience to existing and future pressures, such as pests, diseases and climate change, through the application of the strategic framework's nine principles.

Table 2 – Growing outcomes

Objective	Outcomes
Growing	Increase the average canopy cover to 30 per cent across Auckland's urban area with no local board area having less than 15 per cent canopy cover.
	Increased resilience to existing and future pressures.



5.3 | Te tiaki i ngā mea ka hua Protecting outcomes

To protect and maintain Auckland's existing and future urban ngahere.

Protecting our existing urban ngahere is crucial to realising the values and benefits of mature trees. Caring for new plantings and young trees is essential to ensure that older trees are replaced at the end of their life and our urban ngahere grows over time.

Achieving no net loss ensures that any losses are balanced by a gain elsewhere. At a local board level, any loss will need to be balanced out by a gain in canopy cover elsewhere within the local board area. Table 3 – Protecting outcomes





5.4 Ngā tikanga whakahaere ka hua Mechanism outcomes

Engage and Manage are the two mechanisms Auckland Council will use to achieve the Knowing, Growing and Protecting objectives. For example, increasing the canopy cover and prioritising options for future planting on public and private land will only be possible through engaging and working collaboratively with communities and partners.

Engage

Community support is critical for fulfilling all three main objectives. Auckland Council must engage with relevant partners and stakeholders – mana whenua, private landowners, community groups, and the private sector –to support the growth and protection of Auckland's urban ngahere. The council must also engage with the public more widely about the benefits of urban ngahere to ensure they are understood and recognised.

Table 4 – Engage outcomes



A community engagement programme is needed that addresses Growing and Protecting and is supported by partnerships with relevant stakeholders. The programme must also integrate the aspirations of Māori, in accordance with the principle of partnership enshrined in te Tiriti o Waitangi and recognise the special role of mana whenua as kaitiaki (guardians) whereby ngahere and whenua ora (environmental services) are intimately connected to Māori wellbeing. As the programme evolves, we will develop a better understanding of community aspirations, and knowledge gaps relating to urban ngahere benefits and value.

Manage

Another key mechanism in successfully implementing the vision is the effective management of existing and future urban ngahere on public land through coordinated planning, strategic planting, smart and innovative urban design, and facilitating best practice standards for work on and around trees through maintenance contracts.

Table 5 – Manage outcomes

Mechanism	Outcomes
Manage	Increased survival rate of new plantings and sustainability of Auckland's urban ngahere on public land.

As noted in section 2.2, tree size matters when it comes to the scale of benefits delivered. Central to effective management is the requirement to nurture growing trees and increase the proportion of larger trees.





Tarāwaho whakatinana Implementation framework

The implementation framework consists of high level actions that are central to achieving the strategy outcomes. In addition to the high level actions, collaboration, funding and partnerships and area specific implementation are all fundamental to the strategy's success.

6.1 | Te mahi tahi mō te rautaki ngahere ā-tāone Urban ngahere strategy collaboration

Success will require close collaboration with many partners at various levels across operational boundaries and disciplines, within the municipality and beyond. Some of the key cross boundary groups are:

Cross-council collaboration:

This involves collaboration between internal stakeholders, interdepartmental cooperation and working closely with council controlled organisations. In the urban context, planners should work with foresters and arborists to effectively integrate policy and knowledge management tools to grow and protect the urban ngahere.

Community and council collaboration:

Effective implementation of the strategy requires effective engagement with community groups



and institutions that play a role in growing and protecting the urban ngahere.

Business and council collaboration:

Insight provided by business groups, including developers, is important to support the strategy's successful implementation. The decisions and actions of business groups can have a significant influence on the urban ngahere.

International cooperation:

This strategy draws on the knowledge and experience of many leading cities that have developed their own urban forest strategies. Continued sharing of technical, governance and community know-how will help to achieve better outcomes for Auckland.



6.2 Ngā tahua pūtea me ngā hononga ā-hoa Funding and partnerships

Continuing support from Auckland Council, developers, businesses and the wider community is fundamental to successfully growing and protecting Auckland's urban ngahere. For example, leading developers understand that delivering a successful and sustainable project is not just about building design, but also the surrounding environment and the outcomes this can deliver. Businesses can also contribute to the growth and protection of the urban ngahere through financial support, planting initiatives and effective maintenance of trees on their properties. Most importantly, having financial

support from the council ensures the development of knowledge, growth and protection of urban ngahere on public and private land.

Effective communication on the benefits of urban ngahere, such as better stormwater management, carbon sequestration, lower infrastructure costs, enhanced biodiversity and community health not to mention the city's aesthetic enhancement - is an important tool to justify project costs to stakeholders and partners. It's important to document and disseminate urban ngahere benefits to gain continuous support from all Aucklanders.

6.3 Whakatinanatanga ā-wāhi motuhake Area specific implementation

The strategy must take an area specific approach to implementation. This will require engaging with each local board, partners and stakeholders to discuss needs and drivers for growing and

protecting Auckland's urban ngahere. This will ensure the strategy's high level actions are defined and implemented in a way that matches the needs of each local area.



6.4 Kaupapa mahi matua High level actions

The Engage and Manage mechanisms identified in the strategy framework run through all the high level actions and are central to their successful implementation. Table 6 – Knowing high level actions



- land over time
- urban forest

High level actions

- Incorporate three-yearly LiDAR surveys in council 1 work programmes.
- Create database for existing assets within two year 2
- Integrate scientific knowledge of the urban ngahe 3 mātauranga Māori in partnership with mana wher the urban ngahere.
- Quantify values and benefits (within 12-18 month 4
- 5 Determine survival rates of new council plantings.
- Identify key pressures and risks in partnership with 6 whenua and local boards.

High level actions to support the following outcomes:

• better understanding of the status and trends on private and public

· better understanding of the diverse values and benefits of Auckland's

· better understanding of existing and future risks and pressures.

	Implementation timeframe (years)				
	1-2	3-5	Ongoing		
			•		
ars.	•				
re with nua of			•		
ıs).	•				
			•		
h mana	•				



Table 7 – Growing high level actions

$\langle \cdot \rangle$
Growing

- High level actions to support the following outcomes:
- increase the average canopy cover to 30 per cent across Auckland's urban area with no local board area having less than 15 per cent canopy cover
- increased resilience to existing and future pressures.

High lovel actions		Implementation timeframe (years)			
μıβ	gn level actions		1-2	3-5	Ongoing
1	Increase canopy cover in road corridors, pa spaces to support an average of 30 per ce across Auckland's urban area with no local having less than 15 per cent canopy cover	arks and open nt canopy cover l board area			•
2	Identify and prioritise locations for future on public land in partnership with mana w local boards.	planting ⁄henua and	•		
3	Use science and ongoing engagement with mana whenua and communities to inform relation to types of planting.	n local boards, 1 decisions in			•
4	Increase the capacity of nursery programm maraes) to increase the supply of eco-sou	nes (including rced plants.			•
5	Leverage partnerships established through initiatives (eg the Mayor's Million Trees pro	ı existing ogramme).		•	

Table 8 – Protecting high level actions



Raise arboriculture maintenance programme from 6 to five years or until new plantings are well establi (a target survival rate of 70-80 per cent).

guidelines, proper tree care).

7 Establish a labelling programme for protected tree 12 months (eg species, age and benefits).

	Implementation timeframe (years)			
	1-2	3-5	Ongoing	
ion t.	•			
th	٠			
mes (eg			•	
s urban			•	
of the anting			•	
n two ished	•			
es within	•			





Ngā tohutoro References

- Pacific Southwest Research Station and Center for Urban Forest Research https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/topics/urban_forestry/products/2/psw_cufr687_NYC_MFRA.pdf
- 2. McDonald, R. et al. 2017. Funding Trees for Health, The Nature Conservancy, www.nature.org/trees4health
- 3. urban environment, Environmental Health 2016 15 (Suppl 1):S36 https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12940-016-0103-6
- Cavanagh, J. E. and Clemons, J. 2006. Do Urban Forests Enhance Air Quality? Australian Journal of 4. Environmental Management, Volume 13, 2006 – Issue 2 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14486563.2006.9725122?needAccess=true
- 5. Ecosyst (2011) 14:755-769
- Harmsworth, G., R. Awatere, S. 2013. Indigenous Māori Knowledge and Perspectives of Ecosystems. 6. Ecosystem services in New Zealand – conditions and trends. Manaaki Whenua Press, Lincoln, New Zealand
- 7. Wilcox, M. D. 2012. Auckland's Remarkable Urban Forest, Auckland Botanical Society
- 8. Manaaki Whenua - Landcare Research, Māori values and native forest (Ngahere) https://www. landcareresearch.co.nz/ data/assets/pdf file/0017/43910/maori values native forest.pdf
- 9. The Auckland Plan 2050, Outcome: Environment and Cultural Heritage, Direction 3: Use Auckland's growth and development to protect and enhance the natural environment https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plansstrategies/auckland-plan/environment-cultural-heritage/Pages/direction-use-growthdevelopment-protect-enhance.aspx
- 10. https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plansstrategies/auckland-plan/environment-cultural-heritage/Pages/focus-area-use-greeninfrastructure-deliver-greater-resilience.aspx
- The Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in part (Updated 13 July 2018), E1 Water quality and 11. integrated management http://unitaryplan.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/Images/Auckland%20Unitary%20Plan%20 Operative/Chapter%20E%20Auckland-wide/1.%20Natural%20Resources/E1%20Water%20 quality%20and%20integrated%20management.pdf
- 12. 30(1): 131-146

https://newzealandecology.org/nzje/2297

13. i-Tree Eco https://www.itreetools.org/eco/index.php

Peper, P. et al. 2007. New York City, New York Municipal Forest Resource Analysis. USDA Forest Service,

Salmond, J. et al. 2016. Health and climate related ecosystem services provided by street trees in the

Xiao, Q. and McPherson, E. G. 2011. Rainfall interception of three trees in Oakland, California, Urban

https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/mcpherson/psw_2011_mcpherson008(xiao).pdf

https://www.landcareresearch.co.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/77047/2_1_Harmsworth.pdf

The Auckland Plan 2050, Outcome: Environment and Cultural Heritage, Focus area 6: Use green infrastructure to deliver greater resilience, long-term cost savings and quality environmental outcomes

Meurk, C.D. Hall, G.M.J. 2006. Options for enhancing forest biodiversity across New Zealand's managed landscapes based on ecosystem modelling and spatial design. New Zealand Journal of Ecology (2006)



© 2019 Auckland Council March 2019 Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department

Auckland Council (2019). Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy

ISBN 978-1-98-856480-7 (Print) ISBN 978-1-98-856481-4 (PDF)

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy was approved by the Auckland Council Environment and Community Committee on 20 February 2018.



The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Huaxiu Wang

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: 1071434009@qq.com

Contact phone number:

Postal address: 6 Leixlep Lane East Tamaki East Tamaki Auckland 2013

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

This requirement affects our living due to the use of the area of land for public work, our property is sitting close to the main drive, and we believe the bus and other public use will affect our property and our life in many ways.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: I hope the uses of land do not include the lands that are in front of our property, and make sure this action does not affect any of our living such as the driveway, noise level, and security and privacy.

Submission date: 9 April 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? No

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Tanaz and Rustom Turel

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: tanazturel@hotmail.com

Contact phone number: 021585551 0275149244

Postal address: 2 Banville Road, East Tamaki Auckland 2016

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

The key reason to oppose is that we do not require a separate bus or cycle lane on Te Irrangi Drive as the existing Bus service is going by Chapel Road which is quite good. A connecting service is from Manukau to the airport which is again very good. A year or so ago, GO Bus service started from Botany to Airport was started which was a total failure as there were no commuters and the service had to be discontinued. If you are on Chapel road during peak hours you will notice the handful passengers at a given time on a bus. Total opposite to what you see on the route Botany to city.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: We will like Auckland council to review the existing public transport route to Manukau before deciding on investing in the rapid transit project costing billions of dollars. We would also like council to advise where this money will come from when they are already struggling with existing projects. How much more burden does the council want to put onto Auckland ratepayers?

Submission date: 9 April 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.

We're turning your food scraps into clean energy.			

CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

Before you fill out the attached submission form, you should know:

You need to include your full name, an email address, or an alternative postal address for your submission to be valid. Also provide a contact phone number so we can contact you for hearing schedules (where requested).

By taking part in this public submission process your submission will be made public. The information requested on this form is required by the Resource Management Act 1991 as any further submission supporting or opposing this submission is required to be forwarded to you as well as Auckland Council. Your name, address, telephone number, email address, signature (if applicable) and the content of your submission will be made publicly available in Auckland Council documents and on our website. These details are collected to better inform the public about all consents which have been issued through the Council.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least one of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- It is frivolous or vexatious.
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case.
- It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further.
- It contains offensive language.
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Submission on a requirement for a designation or an alteration to a designation subject to full or limited notification

Sections 168A,169, 181, 189A, 190, and 195A of the Resource Management Act 1991

FORM 21

Send your submission to unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz or	Subn
post to :	_

Attn: Planning Technician Auckland Council Level 24, 135 Albert Street Private Bag 92300 Auckland 1142

	For office use only	
•	Submission No:	
	Receipt Date:	

Auckland

Te Kaunibera o Tāmaki Makaurau

Submitter details

Full Name or Name of Agent (if applicable)

Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms(Full Name) Mr & Mrs. Rustom and Tanaz Turel

Organisation Name (if submission is made on behalf of Organisation)

Address for service of Submitter

2 Banville Road, East Tamaki, Auckland 2016

Telephone:	21585551	Fax/Email:	tanazturel@hotmail.com	

Contact Person: (Name and designation if applicable)

This is a submission on a notice of requirement:

By:: Name of Requiring Authority

Auckland Transport

For: A new designation or alteration to an existing designation

Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park

The specific parts of the above notice of requirement that my submission relates to are: (give details):

My submission is:

I or we support of the Notice of Requirement	
I or we are neutral to the Notice of Requirement	ent

I or we oppose to the Notice of Requirement	×
---	---

The reasons for my views are:

We do not require a separate bus or cycle lane on Te Irrangi Drive as the existing Bus service is going by Chapel Road which is quite sufficient.

A connecting service is from Manukau to the airport which is again very good. A year or so ago, GO Bus service started from Botany to Airport.

As there were no commuters, the service had to be discontinued. If you are on Chapel road during peak hours you will notice a handful of

commuters at a given time on a bus. Empty buses ply non peak. A total opposite to what you see on the route from Botany to city. Besides, this



project will not only cause years of disruption, inconvenience, noise, dust pollution hazard to people living in the area but will also be a major #15 set back to the property owners in the face of cost of living crisis. The project sounds too good but do we really need to invest billions of dollars in it? (continue on a separate sheet if necessary) I seek the following recommendation or decision from the Council (give precise details including the general nature of any conditions sought). We will like Auckland Council and Waka Kotahi to review the existing public transport route and facilities from Botany to Manukau before deciding investment in the rapid transit project costing billions of dollars. We ask the council to advise where this money will come from when they are already struggling with existing projects? Is there money in the Auckland Counil , Waka Kotahia, Government coffers for this project without burdening the tax/rate payers? Similar to us, the other affected property owners has and are likely still working hard to pay off their properties. Who will be responsible for their retirement plans tied up with these properties and the lost future opportunities for themselves and their families?

I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing

Tanaz & Rustom Turel

Signature of Submitter (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

09/04/2023

Date

Notes to person making submission:

If you are making a submission to the Environmental Protection Authority, you should use Form 16B.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the Council (unless the Council itself, as requiring authority, gave the notice of requirement)

If your submission relates to a notice of requirement for a designation or alteration to a designation and you are a trade competitor of the requiring authority, you may make a submission only if you are directly affected by an effect of the activity to which the requirement relates that:

- (a) Adversely affects the environment, and
- (b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

 \Box

 \mathbf{X}

The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Kathleen Waller

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: kiwisteads@gmail.com

Contact phone number: 02102443586

Postal address: 184 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe Auckland 2104

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

* The extended lapse period for NoRs from 5 to 15 years * That this in being rushed through with any confirmation of funding from either Auckland or Central government. * The approach to consultation that did not allow for a combined community meeting - all owners were kept isolated from one another and impacted properties were only published publicly a month ago.

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

Given the current budgetary challenges of both the Auckland Council and Central Government and other clear priorities for roading - it is unfair that our properties might languish under this NoR when this project may not be funded for many years or never. The combination of the extended lapse period and funding uncertainly means this hangs over many property owner's heads causing unacceptable limitations to selling or altering properties. Owners wanting or needing to sell prior to funding will be in the untenable situation of not being able to get a fair price. Lastly, the project team was either not permitted or did not care to organise a community meeting of property owners. The onus for this has been on the property owners. It feels as if this was done by stealth to avoid opposition earlier in the process. This was presented at meetings as a 'done deal'.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: No NoR approved on any impacted property until funding of house purchases can be fairly negotiated without penalising property owners.

Submission date: 9 April 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission?

Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.

We're turning your food scraps into clean energy.
2

CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Danny Charanjit Singh

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: Danny.Singh@hotmail.co.nz

Contact phone number: 0212045287

Postal address: 1 Belinda Avenue Flat Bush Auckland 2023

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

I own and live with my 2 young daughters at the property at 1 Belinda Avenue, Flat Bush, Auckland and have lived here for 17 years after the death of my wife. I am a solo parent and work from home and I am 46 years old and the sole bread winner. I will not be able to get any further mortgage from the bank to buy another property given today's property market price. I am still paying the mortgage on my house alone since my wife passed away in year 2010. Both me and my 2 daughters have sentimental values and emotions attached to this house as my wife passed away here. Both my daughters and myself feel a sense of belonging to our house. It has helped us to survive without my wife and their mother. I have no where to go and I can't re-finance another mortgage through the bank. I have my personal cars and boats that I have acquired that I can't relocate elsewhere. My request to Auckland Council (AT) is to use the centre grass verge that has nikau trees on it for this busway lanes. These nikau trees in the centre grass verge is simply of no use and I personally feel that 2 way bus lanes can be easily constructed in this space that can comfortably accommodate this project. The AT can also remove the footpaths on each side of the road to widen the roads on each side and which will provide easily 6 lanes for cars and buses to and from Botany to Rongomai Park. My house is located past Rongomai Park and the water catchment area after the overpass bridge and I am not sure why my property at 1 Belinda Avenue, Flat Bush, Auckland is subject to this Notice of Requirement for this project. I am sure not all passengers will be travelling from Auckland Airport to Botany Centre upon arrival into NZ and hence ample buses running on Te Irirangi Drive should be enough to cater for these commuters and bus users. I personally do not feel this project should come at our expense as property owners for the benefit of other Aucklanders who may or may not ever use the bus service to its maximum capacity. I am also a New Zealand citizen and an Aucklander for 22 years now and have paid my taxes and served the NZ government department as an employee and I also deserve to be treated equally as any other NZer and Aucklander and my right to choose should also be preserved and taken into consideration by AT in any decision-making process. I have never missed on any of my City Rates or taxes to either AT or to the NZ

government. My kids are still in their studies and they have been disturbed since I have sat with them to give this news given to me by AT. I am not able to eat, sleep, work or to concentrate on my regular daily activities as before since I have received this NOR letter from AT and what they intend to do with my and others property for this busway project. I feel, given the current financial situation and debt level of Auckland Council and AT, this designation for NOR should not be undertaken and executed as it will be unfair and unjust to me as a property owner as this will mot allow me to sell my property, will not allow me to undertake any activities on my property when I am the owner and purchased it rightfully meeting all land and property requirements laid out in the Land and Property Purchasing Act. I should have the right to carry out reasonable activities on my property. AT should give all property owners like myself, due respect and consideration when undertaking this project further. The NOR letters stated that the Waka Kotahi nor AT have any fundings currently available of designated for this project and it is unfair and unjust to bind anyone like myself in such a predetermined project that itself does not have a concrete future and funding given the debt the current Auckland Council is in. It is unjustied and I object this NOR and designation process for all of the above reasons. If the busway project is from Botany to Rongomai Park, then why is my property at 1 Belinda Avenue, Flat Bush, Auckland being subject to these NOR's and restrictions. The AT has government land in form of the green grass verge with nikau trees, avaliable for this project and it is for this reason I clearly object to this NOR's and restrictions to be placed on my property as stated above. The bus industry in NZ and particularly in Auckland is currently affected by lack of bus drivers and lack of service delivery and most commuters like myself prefer to rely on our own cars for transportation as it is far more reliable than the public transport and this poor service delivery from the public transport is evident in the local news and media. It is unclear as to why AT still prefers to spend exorbitant amount of tax payers money towards these busway projects that are not delivering to its maximum service. This is just my thoughts as one of the affected property owner's as I am living happily with my daughters in my property and deserve to live here after all the sacrifices that I have done in my life. I derserve to live and take my last breath in my property as I feel this is where me and my 2 daughters find peace after the passing away of my wife. I humbly request Auckland Council and AT to consider my case for the above reasons of humanitarian and exceptional nature and to allow me to stay in my property at 1 Belinda Avenue, Flat Bush, Auckland and for no NOR's to designated on my above stated property. Please forgive me for anything I may have said wrong but this is simply my feelings and thoughts on this matter and how I personally feel given me and my 2 daughter's have lived in this property for a considerable period of time and we call it home. I feel AT has the centre green grass verge with nikau trees that they can use to make these busways that they need. There is ample land available in the centre of the landscape with currently 2 lanes on each side of Te Irirangi Drive that can be easily used for this project without causing too much disruption to the existing properties, landscape and to the water catchments currently present to Te Irirangi Drive. The overpass bridge is definitely required for cyclists, disabled people, school children and like minded leisure users such as joggers, people taking family and kids for cycling and walking) who currently use this bridge for these purposes. I have lived at 1 Belinda Avenue, Flat Bush, Auckland for 17 years now and have seen how this existing bridge structure has helped the general public residing in the vicinity and how beneficial it is to have. However, I do feel that any further changes are required to the existing structure (the bridge) as it is successfully serving its purpose and it will be a complete waste of the tax payers money to re-invent the wheel and something that is working. In the 17 years living at 1 Belinda Avenue, Flat Bush, Auckland, I have never seen a single bus servicing the Te Irirangi Drive but people have been successfully commuting to and from Auckland Airport and Botany and to the surrounding areas of Flat Bush. This clearly shows the commuters prefer to use their own transport and I strongly support this sentiment given it is currently working for me and has for the last 17 years since I have lived here. I personally do not feel that the public transport is safe for me or my 2 daughters given the level of violence in NZ and the violence committed on innocent bus drivers and public transport officials. It is only time that we will see these hooligans board buses, trains, ferries and other public transport with guns etc. This is now a norm and and a everday thing in NZ and the Police is too late in attending to these violence in the community. While I feel the AT is doing its part in trying to upscale the public transport in NZ, it also needs to be prudent and exercise due care when undertaking such projects. AT also needs to take into consideration the viewpoint of other stakeholders like myself and other property owners and tax payers as it us because of our taxes that the AT, Auckland Transport and Waka Kotahi exist. I humbly request for AT and Auckland Council to review its existing Auckland Airport to Botany busway project and to use the centre green verge and to remove the nikau trees for this purpose rather than to destroy our existing properties in which we are well settled with our children and immediate family.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: I humbly request for AT and Auckland Council to review its existing Auckland Airport to Botany busway project and to use the centre green verge and to remove the nikau trees for this purpose rather than to destroy our existing properties in which we are well settled in with our children and immediate family. From my perspective only 2 busway lanes (one on each side) is required for this purpose and the properties including mine at 1 Belinda Avenue, Flat Bush, Auckland should not be destroyed for this project to be undertaken and especially when there is no funding available for this project and also given the debt situation of AT, Waka Kotahi and Auckland Council.

Submission date: 10 April 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.

We're turning your food scraps into clean energy.	
2	

CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: RAJNISH KALSI

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: rajkalsi78@icloud.com

Contact phone number: 0221876909

Postal address: 14 sheddings lane East tamaki Auckland 2016

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we are neutral to the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are: The information that i read is bit confusing not clearing all the doubts in our mind .

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: We request auckland council to consider health and safety of residents of the area as Te irirangi drive is already very busy .Adding more traffic to this road would be a safety issue for residents of the area specially the properties on both sides of Te irirangi drive.Please consider our concerns before you go ahead .

Submission date: 10 April 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

SUBMISSION ON REQUIREMENT FOR DESIGNATION OR HERITAGE ORDER OR ALTERATION OF DESIGNATION OR HERITAGE ORDER THAT IS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC NOTIFICATION OR LIMITED NOTIFICATION BY A TERRITORIAL AUTHORITY

Section 168A, 169, 181, 189A, 190 and 195A, Resource Management Act 1991

To Planning Technician Auckland Council Level 24, 135 Albert Street Private Bag 92300 Auckland 1142

Email: unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

- 1 The submitter is Kindercare Learning Centres Limited (Kindercare).
- 2 This is a submission on a notice of requirement from Auckland Transport for a designation referred to as "Botany to Rongomai Park" (**NOR**).
- 3 The submitter is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**).
- 4 The specific parts of the NOR that this submission relates to are those that affect the property occupied by the submitter at 4, 6 and 8 Cratloe Lane, East Tamaki, and 18 Chapletown Drive, Otara and the surrounding area. In particular, the NOR will adversely affect access to and from and parking in the vicinity of Kindercare Dannemora for staff and children attending the childcare centre, and their parents.
- 5 Kindercare would like to meet with the NOR team to better understand the impact of the proposal on the submitters property and business and to assess options for alternatives.
- 6 The submission is:

6.1 Submitter and Site

- 6.1.1 Kindercare is an early childhood care and education provider with childcare centres in Auckalnd, Wellington, Hamilton, and Christchurch. 8 Cratloe Lane is the site of "Kindercare Dannemora", an early childhood education and care centre serving babies through to school starters.
- 6.1.2 8 Cratloe Lane in East Tamaki (legally described as Lot 227 DP 198481, Lot 206 DP 199560, Lot 207 DP 199560, and Lot 226 DP 199560). It is a long and narrow rectangular shaped property comprising approximately 2,555 m² as seen in figure 1 below. A copy of the titles are enclosed within *attachment A*.

6.2 Consented Development

- 6.2.1 The submitter operates a childcare centre at this location which caters for 150 children and 25 staff members. A copy of the consent is enclosed within *attachment B*.
- 6.2.2 The property consists of the main childcare building, which consists of two square buildings and a central main entrance which connects the two buildings. Multiple play areas are provided throughout the site to cater to the different age ranges of the children. These are


located at both the northern and southern ends of the property, as well as between the two main buildings.

6.2.3 The onsite parking area is located to the west of the property with a narrow front yard parking area. Access to the property is one-way only, with the site entrance accessed from Cratloe Lane. The exit leads onto Chapletown Drive. On-site angle parking for 18 cars is located along the western boundary of the property.



Figure 1: Aerial Image

6.2.4 Cratloe Lane is a one-way lane from Chapletown Drive to Caltra Place. It allows the property to orient towards Te Irirangi Drive without generating any additional access point off of the main arterial road. Cratloe Lane is approximately 5 m wide and allows parking along the eastern side of the carriageway. It is estimated that approximately 10 cars could park in Cratloe Lane at any one time.

6.3 Proposed NOR

6.3.1 Cratloe Lane is located within the Notice of Requirement 1 area (**NOR 1**). This is an approximately 4.5 km stretch of Te Irirangi Drive between Botany Town Centre and Rongomai Park as per figure 2 below.

#19



Figure 2: General Arrangement Plan

6.3.2 The envisaged public transport improvements would include a central rapid transit bus network with stations (bus stops) located along the route, and two general traffic lanes in each direction. A berm on each side would seek to separate vehicles from the dedicated pedestrian and cycle pathways located along each side of the street. This is depicted in the cross-section figure 3.



Figure 3: Propsoed Cross Section

6.3.3 Based on the General Arrangement Plan provided with the NOR, a section of which has been provided below as figure 4, it is assumed that almost the entirety of Cratloe Lane and the surrounding berm area will be lost. It is also assumed that Te Irirangi Drive entry and exit points, such as that at the western end of Chapletown Drive will also be closed off to maintain streamlined vehicle, cycle and pedestrian pathways.



Figure 4: Specific Area near Submitter's Property

6.4 Concerns

6.4.1 While we are in support of public transport and the overall network improvements that this proposal will likely generate, this cannot be at the cost of existing businesses and their ability to continue to operate and function.

6.5 Loss of Site Entrance

6.5.1 The loss of approximately 100 m of Cratloe Lane, essentially the entire lane, will have great effect on the operation of Kindercare Dannemora. As mentioned above, the sole entry to the childcare centre is located towards the southern end of Cratloe Lane. Given the existing site layout there is only sufficient space within the site for one-way vehicle access and angle parking. It would not be feasible for there to be two-way vehicle access within the site, nor would it be feasible to rely on the existing site exit via Chapletown Drive to be used as a two-way vehicle crossing.



Figure 5: Streetview

6.5.2 While there is no minimum or maximum parking requirements for care centres as per E27.4.2(T64), the realities of the situation and functional requirements of the business need to be considered. While those in nearby residential properties or adjoining streets may be



6.6 Loss of additional/overflow carparking in Cratloe Lane

6.6.1 Cratloe Lane currently provides additional parking nearby. Childcare centres are more likely to have peak traffic movements in the morning and the evening as parents drop off and pick up children. The additional parking provision on Cratloe Lane, as seen in figure 5 has provided additional/overflow parking during these times, as well as the opportunity for staff to park during the day, and allow customers with children to use the on-site car parks. The loss of Cratloe Lane in this case will reduce the available parking area within close proximity to the Kindercare entrance by approximately 10 car parks.

6.7 Loss of Street Trees

6.7.1 Figure 4 above also shows the number of street trees that will be lost as a result of the proposal. Street trees have a number of benefits including ecological values, pedestrian amenity and public health.

6.8 Loss of Direct Access to Te Irirangi Drive

- 6.8.1 As discussed previously with regard to the loss of the site entrance, the choice of childcare centre for a child is dependent on a variety of factors. One of these factors is the ease of drop off/pick up with the parents' commute to work. Parents are likely to choose a childcare facility further from their home if the facility is on their route to work and/or is easier to access.
- 6.8.2 While travelling South along Te Irirangi Drive Kindercare Dannemora can be easily accessed via exiting the arterial at Aaronville Way, and then using Cratloe Lane to enter Kindercare. Similarly, it is easy to exit the site via Chapletown Drive and re-enter the southbound traffic on Te Irirangi Drive.
- 6.8.3 Based on the Wider General Arrangement Plan (figure 6), it is assumed that this access will be lost in order to streamline traffic movement along Te Irirangi Drive and reduce the number of times vehicles cross the cycle and pedestrian pathways. Access to the local residential streets around Kindercare Dannemora will therefore be funnelled through Smales Road and Brinlack Drive.

#19





Figure 6: Proposal Near the Submitter's Property



Figure 7: Accessibility

- 6.8.4 For southbound traffic, the direct access to Kindercare via Aaronville Way and Cratloe Lane will be increase from 250 m (Light Blue Route) to 500m-650 m via Smales Road (Light Yellow Route with no clear proposed site entry point e.g., parking on the street), or 620 m via Brinlack Drive (Light Green Route). Similarly, when leaving Kindercare and returning to Te Irirangi Drive this route will increase from 650 m via Chapletown Drive (Dark Blue Route) to 650 m via Smales Road (Dark Yellow Route), or 550 m via Brinlack Drive (Dark Green Route).
- 6.9 Not only does the proposal increase travel distance off Te Irirangi Drive but it also increases the number of intersections (controlled and uncontrolled). This will increase the time taken to leave Te Irirangi Drive to drop off/pick up children and re-enter the arterial. Traffic will also be funnelled deeper within the residential development, with the potential for increased on street parking.



6.10 Importance of Childcare Facilities

- 6.10.1 Within any neighbourhood childcare facilities have become an important aspect of many families' lives. Kindercare have been operating in this location for 20 years. With the rising cost of living many families require two or more incomes to maintain day to day and month to month expenses. As such it is important that childcare facilities are provided within close proximity and direct access of both residential neighbourhoods and employment centres, as well as provide the necessary on-site amenities to allow children to grow, learn and flourish.
- 6.10.2 Currently, Kindercare Dannemora provides both easy access for those within the local neighbourhood, and those travelling along Te Irirangi Drive, as well as ample parking opportunities, and both indoor and outdoor learning spaces. Compromising any of these aspects could lead to further issues.

6.11 **Overall Potential for Economic Effects / Loss of Business**

6.11.1 As mentioned in the concerns above, there are a number of adverse effects that would be generated as a result of the proposed changes included in NOR1. The reduced site access, parking and privacy between child and public spaces is likely to be a concern for parents and could result in the current or future loss of enrolments, and therefore economic benefit, for this Kindercare location.

6.12 Alternative Options

- 6.12.1 In order to minimise the adverse impacts mentioned above, while retaining the intended alignment and width of road upgrades, a variety of alternative options have also been considered. These include the following:
 - Maintaining the access to the site in their current location and arrangement.
 - Maintaining Cratloe Lane as a slip lane which limits issues and changes for the submitters site and adjacent properties.
 - Any other alternative options that may reduce the negative impacts on the operation of the centre, the children who attend, and the parents who rely on the service.

6.13 Conclusion

- 6.13.1 Overall, the NOR will have significant adverse effects on Kindercare and the operation of Kindercare Dannemora.
- 6.13.2 In particular, the NOR will adversely affect access to and from and parking in the vicinity of Kindercare Dannemora for staff and children attending the childcare centre, and their parents.
- 6.13.3 The adverse effects on parking and accessibility have the potential to compromise Kindercare's business (which has been established at 8 Cratloe Lane for 20 years) and the attractiveness of this childcare centre for parents. Childcare centres provide an essential community service supporting social and economic wellbeing of families who live or work in the area or pass by the area when travelling to and from home and work.
- 6.13.4 Accordingly, the proposed route is not the most appropriate option given the importance of the childcare centre to community social and economic wellbeing.

- 6.13.5 Kindercare would like to meet with the NOR team to better understand the impact of the proposal on the submitters property and business and to assess options for alternatives.
- 7 Kindercare wishes to be heard in support of its submission.

Date: 11 April 2023

D Shaw (authorised signatory)

Address for Service

C/- SFH Consultants Limited PO Box 86, Orewa, Auckland 0946 For: Daniel Shaw Email: daniel@sfhconsultants.co.nz





Page19286





RECORD OF TITLE UNDER LAND TRANSFER ACT 2017 FREEHOLD

Guaranteed Search Copy issued under Section 60 of the Land Transfer Act 2017



R.W. Muir Registrar-General of Land

IdentifierNA127B/807Land Registration DistrictNorth AucklandDate Issued28 January 2000

Prior References NA127A/710

Fee Simple
710 square metres more or less
Lot 227 Deposited Plan 198481

Glennie Oborn Trustee Company 1930 Limited

Interests

D470861.3 Consent Notice pursuant to Section 221(1) Resource Management Act 1991 - produced 20.01.2000 at 9.00 am and entered 28.1.2000 at 9.00 am

Land Covenant in Transfer D470861.6 - produced 20.01.2000 at 9.00 am and entered 28.1.2000 at 9.00 am

D574691.3 Covenant pursuant to Section 108(2)(d) Resource Management Act 1991 - 25.1.2001 at 2.20 pm

NA127B/807









Identifier

Guaranteed Search Copy Page 1/44237558m, Page 5 of 6 Register Only





RECORD OF TITLE UNDER LAND TRANSFER ACT 2017 FREEHOLD

Guaranteed Search Copy issued under Section 60 of the Land Transfer Act 2017



R.W. Muir Registrar-General of Land

IdentifierNA128A/692Land Registration DistrictNorth AucklandDate Issued11 April 2000

Prior References NA127B/823

Estate	Fee Simple
Area	627 square metres more or less
Legal Description	Lot 206 Deposited Plan 199560
Registered Owners	

Glennie Oborn Trustee Company 1930 Limited

Interests

941631.1 Gazette Notice (09.07.1981 No 80 p1899) defining the middle line of Oaonui- Auckland pipeline - 22.6.1981 at 2.33 pm

D493221.5 Consent Notice pursuant to Section 221(1) Resource Management Act 1991 - produced 4.4.2000 at 9.00 am and entered 11.4.2000 at 9.00 am

Fencing Covenant in Transfer D493221.7 - produced 4.4.2000 at 9.00 am and entered 11.4.2000 at 9.00 am

Land Covenant in Transfer D493221.7 - produced 4.4.2000 at 9.00 am and entered 11.4.2000 at 9.00 am

D574691.3 Covenant pursuant to Section 108(2)(d) Resource Management Act 1991 - 25.1.2001 at 2.20 pm

NA128A/692









RECORD OF TITLE UNDER LAND TRANSFER ACT 2017 FREEHOLD

Guaranteed Search Copy issued under Section 60 of the Land Transfer Act 2017



R.W. Muir Registrar-General of Land

IdentifierNA128A/693Land Registration DistrictNorth AucklandDate Issued11 April 2000

Prior References NA127B/823

Estate	Fee Simple
Area	600 square metres more or less
Legal Description	Lot 207 Deposited Plan 199560
Registered Owners	
Glennie Oborn Truste	ee Company 1930 Limited

Interests

D493221.5 Consent Notice pursuant to Section 221(1) Resource Management Act 1991 - produced 4.4.2000 at 9.00 am and entered 11.4.2000 at 9.00 am

Fencing Covenant in Transfer D493221.7 - produced 4.4.2000 at 9.00 am and entered 11.4.2000 at 9.00 am

Land Covenant in Transfer D493221.7 - produced 4.4.2000 at 9.00 am and entered 11.4.2000 at 9.00 am

D574691.3 Covenant pursuant to Section 108(2)(d) Resource Management Act 1991 - 25.1.2001 at 2.20 pm

NA128A/693





NA128A/693







RECORD OF TITLE UNDER LAND TRANSFER ACT 2017 FREEHOLD

Guaranteed Search Copy issued under Section 60 of the Land Transfer Act 2017



R.W. Muir Registrar-General of Land

IdentifierNA128A/706Land Registration DistrictNorth AucklandDate Issued11 April 2000

Prior References NA127B/823

EstateFee SimpleArea618 square metres more or lessLegal DescriptionLot 226 Deposited Plan 199560Registered OwnersGlennie Oborn Trustee Company 1930 Limited

Interests

Fencing Covenant in Transfer D493221.7 - Produced 4.4.2000 at 9.00 am and entered 11.4.2000 at 9.00 am Land Covenant in Transfer D493221.7 - Produced 4.4.2000 at 9.00 am and entered 11.4.2000 at 9.00 am D574691.3 Covenant pursuant to Section 108(2)(d) Resource Management Act 1991 - 25.1.2001 at 2.20 pm

NA128A/706





NA128A/706





Page 283035

Corporate Resources Group



Private Bag 76917 Manukau City New Zealand DX EP75557 Ph 09 263 7100 Fax 09 262 5151 www.manukau.govt.nz

14 December 2000

SFH Consultants PO Box 31-280 MILFORD

Dear Sir/Madam

NOTIFIED APPLICATION FOR RESOURCE CONSENT – RESTRICTED DISCRETIONARY ACTIVITY – MANUKAU PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN AND DISCRETIONARY ACTIVITY – TRANSITIONAL DISTRICT PLAN – TO CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE A CHILDCARE CENTRE FOR 150 PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN AT 4, 6 & 8 CRATLOE LANE AND 18 CHAPLETOWN DRIVE, OTARA

The Otara Community Board Resource Consents Hearings Committee considered the above matter at its meeting on Thursday, 23 November 2000. A copy of the resolution is attached.

I wish to advise that you may, within fifteen (15) working days of receipt of this notice of decision by Council, lodge an appeal with the Environment Court, Tribunals Division of the Department of Justice, PO Box 5027, Wellington, against the Council's decision or against any condition, restriction or prohibition imposed in respect of that decision.

If you are contemplating such an appeal it is suggested that you seek legal or professional advice, and you should discuss the implications of an appeal under the Resource Management Act 1991 with your adviser. A composite of Form (7) from the Resource Management Act (Forms) Regulation 1991 for making an appeal can be obtained from the Customer Service Centre, Ground Floor, Kotuku House, Manukau Court, Manukau City Centre.

Appeals must be lodged in Wellington with the Department of Justice Tribunals Division in accordance with the provisions of the Resource Management Act and Regulations 1991.

Yours faithfully

Puretu Nia COMMITTEE SECRETARY

Minute No. 2046/00

Encl



NOTIFIED APPLICATION FOR RESOURCE CONSENT – RESTRICTED DISCRETIONARY ACTIVITY – MANUKAU PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN AND DISCRETIONARY ACTIVITY – TRANSITIONAL DISTRICT PLAN – TO CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE A CHILDCARE CENTRE FOR 150 PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN AT 4, 6 & 8 CRATLOE LANE AND 18 CHAPLETOWN DRIVE, OTARA

MINUTE NO. 2046/00 - COMMITTEE DECISION

That the application from Kindercare Learning Centres Ltd received on 6 September 2000 for Council's consent to construct and operate a childcare centre for 150 preschool children on a site located at 4, 6 and 8 Cratloe Lane and 18 Chapletown Drive, Otara be determined as a Restricted Discretionary Activity and Discretionary Activity under the provisions of the Proposed Manukau District Plan 1995 and the Operative Transitional District Plan for Manukau, respectively, and that Council HEREBY GRANTS ITS CONSENT pursuant to Sections 104, 105 and 108 of the Resource Management Act 1991, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The proposal shall be in general accordance with the statements submitted with the application and amended plans prepared by TES Taranaki & Associates Ltd numbered and amended 16879/1 by Council, except as explicitly varied by the conditions contained therein.
- 2. The childcare centre shall be limited to a maximum of 150 pre-school children (new-borns to 5 years old), at any one time.
- 3. The hours of operation for the centre shall be 7.00 am to 6.00 pm, Monday to Friday inclusive.
- 4. The proposed building shall be so designed and constructed, and the use of the building and site shall be so conducted, that the noise level (L10) not exceed the limits set out below.

When measured at or within the boundary of any site zoned residential:

DAY/TIME	NOISE LEVEL (L10)
	dBA
Mon - Sat, 7.00am-6.00pm (0700-1800)	50
Mon - Sat, 6.00pm-10.00pm (1800-2200) Sun and public holidays, 7.00am-10.00pm (0700- 2200)	45
At all other times	40

 $Lmax = 70 \, dBA$

The above noise levels will be monitored on two occasions within six (6) months of the commencement of operations on site.

5. The noise levels shall be measured and assessed in accordance with NZS 6801:1991 "Measurement of Sound" and NZS 6802:1991 "Assessment of Environmental Sound".

14/12/00 | 11:35



13. Prior to the commencement of construction on the subject land, the applicant shall enter into a legal amalgamation covenant under Section 108 of the Resource Management Act 1991 with the Council to ensure that Lots 206, 207 and 226 DP 199560 and Lot 277 DP 198481 are held together to the Council's satisfaction and shall not be disposed of separately. The legal documentation shall be prepared by the Council's Solicitor at the applicant's expense upon completion of the attached legal documentation and when it is returned to the Team Leader - Resource Compliance.

ADVICE NOTES

- 1. In accordance with Section 125 of the Resource Management Act 1991 this consent will lapse two years after the date on which it was granted unless it has been given effect to before the end of that period. However the Council does have the power to extend this period in certain cases where a further application is made within three months of the date of expiry.
- 2. This consent does not constitute authority to build and it may be necessary for you to apply for a Project Information Memorandum and Building Consent if you have not already done so.
- 3. A copy of this letter MUST accompany your application for a Project Information Memorandum and Building Consent. Failure to do so will result in unnecessary delay in the processing of your application.
- 4. All works must comply with Council's bylaws, engineering standards and other statutory requirements including obtaining the appropriate licence under the Education (Early Childhood Centres) Regulations 1998.
- 5. Should the cesspits be within the channel of the vehicle crossing, the cesspits shall be moved at the applicants expense. Engineering plans for this work shall be submitted to the satisfaction of the Manager Consents & Compliance for approval before this work is undertaken.

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

- 1. The site is large enough and has the appropriate facilities to cater for a maximum of 150 children.
- 2. The numbers of children attending should not have any significant adverse effect on the adjoining properties and through the imposition of conditions, any adverse effects that may arise can be mitigated or remedied to a level acceptable by the surrounding neighbourhood.
- 3. The proposal satisfies the criteria for childcare centres with over ten children contained in the Proposed Manukau District Plan 1995 and merits a consent pursuant to Sections 104 and 105 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
- 4. It is considered that the design, layout, fencing and landscaping of the site will ensure that the facility is compatible with the character and amenity values of surrounding residential area.



/12/00 - 14:03 384737-SK11-REVC.



11 April 2023

Planning Technician Auckland Council Level 24, 135 Albert Street Private Bag 92300 AUCKLAND 1142

E: <u>unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</u>

NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT: BUS RAPID TRANSIT - BOTANY TO RONGOMAI PARK

I act for Mr Modher Barakat and Mrs Yessar Barakat, the registered owners of the land at 4 Franco Lane, Dannemora.

I enclose a submission in regard to the notice of requirement on behalf of Mr and Mrs Barakat.

A copy of the submission will be served on the requiring authority.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Brownhill

IN THE MATTER OF a Notice of Requirement by Auckland Council for designation of land under s168(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991

SUBMISSION OF COUNSEL FOR MODHER AND YESSAR BARAKAT

11 April 2023

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. Auckland Council has given notice of requirement by Auckland Transport for a designation in the Auckland Unitary Plan (**AUP**) for a public work, being the construction, operation and maintenance of an upgrade to Te Irirangi Drive between Leixlep Lane and Rongomai Park to provide for a Bus Rapid Transit corridor, walking and cycling facilities and associated infrastructure.
- 1.2. The requirement for designation and notice has been made pursuant to s 168(2)(a) and 168(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991(**the Act**).

2. SUBMITTER DETAILS

- 2.1. The submitters are Mr Modher Adnan Abdulrazak Barakat and Mrs Yessar Ahmed Ali Barakat. The submitters are the registered owners of the land at 4 Franco Lane, Dannemora, Auckland (being Lot 111DP 196887, NA 125D/615, North Auckland Registry).
- 2.2. The submitters gain access to and egress from their land by Franco Lane. The lane is the sole means of access and egress to the submitters' land.
- 2.3. The submitters are not trade competitors of the requiring authority.
- 2.4. The submission is made on behalf of the submitters by their counsel Stephen Brownhill.
- 2.5. The address for service of the submitters is c/o their counsel PO Box 4372 Shortland Street Auckland 1140 ; T: 025 5029524 ; E: <u>stephen.brownhill@xtra.co.nz</u>.

3. NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT (NoR1)

- 3.1. This is a submission on a notice of requirement by the Requiring Authority, Auckland Transport, for a designation to widen Te Irirangi Drive to establish a Bus Rapid Transit corridor between Botany and Rongomai Park and to construct walking and cycling facilities and associated infrastructure.
- 3.2. The submission is made in relation to the information provided in the Notice of Requirement for Designation in Form 18, dated 9 December 2022. This includes the nature of the proposed works, the relevant designation plans and drawings, technical assessment reports, with particular consideration of the assessment of effects on the environment (AEE), and the matters to which the territorial authority must have particular regard, pursuant to s 171(1) of the Act.
- 3.3. The proposed works involve NoR1 of the Airport to Botany Rapid Transit Project (**the Project**), and denotes the initial stage of the Project. The extent of these works is shown on the Designation Plans attached to the Notice. The plans show the designation boundary of the works, which extends along the boundary of the submitters' land and the boundary of other land owners on Franco Lane. The works also incorporate the other slip lanes in the designation corridor.
- 3.4. The designation plans show that Franco Lane and the other slip lanes will be repurposed into a corridor providing dedicated walking and cycling facilities and stormwater infrastructure.

4. SPECIFIC PARTS OF THE NOR1 THAT THE SUBMISSION RELATES TO:

4.1. The submission relates specifically to the proposal to repurpose Franco Lane and to construct dedicated walking and cycling facilities and associated infrastructure on the lane. The reasons for the submission are also relevant to the proposed works affecting the other slip lanes in the designation corridor. The submitters are not opposed to the proposal to widen Te Irirangi Drive to establish a bus rapid transit corridor between Botany and Rongomai Park.

5. THE SUBMISSION IS:

5.1. The submitters **oppose** the proposal to repurpose Franco Lane and to construct dedicated walking and cycling facilities and associated infrastructure within the designation boundary incorporating the submitters' land at 4 Franco Lane.

6. THE REASONS FOR THE SUBMITTERS' VIEWS ARE:

- 6.1. The likely adverse effects on the environment of allowing the requirement to repurpose Franco Lane and other existing slip lanes by the construction of dedicated walking and cycling facilities will be significant. There will be a range of potential adverse effects during the construction and operational phases of the Project, including the relevant likely adverse effects set out at page 4 of the Notice and described in detail in the AEE, The adverse effects on the environment will be permanent.
- 6.2. Of particular concern to the submitters is the potential adverse traffic effects in relation to the construction of the Project and the operation of the walkway and traffic facilities. The matters of concern include traffic and pedestrian safety, access to and egress from their land to the dedicated walkway and cycleway corridor, loss of existing on-street parking on Franco Lane,

the prolonged duration of the Project and the adverse construction effects in regard to noise and vibration generated by the movement of construction machinery and the adverse effects on the existing amenity values and the established urban character of Franco Lane and the surrounding neighbourhood.

- 6.3. The submitters are also expressly concerned at the potential loss of private yard space to enable construction of the walkway and cycleway facilities and consequential loss of property value, as anticipated in the AEE. If the submitters' private yard space is ultimately incorporated into the proposed works as part of the proposed designation boundary, the submitters consider that they should receive adequate compensation for their loss under Part 5 of the Public Works Act 1981. In this respect, their property ought to be included in the schedule of 'directly affected properties' listed in the attachment to the Notice.
- 6.4. In regard to adverse operational traffic and transport effects, the submitters make the following comments. While the traffic assessments in support of the proposed walkway and cycleway facilities emphasise a reduction in the risk of death by separating the existing cycleway from local roads, the assessments do not have regard to the potential risk of accident or death by vehicles reversing directly into the proposed walkway and cycleway from the driveways of adjacent properties. Whether this adverse effect is of high or low probability, pursuant to s. 3 of the Act, it is likely to have a high potential impact.
- 6.5. The submitters question whether this potential risk is appropriate when there are existing pedestrian walkways in Franco Lane and cyclists also occasionally use the lane without risk.
- 6.6. In regard to access and parking, the assessments and designation plans do not explain how access to the submitters' land in Franco Lane will be affected in the course of construction of the proposed walkway and cycleway facilities and after completion of the works. While a cross-section of the proposed designation boundary in Figure 1 of the Notice shows Franco Lane within the boundary, it is unclear from this drawing how practical access to 4 Franco Lane is achieved during the construction works and after completion. In this regard, the information in sections 9.3.1.3 and 9.3.1.5 of the AEE is also unclear. It states that for properties within the proposed designation boundary access impacts are not assessed but, despite this, in respect of NoR1 "there are no significant changes to property access in this section."
- 6.7. In regard to parking, the proposal is to remove existing on-street parking spaces in the NoR1 corridor to accommodate the proposed walkway and cycleway facilities and infrastructure. While there are no on-street parking spaces in Franco Lane, parking on-street is not prohibited and is occasionally utilised. The AEE is unclear how the proposed walkway and cycleway will effect on-street parking in Franco Lane and other slip lanes running parallel to adjacent properties. Should this be disallowed to accommodate the proposed walkway and cycleway it will result in a loss of amenity and inconvenience to property owners and visitors.
- 6.8. In respect of the statement in section 9.3.2 of the AEE, the submitters' contend that temporary access to existing driveways during construction is unreasonable and that access should be maintained at all times by the requiring authority in the course of the Project.
- 6.9. In regard to the potential adverse effects on private properties and businesses, the AEE states in section 9.7 that these effects have been reduced where practicable through the development of the Project concept design and proposed designation boundary. The potential
adverse effects on the submitters' property and on other properties in Franco Lane have not been reduced in the concept design or will be reduced under development of the Project. The submitters' land and other properties in Franco Lane are situated on the proposed designation boundary or part of their front yard is situated within this boundary. It was either impracticable to reduce the adverse consequences of this outcome or has resulted because of a perceived need or demand (without evidence) for walkway and cycleway facilities in Franco Lane.

- 6.10. The potential adverse effects of construction noise and vibration will have a significant impact on the submitters and on the residents of other properties in Franco Lane. As their properties bound the proposed walkway and cycleway facilities they will bear the full impact of these effects. The AEE states that these effects exceed on-going continuous activities, in section 9.10.1, however, seeks to justify the acknowledged adverse social and physical effects on residents by making the predictable statement that construction is a temporary activity that has a finite duration. It justifies these adverse effects, which by their nature and proximity to the submitters' land and to other residents in Franco Lane, has a high potential impact and considers that overall the effects will be "generally reasonable" for the majority of activities.
- 6.11. The submitters consider that the potential adverse effects of construction noise and vibration on them and on other residents of Franco Lane will not be generally reasonable in relation to construction of the proposed walkway and cycleway facilities and associated infrastructure. These adverse effects will be exacerbated by the prolonged duration of the proposed works for NoR1, which will require 4-5 years to complete if the territorial authority confirms the requiring authority's request to extend the duration of the designation works from the statutory 5 years to 15 years.
- 6.12. The submitters concern is that these potential adverse effects are likely to have a significant impact on their quality of life and on their mental health. These effects have not been considered in the AEE and have been essentially disregarded by the requiring authority. The potential vibration effects of the construction of the proposed walkway and cycleway facilities over the required duration is also likely to result in structural damage to properties in Franco Road given their proximity to the Project works. The submitters consider that the requiring authority must undertake to accept liability for any damage to properties in Franco Lane due to the effects of vibration in the course of construction of the Project.
- 6.13. Franco Lane and the other slip lanes off Te Irirangi Drive, are important features in the existing residential neighbourhood. In addition to providing access to adjacent properties, Franco Lane is a quiet and pleasant street and includes attractive and well-maintained residential properties. It contains established vegetation along the berms and on the buffer dividing the lane from Te Irirangi Drive which provides effective visual screening of the arterial road and the associated traffic noise.
- 6.14. Repurposing Franco Lane and the other slip lanes into a dedicated walkway and cycleway will result in encroachment of the transport system into the residential neighbourhood and potential adverse effects on the residential character of the environment and the amenity values which residents appreciate and enjoy. The proposed works will result in a loss of character and amenity in Franco Lane and will not enhance the residential quality of the environment. The preliminary urban design assessments undertaken by the requiring

authority in support of the Project are unpersuasive and uncertain as to whether the proposed walkway and cycleway will successfully integrate into the established residential environment.

- 6.15. The requiring authority also asserts that a vital reason for seeking the proposed designation is to "lock in" the proposed works to prevent "inappropriate" development along the designated boundary in the 15 year lapse period sought to complete the works. The AEE also states that the designation is sought to be confirmed now in view of the prediction for higher intensity residential development in the area under the current zoning which may compromise the proposal. Legitimate land use development in Franco Lane and other slip lanes within the proposed NoR1 corridor will be compromised by the required 4-5 years to complete the proposed works and after completion.
- 6.16. The submitters contend that it is inappropriate for the requiring authority to restrict legitimate land use development in the area that accords with the rules, objectives and policies of the AUP. The use of the term "inappropriate" development in the AEE is not defined in the assessment and may include potential residential land use activity allowed by consent under the Act.
- 6.17. The submitters consider that this outcome will result in a potential adverse effect to the integrity of the AUP, and the consistent application of the rules, objectives and policies in relation to legitimate and appropriate land use and development in the area, including Franco Lane. This is an important factor and one that the territorial authority must have particular regard to in respect of the AUP in considering the proposed requirement and any submissions received in regard to the effects on the environment of allowing the requirement, pursuant to s 171(1)(a) of the Act.
- 6.18. After reviewing the proposed mitigation measures in the AEE, the submitters remain of the view that the potential adverse effects of the proposed walkway and cycleway facilities in Franco Lane when considered together in the whole will not avoid, remedy or adequately mitigate the adverse effects on the environment, pursuant to the Act's purpose in s 5(2).
- 6.19. Neither do the submitters consider that the proposed walkway and cycleway facilities and associated infrastructure are reasonably necessary for achieving the objectives of the requiring authority for which the designation is sought, having particular regard to the work and designation, pursuant to s 171(1)(c) of the Act. Even allowing for the degree of latitude and tolerance sought in section 4.2 of the AEE in regard to what is considered "reasonably necessary" in the circumstances, these proposed works fail to achieve the Project objectives under the Act.
- 6.20. The submitters accept that the works and designation for the proposed Bus Rapid Transit corridor in NoR1 is reasonably necessary for achieving the requiring authority's objectives. The Project was "sold" to the public initially by the requiring authority as a need to widen Te Irirangi Drive to enable more efficient movement of traffic from Botany to Airport via a rapid transit bus corridor. The Project was later expanded to include the proposed walkway and cycling facilities and associated infrastructure in Franco Lane and other slip lanes off Te Irirangi Drive. In response to the submitters' query, the Engagement Manager for the Project advised the submitters, on 6 April 2023, by email: "... As part of the Project, an opportunity has been identified for Franco Lane and other slip lanes off Te Irirangi Drive lanes to be repurposed into

an integrated lane which will provide for access to properties, walking and cycling facilities and stormwater infrastructure. "

- 6.21. Consultation with the public in regard to the proposed walkway and cycleway corridor in Franco Lane and in other slip lanes was piecemeal and inadequate. It did not receive general public support. The submitters consider that this is due at least in part to the public view that the existing walkway in Franco Lane and in other lanes and streets situated parallel to Te Irirangi Drive and other major arterial roads provide safe and efficient pedestrian access in the residential neighbourhoods and to facilities in Botany. It is also not accurate for the requiring authority to state, in section 4.2 of the AEE, that there is a lack of safe and separated walking and cycling facilities in the area within NoR1, and that cyclists must share the road space with general traffic along major arterial corridors.
- 6.22. The submitters contend that the proposed work and designation to repurpose Franco Lane and construct a walkway and cycleway corridor is not reasonably necessary for achieving the objectives of the requiring authority for which the designation is sought, pursuant to s 171(1)(c) of the Act. They also question whether this proposal satisfies the requiring authority's operating principles, pursuant to s 40(b), (c), (d) of the Local Government(Auckland Council) Act 2009, by meeting its principal objective(as a council-controlled organisation) under s 59 of the Local Government Act 2002. Specifically the proposed works do not exhibit a sense of social and environmental responsibility by having regard to the interests of the community in which it operates and by endeavouring to accommodate these when able to do so, pursuant to s 59(1)(c).
- 6.23. The submitters request cancellation of the proposal to repurpose Franco Lane and to construct a walkway and cycleway and associated infrastructure. They consider that Franco Lane should remain in its existing form and integrated with the proposed Bus Rapid Transit corridor. As a functioning pedestrian walkway exists in the lane and other streets parallel to Te Irirangi Drive, and as the speed limit has been reduced to 60m/h, maintaining Franco Lane in its present form provides for the safe and efficient movement of traffic and cyclists on the roads including along major arterial corridors. It will also reduce the overall cost of the Project and the required construction time and the significant adverse effects of the proposed works on affected properties.
- 6.24. It is also unclear whether the proposed re-purposing of Franco Lane and the other slip lanes in the NoR1 corridor by Auckland Transport complies with its statutory functions and powers, pursuant to ss 45 and 46 of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009, and in its purpose as a requiring authority, pursuant to s 47(1). The proposed works are not expressly included in the functions and powers set out in s 46. Auckland Transport must establish its statutory authority to seek a requirement for a designation to proceed with this work along the NoR1 route.

7. THE SUBMITTERS SEEK THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION OR DECISION FROM AUCKLAND COUNCIL:

7.1. Modification of the requirement by cancellation of the proposed re-purposing of Franco Lane and construction of a walkway and cycleway and associated infrastructure or;

- 7.2. Inclusion of appropriate conditions in any requirement to satisfy the matters of concern raised by the submitters in this submission, pursuant to s 171(2) of the Act.
- 7.3. The submitters wish to be heard in support of their submission.
- 7.4. If others make a similar submission, the submitters will consider presenting a joint case with them at hearing.
- 7.5. A copy of the submission will be served on Auckland Transport.

Dated 11 April 2023

Stephen Brownhill Barrister
Counsel for Modher and Yessar Barakat
PO Box 4372 Shortland Street, Auckland 1140
T: (09) 337 0110
M: 027 5029524
E: stephen.brownhill@xtra.co.nz.



For office use only

Submission No:

Section 149ZCC of the Resource Management Act 1991 of the Resource Management Act 1991 FORM 21

Send your submission to unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz or

post to :

post to :	Pacoint Data:
Attn: Planning Technician Auckland Council Level 24, 135 Albert Street Private Bag 92300 Auckland 1142	
Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms(Full Caroline Plo	wman. CEO: Michael Campbell. Agent
Name)	National Mini Storage Limited
PO Box 100155, North Shore, 0745, Auc	ckland
Telephone: 09 920 5397 Contact Person: (Name and designation if a	Fax/Email: caroline.plowman@nationalministorage.co.nz applicable) c/o agent: michael@campbellbrown.co.nz
: Name of Requiring Authority	Auckland Transport
A new designation or alteration to an existing designation (describe)	Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid transit - Botany to Rongomai Park
	(give details)
See attached submission.	
In support of the notice of requirement Neutral [include box]	In opposition to the notice of Requirement
See attached submission.	

 \mathbf{N}

(give precise details including the general

nature of any conditions sought).

See attached submission.

I wish to be heard in support of my submission I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing

Signature of Submitter (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

11/04/2023

Date

If you are making a submission to the Environmental Protection Authority, you should use Form 16B.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the Council (unless the Council itself, as requiring authority, gave the notice of requirement)

If your submission relates to a notice of requirement for a designation or alteration to a designation and you are a trade competitor of the requiring authority, you may make a submission only if you are directly affected by an effect of the activity to which the requirement relates that:

- (a) Adversely affects the environment, and
- (b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

SUBMISSION ON NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT 1– Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

To: Auckland Council unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Name of Submitter: National Mini Storage Limited

National Mini Storage provides this submission on Notice of Requirement – Botany to Rongomai Park ("**NOR 1**") to the Auckland Unitary Plan.

The purpose of the NOR is described in the public notice as being to:

- provide an 18 km, dedicated, high capacity, reliable, and frequent Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridor and walking and cycling facilities;
- authorise a 14.9 km portion of the overall Project which extends from the south of Botany Town Centre to Orrs Road under the Te Tupu Ngātahi Supporting Growth Programme; and
- the construction, operation and maintenance of an upgrade to Te Irirangi Drive between Leixlep Lane and Rongomai Park to provide for a BRT corridor, walking and cycling facilities and associated infrastructure.

The Submitter could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission and the submission does not raise matters that relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

The submission relates to the designation corridor, extent of physical works, and conditions.

The Submitter **supports in part** the application for the NOR subject to the following relief sought.

The reasons for the submitter's support are:

- 1. The NOR would promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, in accordance with Part 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act");
- 2. The proposal is consistent with the objectives and policies of the Auckland Unitary Plan and other provisions in relevant statutory planning instruments;

Page **1** of **3**



- 3. The proposal ensures that a well-connected and integrated neighbourhood is achieved that facilitates efficient movement of people and goods through a variety of travel modes; and
- 4. The proposal ensures that appropriate road infrastructure is provided to enable the planned growth and intensification of Auckland.

Relief sought

The Submitter seeks the following decision from Auckland Council in respect of NOR1:

- That, subject to confirming the matters set out below, NOR1 be adopted;
- That there is no encroachment of the existing property boundaries by physical infrastructure, and all physical infrastructure including but not limited to- bus ways, traffic lanes, cycle lanes, foot paths, berms, are contained within the existing road corridor;
- That any earthworks and battering extents beyond the existing property boundary will be designed in consultation with the relevant property owners to minimise any impact to private land, and maintain the same utility of the said land;
- That all earthworks will be managed to minimise any impact to adjoining private properties, including from airborne or deposited dust. In the event adjoining properties are affected, the cost of rectifying and restoring the asset to its original condition (such as building washing) will be met by the requiring authority;
- That any costs to resolve any consenting matters (such as varying consent conditions) as a result of the designation would be met by the requiring authority;
- Such other consequential amendments to the provisions of the NOR1 as may be necessary to give effect to the relief sought in this submission.

The Submitter wishes to be heard in support of this submission. If other parties make a similar submission, the Submitter would consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing.

Ant

Michael Campbell Campbell Brown Planning Limited For and on behalf of National Mini Storage Limited as its duly authorised agent.

4 April 2023

#21



Address for service of submitter:

C/- Campbell Brown Planning Limited PO Box 147001 Ponsonby AUCKLAND 1144

Attention: Michael Campbell

Telephone:(09) 394 1694Mobile:021845327Email:michael@campbellbrown.co.nz

Page **3** of **3**



The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Anil Rodrigues

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent: Anil Rodrigues

Email address: anil459@gmail.com

Contact phone number: +642102859034

Postal address: anil459@gmail.com East Tamaki Auckland 2013

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

This will directly impact us in the following ways: - Our plans to sell and move to a new home have been seriously hampered due to prospective buyers devaluing the property and as a result this will have a very negative effect on our selling price - We are not happy with the disruption to our daily lives that this proposal brings with it. We are not happy with the construction noise and vibrations. - We have a child with severe asthma and we anticipate a worsening of his condition if he were to be exposed to dust and particulate air contamination.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: We seek the Auckland council to cease any further planning of this project as we are put in a situation where we cannot sell due to the negative impact the proposed works have on our property value and disruption to our lives including health concerns we have for our child suffering from severe asthma.

Submission date: 11 April 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.

We're turning your food scraps into clean energy.			
?			

CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Business East Tamaki

Organisation name: Business East Tamaki

Full name of your agent: Dr Grant Hewison

Email address: gm@businesset.org.nz

Contact phone number: 027 234 0885

Postal address: Level 1 1 Sir William Avenue East Tamaki Auckland 2013

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are: Please see attached Submission

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we support the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are: Please see attached Submission

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: Please see attached Submission

Submission date: 11 April 2023

Supporting documents Submission on NOR - BusinessET - Botany to Rongomai Park 2.pdf

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

• by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal

details, names and addresses) will be made public,

• I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.

We're turning your food scraps into clean energy.				

CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.



- 1. Business East Tamaki Inc is an incorporated society (639532) having its registered office at Wynyard Wood, Level 1,60 Highbrook Drive, East Tamaki, Auckland, 2013. Business East Tamaki is also a business improvement district within the Auckland Region. Its functions include: informing, researching and advocating for business and property owners in the economic development of East Tamaki; providing a conduit to business support, resources, education and networking; Enhancing the safety and security of East Tamaki; and promoting the area as a great place to do business and to work.
- 2. East Tamaki is a manufacturing and distribution hub of some 2,000 businesses strategically located close to the motorway, airport and port, generating: \$3 billion for the New Zealand economy each year; \$19 million in rates, and 30,000 jobs with projected jobs of 45,000 on completion of Highbrook Business Park. The precinct has developed from greenfield origins and the availability and relative cost of land has, in the past, made the precinct attractive to businesses. As such, the area has a number of nationally and internationally significant companies, some of which are involved in developing innovative technologies. It has concentrations of activity in manufacturing, wholesale, administrative and support services as well as professional, scientific and technical services.
- 3. Business East Tamaki welcomes the opportunity to make submissions on the NOR 1 Botany to Rongomai Park, which is one of four Notices of Requirement being sought for the Airport to Botany Bus Rapid Transit Project.
- 4. The Notice of Requirement being submitted on is the first of four Notices of Requirement being sought for the Airport to Botany Bus Rapid Transit Project (NOR 1 Botany to Rongomai Park).
- 5. The submission relates to the entire Notice of Requirement.
- 6. Business East Tamaki supports the Notice of Requirement.
- 7. Business East Tamaki will not gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission.
- 8. The decision Business East Tamaki seeks from the Council is to approve the Notice of Requirement, subject to Conditions.
- Our reasons for supporting the Notice of Requirement is that it will provide a dedicated Bus Rapid Transit corridor running along Te Irirangi Drive, including stations at Smales Road, Accent Drive and Ormiston Road.
- 10. However, we do have concerns about likely negative impacts on businesses or for communities accessing businesses from the proposal, including:





- a. disruption caused by construction, such as reduced amenity and health outcomes due to construction noise, dust and vibration impacts, as well as loss in local open space and community facilities.
- b. negative visual impacts due to the establishment of hoarding and changed wayfinding during construction.
- c. increased traffic congestion resulted in road blockages, truck and heavy vehicle movements and cumulative impacts associated with other construction of nearby projects.
- d. reduction in parking availability due to changed road conditions and demand for parking from the construction workforce.
- e. loss in revenue for local businesses directly affected by construction as road blockages or disruptive construction may redirect regular businesses customers.
- f. loss of local employment/ livelihood due to acquisition of local businesses or businesses voluntarily relocating to avoid significant construction impacts.
- g. workers' safety being compromised due to potentially poor safety policy and monitoring (perhaps even fatalities and/or severe workplace incidents occurred.
- h. changes to pedestrian and vehicular accessibility to the town centres, including commercial and residential land use.
- i. changes to local road access and through-routes for freight.
- j. changes to community character and sense of place due to loss or modification to valued local businesses.
- k. loss of businesses serving smaller communities.
- I. loss of employment and livelihood as a result of property acquisition or business disruption.
- 11. To avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects, Business East Tamaki asks that the proposal include a Development Response Management Plan (DRMP) to be implemented prior to the start of construction to provide a framework to assist businesses affected by the Project during construction. As set out in the Assessment of Effects on the Environment of the NOR, this would be a Condition and broadly include: Recommendations for measures to be undertaken to manage the impacts of Construction Works on the identified businesses; A summary of any proactive assistance provided to impacted businesses; and Identification of opportunities to co-ordinate the forward work programme, where appropriate with infrastructure providers and development agencies. A more detailed discussion of the proposed DRMP is included in the Social Impact Assessment.

s Sincerely

General Manager Business East Tamaki



The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Samir Chalabi

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: samirnz@gmail.com

Contact phone number: 021703753

Postal address: 4 Sheddings Lane East Tamaki Auckland 2016

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are: NoR 1: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

We have lived in this property for 16 years and we intend to live 16 more. We invested a lot over the years (money and effort) in making this house a 'home' for my family, with lots of beautiful memories for our 3 children. This area is perfect for my children (6, 14 & 14) whose schools are Willowbank Primary and Botany Downs Secondary. And it is close to my aging parents who live in Guys Road opposite Botany Town Centre. I need to be close to my 80-year-old father who has prostate cancer in case he needs urgent assistance from me or my wife. It has been difficult enough to bear the traffic noise as it is, especially from modified cars that often use Te Irirangi Drive as a drag racing road without much intervention from the Traffic Police nor Noise Control. And the speed cameras don't appear to be operating, they're only there for view. Widening Te Irirangi Drive would double the traffic noise generated by loud busses, and would bring the noise generated by trucks, motorbikes and modified cars even closer to our homes. In addition, most vegetation that is currently acting as noise barriers would be removed to make way for the additional traffic lanes. And Most Importantly, this project would destroy our property value and prevent us from being able to sell it at a fair market price. The QV figure of our property is already ~\$200K less than the council's valuation. Trying to look for another house with similar quality, specifications and price in the Dannemora area is impossible due to the current Housing Market Trends and the number of listed houses is at a 40-year low. You are pushing us away from our beautiful neighbourhood. Similar houses would cost ~\$2.1M - \$3M in the Point View / Kilkenny area. We can barely make ends meet living in this expensive city. If the council always had it in their plans that Te Irirangi Drive would be widened in the future, then why did the Council give permission to Property Developers to build houses adjacent to this road? Had we known of such plans back in 2007, we would never have even contemplated purchasing this house. This project will simply devastate our lives and livelihood, and would put a cruel end to our future and our kids' future here in Dannemora. It would ruin our lives on multiple levels, it will NOT improve it in any way.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: Our recommendation is the Council must NOT grant permission to Auckland Transport to widen Te Irirangi Dr due to the significantly-adverse effect it would cause us and our neighbours as outlined above in detail. Alternatively, we welcome the option of the Council buying our property at the Council Valuation value and pay us the proceeds now, in order to give us the opportunity to search for alternative properties which will be much further and much more expensive.

Submission date: 11 April 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.

We're turning your food scraps into clean energy.	
[?]	

LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Taruna and Saurabh Tiwary

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent: Saurabh Tiwary

Email address: tcctaupo@hotmail.com

Contact phone number: +64210403301

Postal address: 6 Sheddings Lane East Tamaki 2016 Auckland 2016

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

The further increase in congestion , noise and activities on the road which would be brought even closer (the current distance of Te Iririangi Road from our fence is barely 4 metres). We have a sick child (born with downsyndrome). If we opt to buy another house of similar dimension, It would require way more capital that we lack. In tough and high property prices area, keeping up with the repayments and maintenance of this Property is as is a challenge.Let alone the idea , we can move to another location without putting our lives upside down.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: reasons why it wont create a substantial change that is in lines with the above mentioned points.

Submission date: 11 April 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

• by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,

• I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

Submission on a requirement for a designation or an alteration to a designation subject to full or limited notification

Sections 168A,169, 181, 189A, 190, and 195A of the Resource Management Act 1991

FORM 21

Send your submission to <u>unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</u> or post to :

Attn: Planning Technician Auckland Council Level 24, 135 Albert Street Private Bag 92300 Auckland 1142 For office use only Submission No: Receipt Date:

Auckland

Te Kaunihera o Tāmaki Makaurau

Submitter details

Full Name or Name of Agent (if applicable)

Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms(Full Name)

Organisation Name (if submission is made on behalf of Organisation)

Address for service of Submitter

Telephone:		Fax/Email:		

Contact Person: (Name and designation if applicable)

This is a submission on a notice of requirement:

By:: Name of Requiring Authority

Auckland Transport

For: A new designation or alteration to an existing designation

Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park

The specific parts of the above notice of requirement that my submission relates to are: (give details):

My submission is: I or we support of the Notice of Requirement I or we oppose to the Notice of Requirement I I or we are neutral to the Notice of Requirement I The reasons for my views are:

(continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

I seek the following recommendation or decision from the Council (give precise details including the general nature of any conditions sought).

 I wish to be heard in support of my submission
 Image: Comparison of the support of my submission

 I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission
 Image: Comparison of the support of my submission

 If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing
 Image: Comparison of the support of my submission

lick

Signature of Submitter (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Date

Notes to person making submission:

If you are making a submission to the Environmental Protection Authority, you should use Form 16B.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the Council (unless the Council itself, as requiring authority, gave the notice of requirement)

If your submission relates to a notice of requirement for a designation or alteration to a designation and you are a trade competitor of the requiring authority, you may make a submission only if you are directly affected by an effect of the activity to which the requirement relates that:

- (a) Adversely affects the environment, and
- (b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Buffer Properties

Land in the block Puhinui-Ranfurly-Cavendish-Clendon (PRCC) NoR3

plus

All properties adjoining land where properties are to be acquired and demolished for the BRT elsewhere along the length of the route (NoR 1, 2 and 3)

Specific Parts of Designation:

NoR1, NoR2, NoR3

Concerns about the project's effect on the long-term livability and use of the block of land currently zoned primarily residential, bound by Puhinui Road, Ranfurly Road, Cavendish Drive and Clendon Ave. (NoR3)

Concerns for homeowners of properties currently sited behind 'buffer properties' to be removed as part of the BRT project. Noise, visual intrusion that those land owners did not know about when purchasing their properties, and the fact they have not been specifically targeted by AT or SG engagement (or notified of the NoRs) even though they will be significantly impacted by the project if it goes ahead. (NoR 2,3)

Reasons for Submission:

The NoR documentation notes that the land bound by Puhinui Road, Ranfurly Road, Cavendish Drive and Clendon Ave is a bit of an anomaly. It is bound to the East by significant amounts of commercial zoned land and to the West by the NIMT. To the South is more commercial zoned land. To the North is currently residential, though if the proposed BRT infrastructure is built, the block will be severed from its Northern residential zoned neighbours. If the BRT bridge is constructed, the land bound by Puhinui-Ranfurly-Cavendish-Clendon will become an island (referred to as PRCC Island in this submission).

Noise Effects

The land is currently subject to strict planning conditions as a result of the HANA (High Airport Noise Environment) overlay in the District Plan. This results in two things – the land is zoned 'Single House', meaning only one residence is allowed per site, and the site size is 500m². This is to limit the number of homes that are subject to high levels of aircraft noise. It also means that any new homes or additions, etc., are subject to higher than standard acoustic treatment requirements.

The Airport offers a noise mitigation package to existing homes in the HANA, to fit air conditioning and ventilation equipment so that homes are adequately ventilated with all doors and windows shut to keep out the aircraft noise. Note the packages do not include

Page**133357**

double-glazing. The package is offered to homeowners 100% paid for by the Airport. A covenant is placed on the homes. There has been limited uptake of the package, meaning that many homes in the area are subject to significant aircraft noise. At our house (172 Puhinui Road), we are currently in the process of having the mitigation package installed. With the windows open, or when sitting outside, we regularly have to institute what we call the 'Puhinui Pause' as we cannot hear what each other is saying. This, along with the noise from existing traffic on Puhinui Road, led us to install double glazing at our own cost. It has made a significant difference to our quality of life.

While we bought our property on Puhinui road over 25 years ago, knowing there would be noise from both the airport activities and us being located right on a busy road, people owning homes to the South of us (Freyberg Ave) did not buy their houses on a busy road with traffic noise. The homes on Puhinui Road currently provide a buffer to the homes on Freyberg Ave.

If the BRT bridge is built, the majority of homes facing Puhinui Road in this block will be demolished. This will leave people in Freyberg Ave homes experiencing significantly more noise than they expected when they bought their properties. This is acknowledged in the Assessment of Traffic Noise Effects – the ATNE (p.x, 40). In addition, they will have the impacts of shading and visual disruption of a large bridge at the bottom of their back yards, instead of the suburban residential housing that was there when they bought.

The ATNE (p.45) notes that along Puhinui Road, the noise levels can be up to 72dB/24hr, while at the properties that are currently shielded by those Puhinui Road houses, the noise levels are less than 50dB/24hr. The ATNE appendices note expected changes in noise level. For properties in Freyberg Ave, many properties will go from experiencing noise in the 40db/24 range up to 60db/24hr (pp 101-102). This is a *significant* change.

Although these people are not directly affected by the proposed designation in terms of property acquisition in whole or in part, they are going to be directly affected by the construction and operation of the BRT (including the bridge) if it goes ahead. These property owners have not been sent individual letters informing them about the proposed designation, nor have they been invited to make submissions to it. This seems like a poor level of professional planning practice. It has led to anxiety and upset, along with anger that people who will be impacted by the BRT route have not been informed nor invited to be part of the engagement process.

Scenario	Number of people highly annoyed
Existing	133
Do-nothing	141
Do-minimum	149

Table 25 of the ATNE shows the number of people potentially 'highly annoyed' by the noise from the activities on Puhinui Road.

This table suggests that there will only be an increase of highly annoyed people from 133 to 149 (an increase of just 16 people). However, the table is misleading. It neglects to note that most, if not all of the current 133 highly annoyed people will not be living there anymore as their houses will have been demolished. Most of the 149 under a 'do minimum' approach will be newly 'highly annoyed' people living in houses on Freyberg etc., that were previously buffered from the noise of Puhinui Road by a row of houses that will not be there any longer. This needs to be considered – it is not just a small increase of high annoyance.

The ATNE (p.x and elsewhere) notes the properties in PRCC Island should not be overly affected by noise from the proposed BRT as they should already have some acoustic protection afforded them from the HANA noise mitigation package (e.g., p. 45). As noted above, however, uptake of the package has been low in part, because people are concerned about the covenants that give the Airport some say in what people do with their buildings. Also noted above, the HANA only goes so far. It does not, for example, provide extra-thick noise reducing gib-board or double glazing.

P.49 notes the only mitigation method that is recommended, is to ensure the roading surface of the BRT is similarly smooth to the current surface of Puhinui Road. I would like to see this revisited, with some form of compensation given to those property owners such as those on Freyberg Ave, who will experience both unanticipated acoustic and visual impacts. They did not buy their homes in the knowledge that they would, one day, be left with a large bridge overlooking their properties causing visual intrusion and acoustic angst.

There are some properties that will experience even great impacts. These are addresses on Puhinui Road where the properties have been subdivided in the past, and new homes built on the rear properties that have been created. The NoR maps show clearly that these homes will not be considered by AT to be acquired for the project. These homes, many of them double-storeyed, will face directly onto the new BRT bridge. These homeowners, like the other people that back onto properties to be acquired on Puhinui Road, have not been specifically notified about the proposed designation.

Along the small section of Puhinui Road between Clendon Ave and Plunket Ave, there are at least seven such properties. There are approximately 23 properties in this section of the street that are to be acquired. Numbers 176a, 186a, 188a, 190a, 200a and 200 Puhinui Road, and 4 Clendon Ave. This means that around 1/3 homes are not being acquired, but will experience considerable impact from the BRT as they will be sited so close to it. (Note, too, the anomaly where it seems 160 Puhinui Road only has a small road frontage taken, compared with its neighbours which have their entire property taken.)

I imagine that there will be many such properties along the entire length of the proposed BRT as planned in NoR 2 also, where the BRT alignment moves to the Northern side of Puhinui Road to avoid Puhinui School.

Uncertain future zoning

Some maps in the NoR documentation show the PRCC Island zoned in a colour that is not shown in the legend.



Figure 13, AEE. PRCC Island not zoned as anything?



AEE Figure 15: Application of the NPS:UD in the context of the Project (Plan Change 78 zoning forms the base map)

Noting this map was based on Plan Change 78, I looked up that plan change. Under that change, the PRCC Island land would be zoned as follows:



This further confuses the issue, given the impact of the airport HANA and MANA overlays.

This all leads to uncertainty – what is the future zoning of the land to be? I would like this to be clarified. Although the proposed BRT designation does not seek to alter the zoning, these maps have caused a degree of community upset and uncertainty. Some people in the PRCC

Island who are not directly affected by the proposed designation in terms of land acquisition, are wondering what the future of their own homes will be.

Residential re-development on Puhinui?

Something that concerns me on the map in Figure 15 is that it shows the land not used for the construction of the BRT on the Southern side of Puhinui Road, zoned for 'Mixed House Urban Zone – Modified by A2B Team'. Does this mean that any left-over land will be zoned for some sort of intensive residential use?

This concerns me for a couple of reasons.

First, the land could be redeveloped as open space as a ribbon park adjacent to the length of the road, linked in with the proposed walking and cycling paths. This would 'give back' to a community that has paid a high price for the connectivity of people living and working at Botany and the Airport.

Second, though I know the philosophy of developing high intensity residential land use near rapid transit stations is embedded in AC's and central government's plans, do we really, truly, want to rely on either the HANA or MANA Airport noise mitigation packages, or 'responsible developers' (ATNE p.x) to ensure the people living in such high density residential buildings are adequately protected from the noise, vibration and visual overlooking of a BRT bridge? If the land is zoned Mixed Use Urban Zone, and if this means people will be living in homes built on land left-over from the construction of the BRT, there need to be strict building *requirements* on developers, that are resolutely enforced by AC.

A Commercial Future?

The SIA (p.50) notes that, *"Those residential properties directly behind properties fronting Puhinui Road are likely to, over time, redevelop as commercial use being wholly impacted by the HANA."* This came as a surprise when I read it. Does this mean that the PRCC Island is actually planned future commercial? In some ways this makes sense, given that the proposed BRT effectively severs the PRCC Island from the rest of its Papatoetoe community. But, once again, if this is in the future plan, surely those homeowners should be given some idea of this in a manner that is clearer and more focused than being buried in a document amongst many other documents on a website?

Land similarly affected by removal of 'buffer properties'

This submission, while it focusses on the PRCC Island land, is also relevant for any other properties along the entire length of the project, particularly elsewhere in NoR3 and NoR2. Properties in other sections of the project that lose their buffer when houses between them and the BRT route, will experience similar noise and visual impacts to those detailed above for the PRCC Island properties.

These land owners, too, have not been specifically identified and notified of the project or the proposed designation. They, too, should be better informed by the official organisations involved, and be eligible for compensation should the project go ahead – not merely appeased by low-noise road surfacing or limited use of buffer fencing.



Te Irirangi Drive future rezoning

AEE Figure 15: Application of the NPS:UD in the context of the Project (Plan Change 78 zoning forms the base map)

Figure 15 in the AEE (above) notes that there is planned to be the bright orange 'Terrace Housing and Apartment Building Zone (modified by A2B team)' along much of Te Irirangi Drive. This map is, ostensibly, based on the Plan change 78 map. However, when looking at that map (screenshot below), it shows less intensive residential development along the length of Te Irirangi Drive.

This seems like a 'build it and they will come' philosophy, while not taking into proper account the impacts of either the BRT route or the intensified housing on the surrounding area. There is no guarantee that more intensive development will occur along this corridor or if, indeed, more intensive development zoning will be effected in the District Plan as it is currently subject to Plan Change 78. The zoning in Plan Change 78 is less intense than that proposed in Fig 15 as 'modified by the A2B team'. Will there be another plan change from the A2B team that further intensifies future potential development over and above what is being requested by the NPS:UD?



Screenshot of Puhinui Road-Te Irirangi Drive area from Plan Change 78 maps site

Seek recommendations:

Residential - Mixed Housing Urban Zone Residential - Terrace Housing and Apartment Building Zone

- <u>AT to compensate</u> residents of properties along the <u>entire length</u> of the BRT route that lose the buffer of houses currently sited between the affected properties and the proposed BRT infrastructure. Compensation to mitigate visual and noise impacts.
- <u>AT/AC to clarify future zoning plans for the PRCC Island.</u> Different parts of the NoR documentation suggest no zoning/intensified residential/commercial

- <u>AT to re-design</u> 'left over' land along the route that is designated but not used for the actual BRT or active mode infrastructure so it is used as a 'ribbon park' (see my other submission on this topic). <u>AC to rezone</u> left over land accordingly as Open Space.
- <u>AT/AC to clarify future zoning plans for the rest of the proposed BRT route (e.g., Te Irirangi</u> <u>Drive)</u> Different parts of the NoR documentation suggest uncertain plans for degree of intensification, not yet mandated in the district plan.

Construction Effects

Specific Parts of Designation:

NoR1, NoR2, NoR3, NoR4a and NoR4b

All NoRs for construction of BRT project. Some of the construction effects (e.g., noise, dust and vibration) will be significant. Not all mitigation measures mentioned in the documentation are sufficient.

Reasons for Submission:

The NoR documentation notes that once detailed design has occurred, the construction phases of the project will vary between 3-6 years.

Some of the construction effects (e.g., noise, dust and vibration) will be significant. Three to six years is a *long* time. Some of the effects of road construction and maintenance along Puhinui Road (e.g., the Watercare Hunua water main, the construction of existing bus lanes) resulted in significant disruption. It became unpleasant to live in the area. But we always knew the time period would be relatively short. In neither case did it take *years*.

The Assessment of Environmental Effects (p.93) notes the noise of construction will be temporary. But temporary does not mean short.

Some of the noise effects are *significant*. Loud noise, significant vibration, etc.

There seem to be some mitigation measures in place, particularly for sensitive activities. There is the opportunity for short-term respite and relocation in certain circumstances. Reading the conditions for such relocation, suggests to me that it is going to be quite a difficult process to prove the need for such measures. Once again, our community is neither a highly literate nor litigious one. There are social, educational and economic barriers to effective involvement and self-advocacy.

I would like to see AT providing one-on-one assistance for applying for such mitigation measures (similar to the Friends of the Submitter programme, but locally based).

I would also like to see AT providing other support – for example, if a family needs to temporarily relocate due to the effects of construction, they should not be materially disadvantaged by things like the cost of taking their children to school from where they are staying outside the affected area.

Another example of AT providing other support could be temporary relocation to vacant office space where people work from home and their work days are disrupted by the effects of noise and vibration.

I would also appreciate AT, at the design stage of the project, carefully re-assessing the potential effects of noise, vibration, etc., and monitoring them during construction. I would

like to see more effort put into looking at alternatives to mitigate the effects, such as technology advances, rather than just looking at means such as limiting the operational time windows when active construction is taking place.

Once again, this is a high-needs community that is not used to interacting with big, powerful organisations such as AC and AT. I reflect on how differently a community such as Remuera might respond to such a transport proposal, with significant construction effects on properties for up to six years.

Our community is strong, but it is not immune to the effects of stress. I would hate to see issues such as domestic violence, anxiety and depression rates increasing in an already vulnerable area as a result of a transport project which will give that community negligible positive benefits in the future. Indeed, it is likely to be left with ongoing negative impacts (e.g., noise, dust, visual) even once the BRT is operational.

Seek recommendations:

- I would like to see <u>AT providing one-on-one assistance</u> for applying for mitigation measures such as relocation opportunities (similar to the Friends of the Submitter programme, but locally based).
- I would also like to see <u>AT providing other, associated financial support</u> for example, if a family needs to temporarily relocate due to the effects of construction, they should not be materially disadvantaged by things like the cost of taking their children to school from where they are staying outside the affected area.
- I would like AT to provide support to those residents who work from home and are impacted by construction noise (e.g., temporary hire of vacant office spaces away from the affected area).
- I would also appreciate <u>AT, at the design stage of the project, carefully re-assessing the potential effects of noise, vibration, etc., and monitoring them during construction</u>. I would like to see more <u>effort put into looking at other alternatives to mitigate the effects</u>, such as technology advances, rather than just looking at means such as limiting the operational time windows when active construction is taking place.

Effects on local roading network

Specific Parts of Designation:

NoR1, NoR2, NoR3, NoR4a and NoR4b

All NoRs - effects of the proposal on local roads near the BRT route

Reasons for Submission:

Traffic on streets surrounding the BRT route

The documentation for the BRT notes that there will be traffic impacts on surrounding streets that are in close proximity to Puhinui Road and other roadways along the length of the BRT. People will attempt to avoid the congestion caused by construction of the BRT on the main route, by driving in surrounding streets. The residents of these streets will not be accustomed to these volumes of traffic. AT needs to consider how to best manage this through road management practices on those roads, and mitigation of vehicle noise for residents of these streets.

In addition, as residents along the BRT will now only be able to turn left out of their driveways, they will have to drive on these surrounding streets to get to their destinations. The NoR documentation notes in a number of places, that having to turn left out of a driveway and go around the block to get to a destination will add approximately 2.5km to each journey. Assuming people would then return to their homes afterwards, this would add approximately 5km to each trip away from home. When considering this, and adding it all up, an effect of this aspect of the BRT proposal will be more vehicle kilometres travelled and, therefore, more pollution emitted from vehicles. It will also cost residents more over time in fuel and vehicle maintenance.

In order to mitigate these effects, AT should look at compensating for the extra cost to residents with financial compensation. It should also look at how it can mitigate the effect of the increased pollution that will be caused – for example, by using the left-over land that is acquired for the designation, as a ribbon park with plentiful tree planting to offset the increased emission of greenhouse gases caused as a result of the need for people to add 5km of vehicle use per return journey from their homes.

Noel Burnside Ave

I note that the current entrance to SH20 at the intersection of Puhinui Road and the state highway will be closed. The NoR documentation notes this will put added traffic onto Noel Burnside Ave. This is already an extremely busy street. The recent changes to the configuration of lanes in the vicinity of the Noel Burnside/Puhinui/Wyllie Road intersections have led to significant traffic delays as vehicles navigate a short length of Puhinui Road to get from Noel Burnside to Wyllie and vice-versa. This will only be exacerbated with Noel Burnside Ave becoming busier as the main way for cars to get to SH20 from the surrounding area. This aspect of the roading design needs some detailed consideration and a re-look at the potential impacts and practicality of putting Noel Burnside Ave in this position as a major through-link.

Pedestrian linkages across BRT

Various maps in the NoR documentation show arrows where it is expected that there will be pedestrian access across the BRT (e.g., near Puhinui School, and the Puhinui Road shops at the end of Ranfurly Road). In the Assessment of Traffic Effects (p.91) 'cross walks' are mentioned. Elsewhere in the NoR documents, 'at grade' crossings are mentioned (i.e., underpasses or bridges).

I imagine that cross-walks will not help to achieve the rapid transit of buses if signalised pedestrian crossings are put in place. Underpasses are probably not ideal (both in terms of safety and the fact that Puhinui Road has a number of major services tunneled underground along its length, such as gas and water). Bridges for pedestrians will require the acquisition of more land than has been shown in the documentation. For example, near the Puhinui Road shops, if a pedestrian bridge is built at the location shown on the map, it would necessitate the removal of some of the shops to allow for a ramp or stairs to access such a bridge.

In the detailed design phase of the project, AT should work with the community to identify the best ways and locations to provide pedestrian linkages across the BRT route.

Seek recommendations:

- That <u>AT put appropriate traffic management practices in place in surrounding streets</u> to avoid them becoming 'rat races' due to construction of the BRT, and consider how best to mitigate the effects of increased traffic noise on residents of these streets
- That <u>AT provide compensation to land-owners who will only be able to turn left out</u> of their driveways along Puhinui Road as a result of the BRT route.
- That <u>AT mitigate the effect of increased vehicle use</u> by residents who have to drive around the block to overcome the fact they can only turn left out of their driveways, <u>by planting trees. Ideally in a ribbon park</u> created using left-over land acquired but not used for the purpose of the designation.
- That <u>AT further consider and report back on the ongoing operational role of Noel</u> <u>Burnside Ave</u> once the link from Puhinui Road to SH20 is removed.
- That <u>AT assess and report in more detail on the proposed linkages for pedestrians</u> across the BRT

Engagement

Specific Parts of Designation:

NoR1, NoR2, NoR3, NoR4a and NoR4b

Engagement with affected land owners in the lead-up to the lodgment of the NoRs has been poor.

Notification about the NoRs to affected and impacted land owners has been poor.

Communication during detailed design and construction phases needs to be done better than engagement carried out with residents to date.

Reasons for Submission:

I realise that AT as the requiring authority didn't have to engage with the affected community prior to lodging the NoRs (S.36A RMA) but it is generally seen as good practice to do so. In my own experience as a planner at Auckland City Council (admittedly over twenty years ago now), it certainly makes it easier in the long run if you can bring a community along with you when planning a major planning or infrastructure project.

In the case of the Airport to Botany Rapid Transit project, AT and SG have made some attempts to engage. There are two weighty documents that outline their community engagement efforts (see Appendix A to this submission). However, when you dig down into the depths of these documents, to see what *actual* efforts were made to engage with the people likely to be *directly affected* by the route, the efforts were not satisfactory in my view.

I also realise that the engagement efforts of AT an SG will not 'make or break' the decision of whether the designations are approved. However, I'd like to think that what I say in this submission will be taken into account. It will definitely have had a major impact on the number of submissions received, and the understanding people have about the actual potential impacts of the project if constructed.

Engagement prior to lodging NoRs

Appendix A to this submission is my presentation to the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Meeting on 6 December 2022. It specifies the prior engagement that was carried out that specifically targetted people who might be directly impacted by the BRT designation.

Essentially, it boils down to:

- Unaddressed flyers dropped in letterboxes, delivered folded up in a bunch by the same people who drop off the unsolicited 'junk mail'
- Opportunities to talk to AT/SG staff at Manukau Westfield on two occasions and outside Papatoetoe New World on one occasion


- Letters addressed to residents in July 2022 which did not specify the scale or potential impact of the proposed route
- Letters to residents who are directly impacted by land acquisition either in whole or in part in August 2022 with an invitation to meet with SG staff
- Meetings with SG staff where owners of individual properties were told more about the potential impact on their land. For many, this was the first time they realised the extent of the impact to them personally. SG staff made it clear they could not give a map showing the entire route due to privacy reasons and that they could only talk to landowners about their own individual properties.

When we study the information sent to residents in the flyers, and even the information presented to local boards, the route shown was a generalised blue line along Puhinui Road, with absolutely no indication of the scale, including the plan to build a bridge to link with the Puhinui Train Station, and to realign the route to go through all the houses on the southern side of Puhinui Road from Clendon Ave on past Plunket. There was also no reference with the location of the blue line, to the impact on Kenderdine Road, Bridge Street and Cambridge Terrace. In addition, the only real route 'options' that people were asked to comment on in these flyers involved which streets within Manukau Central would have the BRT route. There were no clear opportunities that I can find information on where potentially impacted people were targeted to be invited to have *meaningful* input to which other routes (e.g., not using Puhinui Road at all) were being assessed.

We are also concerned that as the flyers were delivered, not in envelopes, and not individually addressed, they may well have gone un-noticed folded up in the 'junk mail' many of us put straight in the recycling bin.

When we drilled down into the type of consultation that occurred at the New World and Westfield Manukau information sessions, people were asked generalised questions designed to get standardised answers. They were offerred the opportunity to write short comments and place them on maps with post-it notes. The route 'options' presented were few.

When we tried to get further information from SG staff about the other properties affected by the proposed route, we were continually rebuffed, with privacy issues cited. My husband and I went door-knocking up and down the street, trying not to look like we were selling vacuum cleaners, to see talk to other residents about the impact on their properties. We were floored to find that some people had not even received a letter, and thus were completely unaware of the project. (Including a property badly affected by the 2021 tornado – the old house was demolished and there is currently a brand-new two-storey home being built on the site at 182 Puhinui Road – you can imagine the shock and consternation of the land owner who was given consent to build on a property about to be affected by an acquisition under an NoR!)

It was not until late in the piece, after repeated requests from Arena Williams, our local MP, that AT/SG staff came to a meeting outside the Puhinui Train Station and unrolled a map so people could see the actual extent of the proposed NoR.

Digging into the engagement documents from AT/SG, I was surprised to see that residents associations in far-flung areas such as Wattle Downs, had been engaged with, but not the people likely to be directly affected by construction of the BRT route.

The SIA Appendix B, Summary of Engagement, mentions that there were interviews undertaken with stakeholders including private property owners. The document only notes conversations with one business owner from the shops adjacent to Ranfurly Road, and the opinion piece written for and published in the *NZ Herald* by Mr Ali Shakir who lives at the Botany end of the BRT corridor. The first section of the Summary notes that, *"Not all stakeholders were able to participate in the SIA or were able to complet the Social Impact Assessment Process."* I would like to know how the particular stakeholders and groups were identified, and why, for the entirety of the route from the airport to Botany, only two 'private property owners' were interviewed.

The Summary goes on to say that *"We identified advocacy groups, social enterprises, and other groups representing community interestes and business and community networks and contacted them."* I would like to know if any were in the area most affected by property acquisition. The voluntary surveys carried out, and the meetings with groups noted in the Summary show *no* groups directly linked to the area most affected by property acquisition. The groups noted in the Summary were:

- Chinese community in Botany Downs, Botany Junction, Flat Bush, Dannemora and Ormiston with a focus on older people and youth;
- The Fijian Indian community in Flat Bush, Ormiston, Clover Park and the Airport Precinct;
- The Pasifika community in Otara, Clover Park, Wiri, Flat Bush, Manukau City Centre and Ormiston, age groups 18-49; and
- Residents in the Flat Bush and Ormiston area.

<u>None</u> of these groups are located or representative of people living in Paptoetoe, particularly Puhinui Road, or in the vicinity of land to be taken around Bridge Street. This does not seem like an SIA that was carried out with the intention of actually getting honest input from affected landowners.

Social Impact Assessment engagement interviews were carried out with the Puhinui Medical Centre and Puhinui School. These interviews were focussed very much on the impact of the project on business and access. Neither the school nor the medical centre are facing property acquistion. In addition, it is unclear *when* these conversations took place, and whether the true impact of expected housing intensification has been taken into account in discussions on, for example, expected roll growth in the future. In addition, were those at the school made fully aware of the extent of the BRT route and its infrastructure and the fact it will, essentially cut the school off geographically from most of its school community?

Near the end of the Summary of Engagement is a table (Table 2) which notes that approximately 85 of the 475 potentially affected landowners were met with. I would like to know how the 85 were contacted and met with. The only thing I can think of is that it is these land owners who responded to their letters of August 2022 inviting them to meet with representatives of SG. These meetings were not true 'engagement' or part of a Social Impact Assessment – they were merely to inform land owners of what could be happening to their land, and of the designation process itself.

I am incensed at the low level of effective communication with land owners likely to be directly affected by the proposal. I try not to be squinty-eyed and cynical, but I'm sure a proposal as large as this would have been treated quite differently if it were to be planned in a more wealthy, educated area where people are more inclined to litigate.

That said, I once worked as a planner at Auckland City Council. If anyone here should have seen the extent of the proposal coming, it should have been me. But I didn't see it coming. The blue line on the flyers I took to mean some improvements to the bus lane that is already outside our house. Perhaps widening a metre or so to give a bit more space on the carriage way.

When we bought 172 Puhinui Road over 25 years ago, it had a road widening designation on it for a metre or so from the front of the property. This designation was lifted after the full construction of the Cavendish Drive through-route which was where most traffic, including freight vehicles, was expected to travel, leaving Puhinui Road more for local traffic. Since then, bus lanes have been created down Puhinui Road. They are a bit tight so you can imagine, then, when we saw the flyers with the blue line drawn on them, that we thought AT was re-considering minor road-widening such as was proposed when we first bought here, in order to give the bus lanes a little more space.

Even when we received our letter in August 2022 and made an appointment time to talk to SG representatives, I naively went along thinking, even though our whole property was cross-hatched on the map attached to the letter, that only a small sliver was likely to be needed to facilitate improved rapid bus transit via a widening of the bus lane. How wrong I was, and how shocked was I when, at the meeting, after sitting through the planners telling us about the need for improved public transport in the area, they said it was our *entire* property to be taken for the BRT route, and that there would be an enormous raised bridge going through where our house currently sits.

Going back to disect those flyers, I still don't think even knowing what I know now, that the information that was contained in them gave a true and accurate reflection of the potential *scale* of the proposed BRT. The cynical part of me looks at the documentation and wonders if this was intentional all along.

I feel that I have failed my local community by not seeing this coming.

Page37 of the SIA notes that a reason for people in the area having poor knowledge of the project, is that as it has taken a long time to get to the notification of designations, many people have moved out of the area, and the newcomers don't know about the project. This may be the case, but I would also argue that most long-term residents have not known about the project either.

Notification of NoRs

Now that we are at the stage of the NoRs being lodged and publically notified as open for submission, AT/AC have sent letters to directly affected land owners (those with properties to be acquired in full or in part if the designations go through).

Given that there are many others (especially in properties that adjoin those to be acquired, or on the other side of Puhinui Road from the properties to be acquired) who will also be massively impacted by the construction and operation of the BRT, I would like to know why these property owners did not also receive letters to notify them that submissions are open.

As mentioned in the SIA, this is a disadvantaged community with a high deprivation level. The formal method of notifying about the NoRs is not one that will readily see people who live here, getting involved and making submissions. Many are elderly. Many have English as a second language. Some have come from other countries as refugees. Some cannot read or write, certainly not to the level required to understand the NoR documents and respond to them. Many families here live pay-cheque to pay-cheque or rely on assistance from food banks to feed their kids. These people will not necessarily have access to the internet, devices, or printing. People who live here are not generally litigious.

I believe strongly that in areas such as this, there needs to be a better method of getting people involved in the process. Face-to-face meetings are needed, with more assistance than can be provided via Friends of the Submitter whose planning offices are based far away on the North Shore (many here I have spoken to are frightened to talk to the FoS as they see they are employed via AC and, therefore, may not be unbiased). I am unsure why a more locally based planning company was not used to provide FoS services to this community – where they could actually come out on the ground and meet with people who are not comfortable communicating via the phone, internet or the written word.

The statutory timeframe does not give people who are working full time much time to read, absorb and submit for a project of this scale, either.

I would not be at all surprised, if the designations go through and, eventually, construction begins, for some of our neighbourhood to be like Arthur Dent in *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy* by Douglas Adams. Arthur came out of his house one morning in his dressing gown, to find the bulldozers ready to demolish his house (actually, the whole planet) to make way for a new hyperspace bypass. When he asked about what consultation had gone on for the project, he found that the documents had been available for viewing on another planet.

"You hadn't exactly gone out of your way to call attention to them had you? I mean like actually telling anyone or anything."

"But the plans were on display . . . "

"On display? I eventually had to go down to the cellar to find them."

"That's the display department."



"With a flashlight."

"Ah, well, the lights had probably gone."

"So had the stairs."

"But look, you found the notice, didn't you?"

"Yes," said Arthur, "yes I did. It was on display in the bottom of a locked filing cabinet stuck in a disused lavatory with a sign on the door saying, 'Beware of the Leopard'."

Please, Auckland Transport, Supporting Growth and Auckland Council, let's do better.

Detailed Design and Construction Phases

The SIA outlines how, "Ongoing engagement should continue during the planning stage of the Project to continue to maintain and build relationships with the community and provide an opportunity for those new to the area to find out about the project." Given what I have written above, I don't think there are existing relationships to build on.

Indeed, page 52 of the SIA recommends that a Community and Stakeholder Engagement Strategy be developed for the project that includes, among other things, *"Maintaining the current good relationships between Auckland Transport and Waka Kotahi and the community, particularly directly affected landowners."* This is almost laughable given the poor engagement efforts that have been undertaken to date, despite the two impressivelooking engagement documents. I would challenge AT to find even one affected land owner who truly feels they have been effectively engaged with to date that the organization could say they have a 'current good relationship' with.

The SIA (p.52) suggests information about the project be available for the community, and in particular, affected land owners. The SIA suggests this be done via the AT website. For all the reasons noted above, such as low literacy, ESOL, etc., this is not going to be enough. There will need to be face-to-face meetings and get-togethers.

Please treat our community better than has been done to date with this project.

Seek recommendations:

- That AT/AC communicate much more effectively with affected communities if the project goes ahead.
- That there be a more effective, locally-based 'Friends of the Submitter' type offer to assist people in the neighbourhood with the rest of the designation process (hearings, etc.)

- That not only land owners of properties to be acquired are communicated with, but other affected people too, such as those with properties adjacent to acquired properties
- That there be a dedicated team to work alongside the affected residents during detailed design and construction phases (face to face meetings, etc., not just information on a website).

Appendix A to submission by Heather Haylock regarding Engagment for NoRs 1, 2, 3, 4a and 4b

Presentation to Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Meeting

6 December 2022

Regarding Airport to Botany Rapid Transit Route



Presentation to Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Meeting

6 December 2022

Regarding Airport to Botany Rapid Transit Route

by Heather Haylock

I am speaking as one of a number of people who live and work along Puhinui Road, as well as others in Bridge Street, Kenderdine Road and Cambridge Terrace and people in the surrounding area, who are to be massively impacted by the proposed Airport to Botany Rapid Transit Route. Mr Kamlesh Rana will also be speaking at the meeting.

Letters

In July and August 2022, residents of affected properties received letters from Te Tupu Ngātahi Supporting Growth Group/Auckland Transport, advising that the preferred route for the Airport to Botany Rapid Transit Project would impact their properties. The August letter invited individual land owners to make an appointment for an interview with representatives from Supporting Growth. The letter also included site maps for individual properties to show the land expected to be required for the project.

Meetings

At the meetings, landowners for separate properties were ushered into rooms with two representatives from Supporting Growth/AT. This meant that no landowners met with other landowners, and different pairs of representatives spoke to different landowners.

After being told more about the overall rapid transit project and how it fits into overall plans for public transport in Auckland, landowners were able to discuss the impact on their individual properties.

Many of us were shocked at the extent of the land required. In some cases, it is our whole properties. In others, there are significant slices of land taken from the fronts of properties – in some cases, this would mean the transport routes are within a metre or two of existing front doors.

We were shocked at the extent of the proposed project. In none of the community 'consultation' (see 'Background Consultation' section below) had this been made clear. We had been lulled into a false sense of security, and led to think that the impact on this section of Puhinui Road might be limited to some extension of the existing bus lanes.

The Supporting Growth/AT reps explained the designation process. The plan is for a requirement for designation to be applied for by AT in December 2022, with an opportunity

for people to make submissions and appear at Auckland Council hearings in 2023. If the designation is approved by Council, it will go onto the District Plan maps.

The representatives said there are no plans to purchase properties under the Public Works Act until the project is closer to construction. Different residents were told different things by the various representatives. Some were told properties might be able to be bought in five years time, but most were told that as the project is some 10-15 years away, it would be unlikely that an offer would be made for properties for at least ten years.

Different landowners were also given mixed messages about what the purchase of their properties would mean – what 'market rates' paid for the properties actually means in practice. Many landowners do not want to sell, and have concerns about the fact that their land may be taken anyway, whether or not they wish to sell to AT.

When asked for a map of the route to show the true extent of the project, and the route, and the actual properties affected, the representatives told us that was not possible as it would be a breach of privacy – that they could only talk to individuals about their own properties. This seemed disingenuous; as a result, we have gone door-knocking and made announcements in social media to try to get in contact with as many affected people as we can so we can put together our own map of the route.

When we went door-knocking, it came to light that some residents did not even receive their letters, so had no idea about what was going on. In one case, a resident is currently building a new home in place of the one that was destroyed in last year's tornado. It seems almost unbelieveable that consent was given for that building to go ahead in the knowledge that in 10-15 years it will be demolished to make way for the rapid transit route.

The proposal

Despite generalised maps sent out over the past couple of years (see 'Background Consultation' below), at no point was the true scale of the project made clear. It appears that the route comes from the airport, along Puhinui Road, and is then bridged up over the top of the train tracks to link with the top floor of the new Puhinui Train Station. The bridge continues on down past Plunket Ave before the route returns to ground level (apparently a long approach is required on either side of the bridge to get the gradient needed for rapid transit vehicles). Because of the placement of the Puhinui Station, slightly to the south of Puhinui Road, the bridge will go directly through all the properties affected. Scale of the bridge can be seen on the following video: <u>https://youtu.be/jSeQIR7gzZM</u>

Not only will it impact the landowners of those properties that will be taken, but it will also impact those neighbours abutting the bridge (e.g., in Freyburg Avenue), leaving them with a bridge at the bottom of their backyards. These people have not been consulted with at all.

There is planned to be another station at the intersection of Puhinui Road and Lambie Drive, before the route travels along Lambie to get to the Manukau Train Station. After that it winds its way back towards Te Irirangi Drive where it continues to Botany Town Centre.

In addition, the plan is to widen the sections of Kenderdine, Bridge Street and Cambridge Terrace to allow better traffic flow for local traffic and buses, and walking and cycling. Nowhere in the background consultation maps was this suggested at all, so the project has come as a massive blow from left-field for those land owners.

Background 'consultation'

After the interview meeting with the Supporting Growth/AT representatives, we spent some time trying to work out how such a massive project had got to this stage of development without us knowing.

We found reference to two documents which outline the community participation programme. *Southwest Gateway Programme Engagement Summary December2017 to December 2018*, and *Southwest Gateway Programme Engagement Summary January to December 2019*. (see end of this report for location of downloadable documents)

In summary, it appears that residents along the route will have received some flyers in the mail over the past few years, and had the opportunity to go and look at some posters in places such as Papatoetoe New World one evening, and Westfield Manukau on two dates.

There were presentations made to a number of local boards, including the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board on 17 September 2018. (Airport-Botany 20 Connect Southern Local Boards presentation) (see end of this report for location of downloadable document)

When we study the information sent to residents in the flyers, and even the information presented to local boards, the route was a generalised blue line along Puhinui Road, with absolutely no indication of the scale, including the plan to build a bridge to link with the Puhinui Train Station, and to realign the route to go through all the houses on the southern side of Puhinui Road from Clendon Ave on past Plunket. There was also no reference to the impact on Kenderdine Road, Bridge Street and Cambridge Terrace.

We are also concerned that as the flyers were delivered, not in envelopes, and not individually addressed, they may well have gone un-noticed in the 'junk mail' many of us put straight in the recycling bin.

When we dug down into the type of consultation that occurred at the New World and Westfield Manukau information sessions, people were asked generalised questions designed to get standardised answers. They were offerred the opportunity to write short comments and place them on maps with post-it notes.

The two Engagement Summary documents are very thick and impressive-looking, but when you actually read them, there is a lot of repitition. Much fluff and not much substance. We were fascinated to read that groups such as residents groups in Wattle Downs, Weymouth and Alfirston (to name a few) were consulted with – while in the meantime, people whose actual properties would be taken by the project were not directly contacted at all.

In a shortened summary of the community engagement feedback that appeared in the letterbox, it states: *"We asked people what they thought of the preferred rapid transit route between the airport, Puhinui Station Interchange, Manukau and Botany. Of the 62 responses, 83% of people were in support of the preferred route."* This is misleading. The only 'options' referred to here were whether the route through Manukau City itself would go via the Manukau Train Station, or leave the station out and go along the adjacent road instead.

We consider that with a project of this extreme magnitude, more should have been done in the planning stages to involve the local community and landowners directly affected.

It feels to us as though the project has been pushed through underground, in a way whether intentional or not) that has misinformed those directly affected until the last possible moment when the designation was about to be applied for. This does not seem fair, equitable or democratic.

We are concerned that many people in our area will not have been able to access the information. There are many here for whom English is a second language. And many busy living from pay cheque to pay cheque to survive in these difficult pandemic times. These people will not have had an equal chance to participate in this process.

As our representatives to Council, we ask that the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board supports the affected residents throughout the coming process.

Attempts to get further information

At our individual meeting with the Supporting Growth/AT representatives, we asked about the business case that has been put together and, specifically, what other options were investigated. One we suggested was that rather than going through the residential area, why not take the rapid transit directly from the Puhinui Station to the Manukau Station along the corridor already developed for that purpose. We did not get a satisfactory answer to our question.

The representatives there seemed focussed on telling us about the designation process, and what would happen when our land is required.

We emailed Supporting Growth, asking for further information, but were told, once again, no further information could be provided to us about the actual route, citing privacy concerns for other land owners.

Local MP, Media

Some of us have appeared in the *NZ Herald* and *Stuff* talking about the concerns. There are others further along the route near Botany Town Centre who have done the same.

We have also approached Arena Williams, our local Member of Parliament. She has been extremely helpful in trying to get further information from Auckland Transport. She has held a meeting for residents (some Local Board members also attended) and there is another meeting planned for Wednesday 30 November, where AT representatives will be in attendance.

Main concerns

To summarise, some of the main concerns we have are:

<u>Uncertainty</u>

This project puts landowners in an untenable situation. They are in limbo. Some planned to stay in their homes until their deaths. Others planned to sell in the next few years.

Having a designation (or even a proposed designation) on a property means it will be difficult to sell. And until AT applies for and gets central government funding, it is our understanding they will not be looking to buy properties for the forseeable future.

This uncertainty is putting people under incredible amounts of stress. We have heard reports of people being extremely upset, to the point of depression and anxiety attacks.

Property Value and liveability

Having a designation on a property affects its value. For those whose whole properties are planned to be taken in their entirety, it affects how much those properties can reach.

For those whose properties have a sizeable chunk taken away from the front of them, they will be left with a roadway very close to their front doors. This will impact their quality of life. In addition, in some cases, it will leave them with a tiny property footprint that will be incredibly hard to either develop or sell.

Another concern is that given the uncertainty, people may neglect to develop and maintain their properties in the meantime, in the knowledge that the houses will eventually be taken and demolished. This will then potentially have a negative impact in terms of property values for the area that may apply when and if AT gets the central government funding to buy the properties under the Public Works Act.

<u>Fairness</u>

The process seems very unfair and one-sided. It feels like AT has all the power and we have none.

<u>Process</u>

The consultation process to date has not been effective in letting people know about the project and its true scale and impact. It seems very wrong that those people most directly affected have not been contacted directly until almost the very last minute. (Indeed, some never received their letters at all.) It also seems wrong that those with properties adjoining

the proposed route have not been involved in the process either, as the project will have a massive impact on them and their property values too.

<u>Potential</u>

In none of the documentation seen so far, has there been any mention of potential improvements to the public facilities in the affected area, to go along with the proposed rapid transit route itself. If the project does end up going ahead, it would be an opportunity for this area to have some extra investment in public facilities (e.g., pocket parks). If the large swathe of land is to be taken anyway, and developed with a rapid transit route and bridge, we would urge AT to ensure that some of that land is used as a buffer for neighbouring residents (e.g., along Freyburg Ave), and that it is landscaped appropriately. There is a dearth of parks in this Puhinui area, with the closest playground being at Sunnyside Reserve. With the residential intensification occurring in the area, there is a need for places for people to relax and play. Perhaps the negative outcome of a rapid transit route could be somewhat ameliorated by sensitive landscaping and investment in seating, playground equipment, plantings, etc.

Equatability

We are not a flash area in comparison to many other parts of Auckland City. We are a strong community, however, with many people having lived here their whole lives (and some families have been here for generations). We do not have the financial ability to take this project to its legal conclusion (to the Environment Court) if necessary. We wonder if this type of project would have ever been proposed if it were in a more wealthy suburb of the city.

Local Board Involvement

As our representatives to Council, we ask that the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board support us in our efforts to raise awareness about this project and its impacts.

We ask that the Board require more detailed information from AT about the actual route, including properties affected (there may still be some people completely unaware their properties are affected if they did not receive their letters in the mail).

We also ask for continued support as the designation process is undertaken throughout 2023 and beyond.

Attachments

- Southwest Gateway Programme Engagement Summary December2017 to December 2018 <u>https://at.govt.nz/media/1981430/southwest-gateway-programme-summaryreport.pdf</u> too large to attach here but available by scrolling down on the following website page: <u>https://at.govt.nz/projects-roadworks/airport-to-botany-rapid-transit</u>
- 2. Southwest Gateway Programme Engagement Summary January to December 2019 https://at.govt.nz/media/1983567/southwest-gateway-public-summary-report-sept-

<u>2020.pdf</u> too large to attach here but available by scrolling down on the following website page: <u>https://at.govt.nz/projects-roadworks/airport-to-botany-rapid-t ransit</u>

3. Airport-Botany 20 Connect Southern Local Boards 17 September 2018 <u>https://www.scribd.com/document/393138223/2018-08-17-Southern-Local-Board-Cluster-Meeting-V2</u> or <u>https://fyi.org.nz/request/8884/response/29778/attach/5/2018%2008%2017%20SouthernLocalBoard%20ClusterMeeting%20V2.pdf</u>

Flood Hazard

Specific Parts of Designation:

NoR1, NoR2, NoR3, NoR4a and NoR4b

All NoRs – effects of the proposal on flood hazard for properties near the BRT route

Reasons for Submission:

The Assessment of Effects on the Environment (AEE) (pp. 91-92) notes that a '100 year flood' calculation is being used to in modelling to assess the impacts of flood hazard. It recommends that there be no increase in flood levels for existing authorized habitable floors that are already subject to flooding. It also notes there should be no more than a 10% average increased flood hazard for the main access to authorized habitable dwellings.

Given the recent catastrophic floods in the Auckland region and elsewhere this summer, along with the predicted ongoing changes to the climate including a greater frequency and severity of extreme natural events such as rain storms and floods, I think both AC and AT should look at whether the level of risk is acceptable to the community. At the design stage of the BRT project, AT can consider ways it can contribute to lessening flood hazard in the surrounding areas (e.g., by looking at the creation of a 'ribbon park' that would help absorb stormwater (see my other submissions on this topic) using land acquired for but not used for the BRT route infrastructure.

Seek recommendations:

- That <u>AT and AC reconsider the use of the '100 year flood' calculation and the no</u> <u>more than 10% increased flood hazard risk</u>, and whether this level of risk is acceptable to the community given recent rainfall events and the potential for increased severity and frequency of extreme weather events in the future.
- That AT consider, at the design stage of the project, ways in which it can further reduce the flood hazard in areas surrounding the BRT route (e.g., stormwater soaked up in a 'ribbon park' created on unused acquired land.

Land Acquisition

Specific Parts of Designation:

NoR1, NoR2, NoR3, NoR4a and NoR4b

All NoRs – effects of the proposal on properties to be acquired either wholly or in part, near the BRT route

Reasons for Submission:

The proposed BRT route, if it goes ahead, will require the acquisition of a large number of properties, either wholly or in part. This includes both residential and commercial/industrial zoned properties.

The acquisition will occur by means of the Public Works Act.

Affected land owners are confused. They are anxious. They are angry. They are sad.

At meetings with residential property owners at the Allenby Motel after letters were sent to landowners in August 2022, representatives from Supporting Growth (SG) were at pains to explain that the process would be carried out equitably and fairly. Terms such as 'market value' and 'payments for moving house' were used.

The fact remains that there are many people living along the route who do not want to move. Indeed, some will struggle to. There are people who have developed their sites into multi-generational homes, and vow to only ever 'be carried out in a box'. Some people are in the situation of having reverse mortgages on their homes.

There is the concern, too, of 'market rates' and what a proposed designation on a property will do to those rates. People don't know whether to sell early or to hold on. In any case, it is our understanding that AT doesn't yet have the central government funding it requires for such an enormous transport building project (and significant land acquisition).

Residents have already had letters in the mail from property lawyers saying they can actually sell early if they want to, and that there is an obligation for AT to purchase the properties if they are hard to sell in the current market with a proposed designation hanging over them. This has confused people and given an added layer of anxiety and worry.

There are some who had been planning to move in the next few years (before the 10-15 year construction timeframe). They are now in limbo, not being able to sell privately (who would want to buy a property for a fair price with a designation on it?), but not yet being able to negotiate with AT about acquisition.

Those of us with properties to be acquired under the designation have been warned that there will be developers knocking on our doors to buy our properties at low prices so they can land bank and hold out for a higher price from AT close to the construction period. As

mentioned in my other submissions, this is an area where people are not always able to advocate effectively for themselves in such situations.

People we have heard of in other areas (e.g., residents affected by recent roading projects in Pakuranga) have had to fight hard to get more than the minimum value for their properties that was offered by AT and its valuers. Some people in affected properties along the BRT route, are likely to struggle with this part of the acquisition process. They will need independent support and guidance.

Some people are faced with the prospect of only part of their properties designated to be acquired. Many of them would prefer their properties be designated for acquisition in their entirety, as their properties will be either unlivable or unsellable with large chunks taken off the front for the project.

Others, who are not impacted directly by their properties being acquired, live in properties that are adjacent to designated ones. They, too, may well wish to leave the area to avoid the negative impacts of noise and vibration, etc. But they are now in a position where they will adjoin designated land, so their land value will be negatively impacted.

Sadly, the uncertainty caused since the letters of August 2022 has caused some members of our community to leave the area already. One young family we know has moved to another suburb. They have a four year old who was due to start soon as a new entrant at Puhinui School soon. But because they want certainty and continuity for their children throughout their school years, and for their kids to make friendships at primary school that continue through intermediate and high school, they have chosen to move and establish elsewhere. They were concerned that they may need to leave the area sometime when their kids are at intermediate or high school given the timeframes of the BRT project, and didn't want to take that risk. They are a loss to our community.

People need greater certainty than they have currently. To stay or to go? To sell sooner or hold out till the bulldozers are revving up? People don't know what to do. More support is going to be needed in the community to help people navigate the process and come to decisions they can live with.

Seek recommendations:

• That <u>independent support mechanisms be put in place</u>, funded by AT similar to 'Friend of the Submitter', to help those impacted by property acquisition to advocate for the best outcomes for themselves.

Route and Station Options

Specific Parts of Designation:

NoR1, NoR2, NoR3, NoR4a and NoR4b

Route options and station options chosen for entire length of BRT (covers NoR 1, 2, 3, 4a and 4b)

Reasons for Submission:

1. Project Objectives:

Form 18 and other documentation for the NoRs note that the *primary* project objective for the Notices of Requirement are to provide a bus and rapid transit corridor that connects the key destinations of

- Auckland Airport (from the Orrs Road boundary),
- Manukau City Centre and
- Botany Town Centre.

There is also the *second* objective of providing corridors for both public transport and active modes (walking and cycling).

Cars and freight vehicles:

It is notable that the continued efficient use of private cars for passengers, and efficient use of road vehicles for freight are not mentioned in the list of project objectives.

2. <u>Pūkaki Creek</u>:

Also notable is that the section of the eventual route from the airport itself to Orrs road is not part of the study area or the sections covered by the NoRs. The Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) section 2.1.1 addresses this, noting that, *"Through the Eastern* Access Agreement, it was agreed that the form of the bridge over Pūkaki Creek would remain as a two-lane bridge in perpetuity. This bridge is located to the West of Orrs Road and is a crucial element for the future connection of the Project to Auckland Airport."

Indeed, if the configuration of this bridge is not altered to make it wider, or an alternative bridge structure provided, none of the overall BRT project outcomes will be achievable. The end of the NoR will see enormous traffic jams as private cars and rapid transit buses try to navigate what is already a narrow, restrictive bridge.

It seems ludicrous to continue with the social anxiety and upset being caused to affected residents and business owners, and work involved for staff at AT, SG and AC, etc., in progressing the NoRs until there is a clearer indication that the bridge can be widened or another bridge structure built over the Pūkaki Creek.

3. Route Options considered:

Appendix A (Volume 2) of the AEE assesses alternatives to the chosen route. I refer to this document as the AoA (Assessment of Alternatives).

Page 2 of this document notes the process of looking at alternatives should be

- transparent, robust and clearly recorded so as to be understood by others.
- In addition, an 'appropriate range of alternatives' should be considered, and
- The extent of options considered should be proportional to the potential effects of the options.

A range of alternatives were, indeed, considered (e.g., the 'initial options' in Figure 8, p. 22). Some of the alternatives followed variations of the final route presented in the NoRs. Other options went further North towards Mangere, or further South towards SH20, or further East on Chapel Road.



Fig 8 pg 22 Assessment of Alternatives

A shortlist was eventually chosen (map on p.66 AoA) which broadly follows Puhinui Road from Orrs Road along SH20b, over a new BRT bridge at Puhinui Station, continuing along Puhinui Road to Lambie Drive, along Lambie, winding around Hayman Park to Manukau Train Station, then winding through several tightly aligned streets in Manukau City Centre before continuing on directly to Botany Town Centre along Te Irirangi Drive. Along that route, 12 stations (stops) have been identified where passengers can get on and off buses.

Different modes of transport were also considered as part of the process, with the final decision being rapid transit buses (electric, high frequency, large vehicles with plenty of room for passengers).

Concerns/Alternative options not in the documentation:

Going back to the primary objective of connecting the three centres – Airport, Manukau and Botany, the route chosen seems to have some significant 'dog legs' that will make the journey slower and less direct. In particular, the winding route around Hayman Park and back through Manukau City Centre, before finally reaching Te Irirangi Drive, appears unnecessarily convoluted.

I would like to know why some other options do not appear in the documentation to have been considered at all.

Airport-Puhinui Station

As there are no planned stations/stops between the Airport and Puhinui Station, why does the route go down SH20b and the Western end of Puhinui Road to reach Puhinui Station? Could it not have been aligned in the vicinity of the West 6/West 7 original options?



Indicative map of route West 6 or 7 (as BRT rather than heavy rail)

I note those options were originally considered as part of a heavy rail option, but I see no reason that a BRT route could not have been considered along that alignment instead, going through what is primarily rural land or land being developed for industrial or commercial use in the vicinity of Prices Road, with the eastern end approaching Puhinui Station running beside the existing heavy rail line. Aligning a BRT along here would remove the necessity to disrupt a significant number of residential and commercial land owners along Puhinui Road. Yes, there would be alternative land owners to negotiate with, but these would be fewer in number and have less significant building infrastructure already in place.

Puhinui Station-Manukau Station

I also question why the proposed BRT route continues from Puhinui Station along Puhinui Road via a significant, large, bridged structure, to a proposed new station at the intersection of Puhinui Road and Lambie Drive, then along Lambie and around Hayman Park to the Manukau Station.

This route will require the purchase of a significant number of existing residential dwellings or part thereof, as well as some commercial zoned land. It will leave remaining residents (an future residents if the area is intensified) living within the shadow and noise of a large bridge structure.

I am aware that going down this route, along with the addition of a station at Lambie Drive, may pick up some passengers who live within walking distance of this new station. However, there are questions about how many passengers would actually access this station, referred to in the documentation (e.g., Figure 16 on p.16 of the Assessment of Transport Effects) and it may be that a more direct (i.e., faster) route between Puhinui Station and Manukau Station exists.

I cannot find anywhere in the options documentation that shows an option has been considered of constructing a BRT route either alongside or instead of the heavy rail connection that has recently been completed to link the Puhinui and Manukau Stations.



Indicative direct route Puhinui Station to Manukau Station via BRT next to or instead of existing rail line spur

Going along this route directly links Puhinui Station to Manukau Station. It would, yes, mean that some people living in walking distance from the proposed Lambie Drive station would not be so close to a BRT station, but if the primary objective of the project is to link the Airport-Manukau-Botany centres, this may be a worthwhile trade-off. There are other nonstructural options such as regular shuttle buses or vans to take people from this Lambie area (and others around Papatoetoe and elsewhere on the route) directly to either Puhinui or Manukau stations to catch the BRT vehicles to either the Airport or Botany.

Manukau Station-Te Irirangi Drive

The dog-leg in the proposed route continues from Manukau Station along Davies Ave, winding along Ronwood Ave and Great South Road before turning sharp right to travel along Te Irirangi Drive for the remainder of the journey to Botany. The Social Impact Assessment (SIA) notes in Appendix B that Westfield Manukau is planning to develop its own public transport hub near Friendship House. The SIA notes Westfield asked that a bus stop be put on Ronwood Ave. I am unsure how this request for a bus stop has turned into an entire BRT station on Ronwood Ave in the NoR documents. I would like this explained to me.

If, once again, we go back to the primary objective of getting people from the Airport-Manukau-Botany, this dog-leg seems counter-productive, adding to the length, complexity and time of the journey, not to mention the significant portions of commercial land that will need to be taken to fit the BRT into a widened carriageway. In addition, (see Fig 16 of the ATE referred to in section 4 of my submission below) it appears that adding the Ronwood station onto the route will not significantly increase patronage compared with focusing efforts on the existing Puhinui and Manukau stations.

A much more direct route that I cannot see considered in the documentation that I could find, would be to take the BRT directly from the Manukau Station along Station Road, up Redoubt Road, down Hollyford Drive (which already has an extremely wide berm for its entire length that would mean no need for property acquisition) to link with Te Irirangi Drive.

I am aware that in a number of the NoR documents, taking the BRT along Manukau Station Road and turning onto Great South Road to get to Te Irirangi was discounted as it would interfere too much with the Great South/Manukau Station/Redoubt Road intersection with car and freight traffic. This argument does not seem to have interfered with plans elsewhere on the route to interfere with traffic on existing road ways (e.g., Puhinui, Lambie, Davies, Ronwood, etc).

I would like this route to be investigated for its potential for the BRT, including the number of affected residential properties along Redoubt Road that may be affected, and the gradient of the road.



Potential more direct route Manukau Station to Te Irirangi Drive via Manukau Station and Redoubt Roads - Hollyford Drive

Another option could be going along Manukau Station Road, Great South Road and then to Te Irirangi Drive, to avoid the residential area along Redoubt Road along with the steep gradient of Redoubt Road to Hollyford Drive.



Potential more direct route Manukau Station to Te Irirangi Drive via Manukau Station and Great South Roads

While people closer to Ronwood Ave would not have a dedicated station there under these options, there is the shuttle bus/van idea noted above for the Lambie station catchment, and if walking infrastructure (e.g., covered ways) were improved in the Manukau City Centre streets, it is approximately 700m depending on the route taken, well within the 1km walking

distance to a rapid transit station that is quoted elsewhere in the NoR documentation. (See approx. walking distances on maps below.)



Distances to walk from Ronwood Ave near Gt St Rd to Manukau Train Station

I would like AT to consider and let submitters know about these other options that do not seem to have been considered in the documentation. These other options would be

- more direct (avoiding the dog leg around Hayman Park/through Manukau City Centre)
- faster (with less stops)
- requiring the acquisition of fewer residential and commercial properties along the route.



Two potential indicative alternative overall routes Airport-Manukau-Botany

Overall Route – role of Puhinui Station

When put on a map, the options I have requested be re-looked at have an obvious detour to the Puhinui Station (as does the proposed BRT in the NoRs).

Another option would be to not go through the new Puhinui Station at all. If the true main objective of the project were to link the Airport-Manukau-Botany route directly, this option would seem to directly achieve that objective. This would be another option for AT to report back on.

I imagine it would be unlikely to gain much political support given the huge amount of money that has been spent on building a very large station at Puhinui already it seems to the outside eye at least, to have been designed with the BRT bridge option firmly in mind. (The Puhinui Station's location to the South of Puhinui Road alignment and the large verandah which has been designed to link with the proposed bridge.)



Two potential indicative alternative overall routes Airport-Manukau-Botany sans Puhinui Station

4. Station Options considered:

It appears from information in the Assessment of Traffic Effects (ATE) figure 16, which estimates daily boarding numbers at stations on the route in 2038, the expected numbers of passengers accessing the BRT by the Lambie Drive and Ronwood Ave BRT stations will be well below the expected numbers using other stations, notably the existing Puhinui and Manukau Stations.



Fig 16 from ATE

This feeds into my questions about the need to take the BRT route via Puhinui Road, Lambie Drive, etc., with the dog-leg back down Davies and Ronwood Aves.

If the main objective of the project is to get people quickly and efficiently between the Airport-Manukau-Botany, the addition of smaller stations along the way such as Lambie and Ronwood seems to not directly support that objective.

(Note, too, that many of the other stations in Figure 16 above that are not associated with a shopping centre or existing major transit station, are also expecting very low daily boardings – e.g., Diorella, Accent and Smales. These stations should also be looked at again to determine whether they actually assist in achieving the main objective of getting people rapidly between the Airport and Botany.)

I also question why, in the plans shown in the NoR documentation, there are no stations located between Puhinui Station and the Airport, given the significant new development of commercial areas in the general area of Prices Road, etc.

Lambie Drive

The documentation, and time spent talking with AT and SG staff at meetings, seems to suggest that the main reason for going along Puhinui Road and having a station at Lambie Drive, is to provide people within walking distance of that station, the opportunity to get on and off the BRT. (With the added factor of encouraging high density 6-storey residential intensification around public transport stations.) This is mentioned in some of the documentation (e.g., p. 106 of the AoA). However, p. 107 of the document notes that the Lambie Station is a 'minor priority'.

I would like to see other, softer, non-hard-infrastructure options, researched and reported back to AC and the community. For example, frequent, rapid mini-shuttles that circulate from that Lambie-St George Street area, taking people to either the Puhinui or Manukau Stations to access the BRT.

Ronwood Ave

In relation to the proposed Ronwood Ave BRT station, I note (in Appendix B of the SIA) that Westfield Manukau has its own plans for expansion, including extending its current building footprint to cover the large existing open car park along the boundary with Great South Road, and developing its own public transport hub. This plan for a separate, new transport hub seems a little odd to me, given that so much resource has already gone into developing the new Manukau train station and the Manukau bus station right on the doorstep of Westfield Manukau. These relatively new bus and train stations are 700m or less from the furthest corner of the current Westfield building footprint where Farmers department store is. (Well within walking distance from the shops.) If resources were put into improving the walking and cycling surfaces leading from the shops to the bus and train stations (e.g., suitable wide shared paths, covered areas where required), it seems to me that the proposed Ronwood BRT station would be unnecessary. I would like to see AT reconsider and explain more fully the reasoning behind the perceived need for a BRT station at the Ronwood location, given the close proximity of the existing bus and train stations to the Westfield shops. Is it something AT has agreed to in order to acquire support from Westfield Manukau given the significant disruption the construction of the proposed BRT will have on the commercial area noted in Appendix B of the SIA? I cannot see any other logical reason for locating a station at Ronwood Ave, despite having read through the documentation provided in the NoR.

Wyllie Road area potential station

Given the rationale for the station at Lambie Drive, which has largely been given as serving the residential catchment within walking distance of that station, why then, is there not a similar station to serve those in the Western part of Papatoetoe, in the region of the intersection of Wyllie Road with Puhinui Road? It would seem that people are required to make their way all the way to the Puhinui Station if they live anywhere near Wyllie Road/Pah Road etc., which seems to not be the same reasoning compared with the station being provided for those living in walking distance of Lambie Drive and the proposed station there.

SH20b Potential Station(s)

There is currently significant new development of land that was previously zoned rural, into commercial zoned properties. This is currently mainly occurring on the Southern side of SH20b in the vicinity of Prices Road. Given this commercial development, along with the fact that the Manukau Memorial Gardens are a significant destination, it seems bizarre to me that there are no BRT stops planned to serve this area of the route.

P.106 of the AoA assesses this commercial development area as being a low-density land use that does not warrant a BRT station. When talking to AT and SG staff, I was told that if people working in that area wanted to use the BRT, they would either have to get off at Puhinui Station and catch a bus or uber to work, or go all the way to the Airport, then catch a bus or uber back to work. This seems unlikely – people will just take their cars, adding to the congestion on the road network.

If the dog-leg around the Manukau City Centre with its added station goes ahead, with the delays traversing that area and the Ronwood station, why not allow a little more delay by adding in a station or stations in the vicinity of the Memorial Gardens and the new commercial zoned area near Prices Road?

5. Hard Infrastructure/Mode Options:

Throughout the NoR documentation is the obvious desire to pursue a hard infrastructure approach to the perceived problem of there not currently being an effective, resilient, frequent, fast way for people to get between the Airport-Manukau-Botany. (e.g., AEE Appendix A 4.1.2.1 where non-infrastructure interventions are discounted in favour of new

infrastructure as opportunities for the future. This seems to me, to be backwards – why not thoroughly investigate non-infrastructure interventions first (e.g., new bus routes, more frequent bus services) before embarking on costly, long-term, non-retractable infrastructure projects?

Hard Infrastructure for BRT

Section 1.3 of the AEE notes the current bus routes do not get people quickly enough from one end of the route to the other and that the area is not well-served currently by public transport. Appendix A of the AEE (the Assessment of Alternatives) section 4.1.2.1 concludes that hard infrastructure is the best option to solve the problem.

I went onto the AT Journey Planner site, to look at the current bus routes running between the Airport-Manukau-Botany.

The orange AIR bus runs frequently between the airport and Manukau bus station (adjacent to Manukau Train Station) along Puhinui and Lambie Drives. From Manukau bus station to Botany there are two main existing bus routes – the 353 bus that goes via Preston and Springs Road, and the 35 bus that goes via Chapel and Murphys Roads.



It is notable that neither of these existing bus routes between Manukau and Botany actually go via Te Irirangi Drive currently. Given that Te Irirangi Drive currently has a faster speed allowance (60kph) compared to most of Preston/Springs or Chapel/Murphy, we don't know how fast it could actually be to go by bus now if it were to go via Te Irirangi Drive. I would like to know the comparison between a bus travelling along Te Irirangi Drive between Manukau and Botany, and the current buses that go via either the 353 or the 35 route.

Te Irirangi Drive is the route for the proposed BRT. It already has a wide median which was designed with some form of rapid transit in mind. Current transit times include the slow speed bus route 353 or 35. If this section of the BRT were to be built on the median as suggested in the NoR, it may give enough of a boost to the speed of the Airport-Manukau-Botany link without the enormous disruption caused by the hard infrastructure proposed elsewhere on the route (e.g., Puhinui Road, the BRT bridge linking Puhinui Station, etc.)

I would like AT to research and report back on how long it will be expected to take to go by bus via Te Irirangi Drive both now and when the BRT would be expected to be built (10-15 years). At the moment we are comparing the time it takes to take a future BRT route

between Manukau and Botany, against how long it takes to go now via either the slower Preston/Springs or Chapel/Murphys, not via the faster Te Irirangi.

We need to be comparing apples with apples, and with the information contained in the NoR I am comparing apples with carrots.

It may be there is not as much need for a hard infrastructure approach for the entire length of the route (including the BRT bridge at Puhinui Station), if the Te Irirangi Road section were built first and bus schedules and routes were re-assessed and re-jigged, then the situation looked at again. However, understanding the need to protect/designate land ahead of time, I'd like to at least see some scenarios with the alternative route (no BRT bridge etc., at Puhinui Station, go via existing AIR bus from Airport to Manukau, then a BRT directly going along the median of Te Irirangi Drive) to compare the right fruit with the right fruit, not with a vegetable.

Mode Options and Public Transport Usage

This is not my area of expertise however; I would like to know how much research AT has done into the future of transport technology.

Will we still be using large scale buses in twenty years' time on fixed routes, or will there be other options? Things that come to mind are self-drive cars or mini vans that you can arrange to pick you up and drop you off exactly where you want to go. If this is the future of transport technology, will there be a need for large-scale infrastructure projects like the one planned for in the NoRs? Will we need to be planning for large buses to go along predetermined routes? Or will we be looking at smaller-scale, more agile technologies and the opportunities that go with them?

I would like to see proof that AT has considered the future options and isn't just planning for current technology in a future world.

Living on Puhinui Road, with my office where I work from home with a window looking directly across the road to an AIR bus stop, I get to see the frequent orange AIR buses passing by. I would say that 99% of the time, they have, at most, three passengers on them. Often they go by with no passengers at all – just a driver. This does give me pause to wonder how much the proposed BRT will actually be used.

If we go to the airport we use the AIR bus, and can confirm that more passengers use it between the airport and Puhinui Station than they do between Puhinui Station and Manukau Station. Our daughter attends university at the Auckland University South Campus on Osterley Way. She often takes the AIR bus to and from her lectures. She calls it her 'personal uber' as she is generally the only person on the bus, and it drops her almost outside our door.

I realise the proposed BRT isn't planned to be constructed for 10-15 years, but I really do wonder what 'push' factors will cause people to use the service over and above the 'pull' factor of a new, purpose-built, frequent rapid bus infrastructure.

I would like to see information from AT to know they have considered the current low patronage of sections of the AIR bus route, and how this will change with a new BRT system in place.

Seek recommendations:

- In relation to section 1 above, <u>delay</u> continued development of the NoRs until crucial decisions are made about the bridge (or an alternative bridge structure) over Pūkaki Creek.
- In relation to section 2 above, require AT to <u>reconsider and research and report back</u> <u>on</u> alternative routes specifically:
 - BRT route that goes from airport directly to Puhinui Station *not* using Puhinui Road, but instead in the area of the rejected West 6 and 7 routes + adjacent to existing train line South of Puhinui Station
 - BRT route on land adjacent to or currently used for the rail link from Puhinui Station to Manukau Station
 - BRT route without the dog-leg through Manukau City Centre go directly from Manukau Station, to Great South Road, then up Te Irirangi, or up Redoubt to Hollyford down to Te Irirangi.
 - BRT route via the rejected West 6 and 7 routes, from Airport to Manukau and on to Botany without going via Puhinui Station at all
- In relation to section 3 above, and at the same time as reconsidering the need for the BRT route to follow Puhinui/Lambie/Hayman Park/Davies/Ronwood at all, require AT to reconsider, research and report back on the need for the <u>BRT stations</u> that appear to expect relatively low daily passenger boardings as shown in Fig 16 of the ATE including:
 - o Lambie Drive
 - Ronwood Ave
 - Diorella, Accent and Smales
 - Also in relation to section 3 above, require AT to <u>reconsider</u>, <u>research and</u> <u>report back on</u> an additional station location between Puhinui Station and SH20 in the vicinity of the intersection of Wyllie Road with Puhinui Road to serve the residential area of western Papatoetoe that not within easy walking distance of Puhinui Station.
 - Also in relation to section 3 above, require AT to <u>reconsider</u>, <u>research and</u> <u>report back on</u> additional station locations between Puhinui Station and the Airport to serve the Manukau Memorial Gardens and the new commercial development occurring on the southern side of SH20b along the proposed BRT route.

- In relation to section 4 above, require AT to <u>reconsider and research and report back</u> <u>on</u> the necessity for this hard infrastructure as a response to the perceived problem.
 - This to include running scenarios of the time it takes to travel by bus now along Te Irirangi Drive from Manukau to Botany, and to trial existing AIR bus Airport-Manukau (no BRT bridge at Puhinui) with Te Irirangi median strip BRT to take passengers directly from Manukau Station to Botany via Te Irirangi Drive rather than on the current 353 or 35 routes.
 - To also include external research into <u>future technologies and their impact on</u> <u>the value/appropriateness of the fixed-route BRT</u> (e.g., self-drive cars/vans that are agile and able to go via any route)
 - To show how AT plans to <u>increase patronage</u> of the current poorly used AIR bus route between Puhinui Station and Manukau Station

Surplus Designated Land Post-Construction

Specific Parts of Designation:

NoR1, NoR2, NoR3, NoR4a and NoR4b

Land left-over after construction of BRT – submission on what that land will be used for after construction.

Reasons for Submission:

If it goes ahead, the BRT will cause massive disruption to the local community. As shown in the Social Impact Assessment, the people who live in NoR 2 and 3 are already in a situation of social deprivation, economically they are not well off, with low household incomes, there are a lot of people renting short-term, it is a relatively transient population despite some people having lived in the area for many years. (In some cases, for generations.) In addition, the Puhinui/South Papatoetoe area is very poorly served with open space and areas for active recreation such as playgrounds. I have had discussions about this in past years with AC parks and community facilities staff who have confirmed this.

The BRT will, effectively, cut the community in half, North to South. There will be some formal road crossings provided, though the location and type of these is yet to be determined. Some may need to be bridged.

The community will need to absorb significant disruption during the construction of the route. The community will be left with a significant new transport route including a large, imposing BRT bridge structure traversing the area.

I am concerned in reading the various NoR documents (see my other submissions) that it appears the left-over land that has been designated and acquired will be used for residential activity after construction of the BRT. (See map in Figure 15 of the AEE.)

The map shows the land not used for the construction of the BRT on the Southern side of Puhinui Road in NoR3, zoned for 'Mixed House Urban Zone – Modified by A2B Team'. Does this mean that any left-over land will be zoned for some sort of intensive residential use? Left over land on the Northern side of Puhinui Road in the area of Puhinui School may also be in a similar situation.

Though I know the philosophy of developing high intensity residential land use near rapid transit stations is embedded in AC's and central government's plans, do we really, truly, want to rely on either the HANA or MANA Airport noise mitigation packages, or 'responsible developers' (Assessment of Traffic Noise Effects p.x) to ensure the people living in such high density residential buildings are adequately protected from the noise, vibration and visual over-looking of a BRT bridge? If the land is zoned Mixed Use Urban Zone, and if this means

people will be living in homes built on land left-over from the construction of the BRT, there need to be strict building *requirements* on developers, that are resolutely enforced by AC.

Potential for Good

It seems to me, for a number of reasons, that a better way forward for the left-over land would be to rezone as open space and develop a high-quality 'ribbon park' the length of Puhinui Road, linked in with the proposed walking and cycling paths.

A ribbon of green space alongside the BRT could be interspersed with pocket parks, community gardens, basketball courts, and playgrounds. This would 'give back' to a community that has paid a high price for the connectivity of people living and working at Botany and the Airport.

Planting along the green ribbon would add to the visual amenity of the area postconstruction, and could also go some way towards government commitments to mitigating the effects of climate change, and the Urban Forest Strategy.

It would also be likely to give 'brownie points' to AT/AC and be a way to bring the community alongside to support the overall BRT project. Engagement in and positivity about the A2B BRT project in the local area is not currently high. If the project were seen to leave something positive for the remaining community in its wake, I think this would go some way to ameliorating people's concerns and mitigating the effects of the BRT construction and operation.

It would help address the lack of public active open space areas in the vicinity, adding to people's health and well-being in what is a socially and economically deprived area. It would also encourage more people to use the walking and cycling aspects of the BRT project. It would mean more people walking and cycling in the area for fun and recreation, rather than just for getting from A to B.

It would also provide something of a green buffer for properties adjoining properties that are to be acquired for the construction of the BRT. Planting trees on the boundary, in particular, would help in some ways to mitigate the visual and noise impacts of the BRT.

Seek recommendations:

• That any <u>left-over designated land be rezoned</u> as open space and <u>developed as a high quality</u> <u>ribbon park</u> with associated facilities along Puhinui Road, Te Irirangi Drive and elsewhere along the BRT route

From:	NoticeOfRequirementOnlineSubmissionForm@donotreply.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
То:	Unitary Plan
Subject:	$\ensuremath{\left[\textsc{ID:471}\right]}$ Notice of Requirement online submission - TIM Nominees Limited and The Saint Johns College Trust Board
Date:	Tuesday, 11 April 2023 5:15:26 pm
Attachments:	<u>HG Submission-NOR-439 East Tamaki Rd-ctc- final.pdf</u> 439 East Tamaki Road - F21 Impact Assessment letter dated 10 April 2023 (002) - TS corrected.pdf

The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: TIM Nominees Limited and The Saint Johns College Trust Board

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent: Clare Covington - Harrison Grierson

Email address: c.covington@harrisongrierson.com

Contact phone number: 0212888795

Postal address: PO Box 5760 Victoria Street West Auckland 1142

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are: The proposed NOR as it relates to 439 East Tamaki Road

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

The effect of the proposed land encroachment into the outdoor yard and parking area will significantly affect the current and future operations of the site (refer to the attached submission and Impact Assessment)

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: That the NOR is removed from 439 East Tamaki Road or alternatively that the extent of encroachment is reduced so as not to remove 57 parking spaces.

Submission date: 11 April 2023

Supporting documents HG Submission-NOR-439 East Tamaki Rd-ctc- final.pdf 439 East Tamaki Road - F21 Impact Assessment letter dated 10 April 2023 (002) - TS corrected.pdf

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.

We're turning your food scraps into clean energy.	

CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.
SUBMISSION ON A REQUIREMENT FOR DESIGNATION OR ALTERATION OF DESIGNATION

Form 21

То

Auckland Transport

Name of submitter

TIM Nominees Limited & The Saint John's College Trust Board C/- Trust Investments

This is a submission on a notice of requirement from Auckland Transport for a designation or an alteration to a designation (the **notice of requirement**).

Auckland Transport has lodged a Notice of Requirement (NoR) for a new designation to widen Te Irirangi Drive between Botany and Rongomai Park to provide for a Bus Rapid Transit corridor and walking and cycling facilities. This NoR is being sought as part of the Airport to Botany Bus Rapid Transit project.

The submitter is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991.

The specific provisions of the notice of requirement that this submission relates to are:

The site at 439 East Tamaki Road is in the ownership of The Saint Johns College Trust Board and TIM Nominees Limited. The proposed NOR will result in an approximate 5.0m strip of land taken along the current boundary with Te Irirangi drive. The General Arrangement Plan shows this land take relates to some cut and battering to provide for pedestrian and cycle pathways.

This land take will remove all the perpendicular parking currently along this site boundary (comprising the majority of parking for the activity at the site) and reduce the ability for truck manoeuvring and access around the building. This reduction in the outdoor yard area will have significant effects on the day-to-day operation of the site for the current tenant and reduce the viability of the site for future tenants.

1. This submission is:

The submitter opposes the NOR as it relates to the location and size of the encroachment on their landholding at 439 East Tamaki Road. The reason for this opposition is the effect that the proposed land encroachment will have both on the current operations of the site and future land use that the site may hold.

The current land use of the site is as a New Zealand Customs Service controlled transitional warehouse facility, including offices, a secure yard, car parking and a container truck hard stand and loading area. The facility is approved under the Biosecurity Act 1993 by the Ministry for Primary Industries, presently operated by Auslink Logistics Limited (as the tenant). As a result, entry and egress are strictly controlled and loading and unloading of containers is required to abide by strict location and separation distances across the yard at 439 East Tamaki Road. Refer to Attachment 3 showing photographs of the current use of the yard.

The Notice of Requirement (NoR) to designate land (819 sqm) will significantly impact vehicle yard movements at the site. The proposed designation is approximately 5.0m (depth) x 160m (length) along the Te Irirangi Drive boundary. The designation for road widening will remove 57 car parks/ current storage space and adversely affect operations for the entire 2.0ha site. Impacts of land loss will include removal of parking, restricting truck movement and yard manoeuvring, loss of hard stand, a loss of signage (2 existing signs are located within the NOR affected land), loss of landscaping and relocation of the security fencing. In addition, the required safe distance for container loading/unloading will be compromised and the 5.0m width of land taken will severely impact areas needed for cargo laydown. Accordingly, the loss of operational land and injurious effect to the





remaining site will result in a significant compensation claim under the Public Works Act 1981 should the designation proceed, and land be taken under the proposed design (refer to the attached Impact Assessment letter from Ian Campbell of Public Works Advisory dated 10 April 2023 – Attachment 1).

The submitter also notes that there may be different future uses/tenants of the site and to ensure that the site remains viable for these different uses and tenants it is vital that the current size of the yard is retained. Due to the zoning of the site, being Business – Light Industry Zone under the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) (AUP(OP)), there are multiple potential uses of the site, which may be impacted or constrained by a reduction in useable land area for the yard and area for staff and visitor parking. Past uses have fully utilised the parking spaces which fall within the proposed NOR (as shown on the attached photographs in Attachment 3). The removal of a 5m strip will not allow the same number of parking spaces to be relocated due to the close proximity to the building and the loading and manoeuvring requirements in the rest of the yard area. (Refer to the attached Traffic Memo dated 11 April 2023 – Attachment 2).

The submitter seeks in the first instance that the proposed designation does not encroach into 439 East Tamaki Road, ie. that no land is taken from the site. This will allow the site to continue to operate as it currently does. The current site size is already considered 'constrained' for the truck movements, required car parking and availability of hard stand areas for the operation as a freight handling facility. This means that any reduction the amount of useable land will have significant effects on the continued safe and efficient operation of the site by the current tenant.

The submitter has included an alternative design option within the attached Impact Assessment. This alternative design would change the pedestrian and cycle pathways to a shared path and therefore reduce the amount of land taken from the 439 East Tamaki Road site. This option should be considered given that the west side of Te Irirangi Drive is in commercial land use and there is little benefit for a dedicated pedestrian path. A shared cycle and walking path could reduce the 5.0m land requirement down by at least 2.0m. For the submitter's site, this reduction would avoid the loss of car parks and go some way to minimising the effects.

2. I seek the following recommendation or decision from the local authority:

The submitter seeks that the NOR does not extend into the site, so that no land is taken from the property at 439 East Tamaki Road for the designation.

Alternatively, the submitter seeks that the extent of land required to be taken from 439 East Tamaki Road is reduced, which may be achieved through the alternative design proposed in the Impact Assessment. This would involve removing the batter/cut and buffer area and instead using a small retaining wall. In addition, an alternative road layout for the busway could reduce the extent of the designation by using a shared pathway rather than separate pedestrian and cycle pathways as proposed. Please see the attached Impact Assessment for the details and area of this proposed alternative design.

3. The submitter wishes to be heard in support of this submission.

4. If others make a similar submission, the submitter will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

Signature of Submitter:

Clare Covington

Date: 11 April 2023

Electronic Address for Service of Submitter: c.covington@harrisongrierson.com

HARRISON GRIERSON COM



Telephone: (09) 917 5045

Postal address (or alternative method of service under section 352 of the Act):

The St Johns College Trust Board/ TIM Nominees

c/- Harrison Grierson Consultants Limited

PO Box 5760, Victoria Street West

AUCKLAND 1142

CONTACT PERSON: Clare Covington



ATTACHMENT ONE: Letter from Public Works Advisory and Impact Assessment

[refer to attached letter]



ATTACHMENT TWO: Traffic Memo

[refer to attached memo]

#27



ATTACHMENT THREE: Site photos showing historic and current use of the outdoor yard













Page **1930**



Historic Uses – Pumpkin Patch Distribution Centre









HARRISON GRIERSON. COM









10 April 2023

Planning TechniciansPlans and PlacesAuckland CouncilPrivate Bag 92300Auckland 1142Email unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Dear Sir/Madam,

439 East Tamaki Road - Notice of Requirement (NOR) Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

On behalf of the landowners of 439 East Tamaki Road we attach: -

- a. Submission under Form 21
- b. Impact Assessment for 439 East Tamaki Road
- c. Current proposal and Alternative option

We confirm we wish to be heard in support of this submission.

Yours faithfully

Ian Campbell

Director

Email ian@publicworksadvisory.co.nz Mobile 0274 770 486

Submission on a requirement for a designation or an alteration to a designation subject to full or limited notification

Sections 168A,169, 181, 189A, 190, and 195A of the Resource Management Act 1991

FORM 21

	For office use only	
Send your submission to <u>unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</u> or	Submission No:	
	Receipt Date:	
Attn: Planning Technician		
Auckland Council		
Level 24, 135 Albert Street		
Private Bag 92300		
Auckland 1142		

Submitter details

Full Name or Name of Agent (if applicable)

Mr/Mrs/Miss/Ms(Full Name)

Ian Campbell

Organisation Name (if submission is made on behalf of Organisation)

Public Works Advisory Limited

Address for service of Submitter

Level 26 HSBC Tower 188 Quay Street Auckland

Telephone:	274770486	Fax/Email:	ian@publicworksadvisory.co.nz

Contact Person: (Name and designation if applicable)

This is a submission on a notice of requirement:

By:: Name of Requiring Authority

Auckland Transport

For: A new designation or alteration to an existing designation

Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park

The specific parts of the above notice of requirement that my submission relates to are: (give details):

 \bigcirc

 \Box

Land required at 439 East Tamaki Road (Property ID 623881) comprising a 5.0m x 160m strip (816sqm) along the Te Irirangi Drive boundary.

My submission is:

l oi	we	sup	port o	f the	Not	ice	of Re	equire	emen	t
l oi	we	are	neutra	al to	the	Noti	ce of	Req	uiren	nent

I or we oppose to the Notice of Requirement

The reasons for my views are:

The NoR to designate land (816sqm) for road widening (5.0m x 160m) at 439 East Tamaki Road is opposed due to the impact this will make on the

commercial property, its current and future yard use, and operations by the existing long term tenant. The land required will impact open area container

loading and unloading within the yard and create significant long term direct affects including a loss of 57 carparks, loss of loading area, landscape, storage and loss of signs. We attach

a impact assessment for the property, and indicate that land taken will result in significant compensation payable by Auckland Council under the Public Works Act 1981.



#27

Auckland

Tāmaki Makaurau

Te Kaunihera o

We recommend an alternative design is provided so to reduce the 5.0m wide land requirement into the property and subsequent compensation payable.
#27

(continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

I seek the following recommendation or decision from the Council (give precise details including the general nature of any conditions sought).

That no land is required at 439 East Tamaki Road. The alternative design option is to adopt a shared walking and cycling path on the commercial side of Te Irirangi Drive, that will reduce or eliminate impact on this property, and other adjoining commercial property.

I wish to be heard in support of my submission	\bigotimes
I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission	
If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing	

Signature of Submitter (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

10 April 2023

Date

Notes to person making submission:

If you are making a submission to the Environmental Protection Authority, you should use Form 16B.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the Council (unless the Council itself, as requiring authority, gave the notice of requirement)

If your submission relates to a notice of requirement for a designation or alteration to a designation and you are a trade competitor of the requiring authority, you may make a submission only if you are directly affected by an effect of the activity to which the requirement relates that:

- (a) Adversely affects the environment, and
- (b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Notice of Requirement (NoR1) Bus Rapid Transport - Botany to Rongomai Park - Impact Assessment for 439 East Tamaki Road



Property Details

Property ID: Address: Legal: Owner: Tenant: Land Area: CMV (2022): Zone: Required Land: 623881 439 East Tamaki Road Lot 1 DP 544700 on NA 923193 (Fee Simple) TIM Nominees Ltd and St Johns College Trust Board Auslink Logistics Ltd 2.0775 hectares (more or less) \$37,050,000 AUP Operative - Light Industry Zone 819 sqm (5.0m x 160m approx.)

Site Description

The property operates as a NZ Customs Service controlled transitional warehouse facility and includes offices, secure yard, car parking, container truck hard stand loading all within a secure 2.0 ha site.

The facility is approved under the Biosecurity Act 1993 by Ministry for Primary Industries and operated by Auslink Logistics Limited (as tenant). There are strict yard and container handling requirements for biosecurity purposes. Entry and egress are controlled at 439 East Tamaki Road.









Impact Assessment

The Notice of Requirement (NoR) to designate land (819 sqm) will significantly impact vehicle yard movements at 439 East Tamaki Road. The proposed designation is 5.0m (depth) x 160m (length) along the Te Irirangi Drive boundary. The designation for road widening will remove 57 car parks and adversely affect operations for the entire 2.0ha site.

Impacts include removal of parking, restricting truck movement and yard manoeuvring, loss of hard stand, a loss of 2 signs, loss of landscaping and relocate the security fencing. The required safe distance for container loading/unloading will be compromised. The land taken will remove critical cargo laydown areas when these are needed.

Accordingly, the loss of operational land and injurious affection to the remaining site will result in a significant claim for compensation under the Public Works Act 1981 and payable by Auckland Council should the designation proceed, and land taken using the proposed design.

439 East Tamaki Road

31 March 2023

PUBLIC WORKS

Notice of Requirement (NoR1) Bus Rapid Transport - Botany to Rongomai Park - Impact Assessment for 439 East Tamaki Road



Photos taken at 439 East Tamaki Road fronting the Te Irirangi Drive boundary. (From the Left) View looking north showing planted landscape and electrified security fence; View looking south; and View indicating the southern corner boundary with sign located on the property. This land including carparking will be taken for footpath and cycleway under the proposed designation.







(From the Left) Photo showing location of the red manhole services connection within the northern boundary being affected by the proposed designation; View looking towards the boundary; View showing the northern corner boundary and corner sign impacted by the proposed designation.

439 East Tamaki Road



Notice of Requirement (NoR1) Bus Rapid Transport - Botany to Rongomai Park - Impact Assessment for 439 East Tamaki Road

Current Proposal

The proposed designation introduces new dedicated cycleways with generous berms between transport modes. The design requires commercial land purchases along the west side of Te Irirangi Drive.



Alternative Option

As the west side of Te Irirangi Drive is commercial activity, there are less benefits for a dedicated pedestrian path. The alternative is to construct a Shared Walking and Cycle path and retain the pedestrian path on the Residential side. This alternative option will reduce the commercial land requirement along Te Irirangi Drive.





439 East Tamaki Road

31 March 2023

Technical Memo 439 EAST TAMAKI ROAD

Thomas Snedden

Reza Khorasani

Transport Assessment

TO:

FROM:



 HG PROJECT NO:
 A2111764.00

 DATE:
 14 April 2023

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Harrison Grierson Consultants Ltd (HG) has been commissioned by St Johns College Trust Board to provide a traffic memo to assess the impact of the Notice of Requirement (NoR) lodged by Auckland Transport on the site located at 439 East Tamaki Road, East Tāmaki.

The NoR is being sought as part of the Airport to Botany Bus Rapid Transit project to provide for a dedicated Bus Rapid Transit corridor and high-quality walking and cycling facilities by widening a section of Te Irirangi Drive between Botany and Rongomai Park to provide:

- A dedicated Bus Rapid Transit corridor, centre-running along Te Irirangi Drive
- Bus Rapid Transit stations at Smales Road, Accent Drive, and Ormiston Road Botany Junction Shopping Centre
- Walking and cycling facilities on both sides of the corridor
- Swales and wetlands
- Areas for construction-related activities including yards, site compounds, and bridge and structure works.

The subject site is at 439 East Tamaki Road, East Tāmaki located within the Business-Light Industry Zone, where an approximately 5.5m wide land strip along the entire eastern boundary fronting Te Irirangi Drive is required to be acquired as part of the NoR, as shown in Figure 1 below (subject site is outlined in green).



FIGURE 1: LOCATION OF THE NOR ON THE SITE

This memo provides an impact assessment of the proposed NoR on the existing and potential future operation and transport services on the site.

1

2.0 AFFECT ON PARKING SPACES AND STORAGE AREAS

The current activity on the site is a warehouse and storage facility, which requires parking spaces for the staff and visitors and storage areas for containers. Figure 2 below shows the indicative site layout that includes three container storage areas and parking spaces. The site activities are currently split between the office use and associated to the north of the building (located outside the yard area) and the warehouse and associated yard and parking. The warehouse building is approximately 10,000m² GFA and has an associated staffing of up to 40 persons. The office space is 2,500m² and fully utilises the parking spaces outside the yard.



FIGURE 2: INDICATIVE CURRENT SITE LAYOUT

Figure 3 shows the container storage area three and the existing parking area on its northern side. Removing the 5.5m wide land strip will directly affect this container storage area and the parking areas. An alternative solution considered was to shift the same amount of storage and parking spaces over to the left side of the NOR land taken, however this would require a significant alteration to the parking formation, dimension, and manoeuvring spaces. Based on the limited information available, we envisage the following could occur adjacent to Container Area 1 should the NOR land be taken:

- Approximately 20 perpendicular parking spaces could be converted to approximately 9 parallel parking spaces, subject to survey of the current layout (or up to date aerial imagery) and design.
- Relocating the perpendicular parking spaces to the new boundary and removing the container parking closest to Te Irirangi Drive. Again, subject to survey and design



In addition, there is a gate to the warehouse building, as shown in Figure 3, where removing the land would narrow the manoeuvring area in front of the gate restricting access for vehicles entering and exiting the warehouse, especially trucks.



FIGURE 3: CONTAINER STORAGE AREA ONE (VIEW TOWARDS NORTH)

Figure 4 shows the container area one located in the middle of the yard. This storage area is located with a gap for vehicle access/manoeuvring on the western side of the parking spaces stretched along the eastern boundary, and removing the land would result in removing the entire row of parking spaces along the eastern boundary (approximately 57 spaces).





3.0 AFFECT ON TRUCK MANOEUVRING FOR EXISTING OPERATION

The current activity on the site is a logistics operation facility which requires providing on-site manoeuvring for side loaders and B-train trucks shown in Figure 4 and Figure 5. The yard area is fully utilised by this existing operation and the yard layout has been approved by MPI to ensure it allows the adequate spacing /clearance between containers through clear markings across the yard. Given that the only access to the site is from East Tamaki Road, the truck turning area is essential for the operation of the

site and removing the 5.5m wide land strip would significantly reduce the manoeuvring spaces required for the container trucks and consequently affect the operation of the site.



FIGURE 5: B-TRAIN TRUCK ON THE SITE (OBTAINED FROM GOOGLE STREET VIEW IN 2019)

Figure 6 below shows a vehicle tracking using a semi-trailer with a 12.5m turning radius, demonstrating the impact on the on-site manoeuvring before and after widening the road. As can be seen, after widening the road, there is not enough space for a semi-trailer truck to reverse from the container storage area one and exit the site and to enable that, five existing parking spaces on the northeast of the warehouse building would need to be removed.



FIGURE 6: SEMI-TRAILER EXITING THE CONTAINER STORAGE AREA ONE

4.0 AFFECT ON SITE OPERATION FOR POTENTIAL FUTURE OPERATIONS

There are approximately 57 spaces along the eastern boundary of the site, and the proposed land take would result in the removal of all these parking spaces; however, the Airport to Botany Assessment of

Transport Effects report dated December 2022, in Table 23 states that the project will have "Minimal impact on on-site parking for adjacent properties. A total of 46 on-site parking spaces affected across three commercial sites" which is significantly lower than the number of on-site parking spaces which would be affected just on this site.

In addition, the site buildings and zoning leave a range of potential activities associated with future tenants. The site owner is concerned that the proposed land take would restrict the yard and parking spaces available for these potential activities reducing their ability to find suitable future tenants.

Past uses have fully utilised the parking spaces which fall within the proposed NOR (as shown on the photographs in Attachment 3 to the submission).

In particular, the current NOR would remove the majority of the site parking associated with the warehouse building for staff and visitors (approximately 5 spaces remain) and reduce manouevring space into the loading doors, particularly the one within Area 3 shown on Figures 2 and 3 above. The removal of a 5m strip will not allow the same number of parking spaces to be relocated due to the close proximity to the building and the loading and manoeuvring requirements in the rest of the yard area.

The types of activities the site buildings (being 10,000m²) warehouse gross floor area) could cater for and their likely parking requirements would be:

- Garden centre up to 200 spaces (1 per 50m²)
- Motor vehicle sales up to 100 spaces (1 per 10 display spaces and 1 per 50m² additional gfa)
- Marine retail up to 200 spaces (1 per 50m²)
- Trade suppliers up to 200 spaces (1 per 50m²)
- Industrial activities up to 100 spaces (1 per 100m²)
- Wholesaler up to 100 spaces (1 per 100m²)
- Storage and lock up facilities up to 100 spaces (1 per 100m²)

While there may be some ability to provide parking spaces within the reduced yard area, this also restricts the truck manoeuvring options further as demonstrated in the assessment for the existing operation above. As the site yard is relatively small for the size of warehouse/industrial building to cater for large scale trucks, any reduction in the yard area will restrict future tenant operations.

5.0 REVIEW OF ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS FOR NOR CROSS-SECTION

The General Arrangement Plan for the NOR where it crosses the site indicates a 5m strip of land take however this only appears to provide for battering adjacent to the widened road and potentially allow for construction works (see Figure 7 below). The topography in this location is fairly flat and the extent of cut for the road widening would be insignificant. Reducing the extent of land take to only that of the cut would reduce the extent of land take and could avoid the removal of parking spaces. If the cut was removed through the use of a small retaining structure, land take at the site could be avoided altogether. Both of these options would retain the existing proposed cross-section for the new road layout.

The proposed cross-section for the new road layout (Figure 8 below) also includes separate pedestrian and cycle lanes on both sides of the road. In the section of road adjacent to the Light Industrial zoned properties where there is restricted access from the adjacent sites, an alternative of a shared cycle/ pedestrian path would also reduce the extent of land take required.

Both of these alternative considerations would reduce or completely remove the requirement to take land from 439 East Tamaki Road and therefore avoid the significant effects on the site's ongoing and future operation discussed above.

In addition, given that the land take would significantly impact the on-site truck manoeuvring, a Left in/left out (LILO) or one-way exit access from Te Irirangi Drive could be considered to enable B-train trucks to enter and leave the site.



FIGURE 7: EXTRACT FROM THE GENERAL ARRANGEMENT PLAN SHOWING EXTENT OF LAND TAKE AT 439 EAST TAMAKI ROAD



FIGURE 8: CROSS-SECTION FOR PROPOSED ROAD LAYOUT TAKEN FROM THE NOR DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED

6.0 CONCLUSION

It is concluded that the proposed NoR would significantly affect the number of parking spaces provided on the site, the operation of the activity, and the truck manoeuvring on the site. Alternative solutions for the proposed NOR land take requirement have been identified which would avoid this effect.

Yours sincerely

Harrison Grierson

Author:	Reviewed:
Reza Khorasani	Gary Black
Technical Lead Transportation	Technical Director Transportation
i de ci	G. Black

The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Phisan Charoenmongkhonwilai

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: aungood@gmail.com

Contact phone number: 021428625

Postal address: 53 Malaspina Place Papatoetoe Papatoetoe 2025

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are: Related to the property of 3/146 Puhinui Road, Papatoetoe.

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we are neutral to the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are: we are neutral

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: Need to be informed about every stage of decision-making as it affects our property.

Submission date: 11 April 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Samantha Searle

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent: Samantha Searle

Email address: samantha.searle@hotmail.co.nz

Contact phone number:

Postal address: 14 Wando Lane East Tamaki Auckland 2013

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Auckland Airport

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

That it states that this is to create 'rapid transport', yet walking and cycling aren't rapid. Creating the walk/cycle lanes would also result in trees having to be removed which takes away what NZ is known for, it's greenery.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: To just focus on the rapid transport - bus route from Botany to Auckland Airport.

Submission date: 11 April 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? No

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Paul Reyneke

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: reyneke@xtra.co.nz

Contact phone number: 021312927

Postal address: 24 Lydiard Place Beachlands Auckland 2018

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Project scope • Walking and cycling networks • Reduction in urban ngahere • Increased flooding risk

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

The project has always been Airport to Botany - rapid transit network (RTN) (the project). The current RLTP highlights delivering a significant increase in rapid transit travel options (fast, frequent, high capacity bus and train services separated from general traffic). Walking and Cycling are not forms of rapid transit. These should not be included in this projects scope. An example of how the project has been described to stakeholders and the public is "The next stages to be delivered under this RLTP involve protecting the future A2B rapid transit corridor, between Auckland Airport and Botany via Manukau, and extending the new AirportLink bus to Botany via Te Irirangi Drive. Extending the AirportLink bus to Botany will be supported by bus interchanges and priority improvements along Te Irirangi Drive, with a move toward a rapid transit corridor in future decades." There is no mention of walking and cycling. Therefore, the stakeholders and public have been misled. Support was gained prior to the inclusion of walking and cycling facilities. The consequences of including improved walking and cycling facilities along both sides of the corridor into the project scope is a significant increase in project costs, an enormous reduction in trees and the urban ngahere canopy coverage across this area, increased flooding risk and climate impacts, an increase in the urban heat and island effect, decreased visual amenity, loss of shade, decreased health and wellbeing to the public and decreased air quality. These impacts are significant and outweigh the benefits of pouring concrete in place of these trees for walking and cycling facilities. There is already footpaths. It is legal for cyclists to ride on the roads. An alternative would be to incorporate a cycling network into the median strip of Ti Irirangi Drive where the RTN busway will go as this will have such few buses, at most, one every 15 minutes I assume and the road is very long and straight so the bus and cyclist will see each other. I don't believe this project has been

transparent with making stakeholders aware of the impacts of including the improved walking and cycling networks into this project. It has been a late addition and one I would deem as misleading after support for the project was gained. I am appalled decision makers have agreed to the destruction of thousands of trees to pour concrete to allow a better footpath / cycling path when this already exists. I don't agree with the statement that that is what public feedback has said. The public would not want improved walking and cycling networks by the destruction of thousands of trees. Should this project proceed unchanged, the inclusion of the walking and cycling aspect no longer adheres to Te-Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan, specifically Action Area N2 and Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy. The specific principals this violates is - Grow our rural and urban ngahere (forest) Action area N2: Grow and protect our rural and urban ngahere (forest) to maximise carbon capture and build resilience to climate change. And • Increase indigenous tree plantings in road corridors, parks and open spaces. Each CCO must work within Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Action Framework. I am not opposed to the RTN along the median strip of Ti Irirangi Drive and would like the project scope and the Notice of Requirement designation reduced to include only the median strip of land.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: Request the project scope be reduced to a rapid transit network - Airport to Botany which includes: a) a dedicated Bus Rapid Transit corridor, centre-running along Te Irirangi Drive b) Bus Rapid Transit stations at Smales Road, Accent Drive, and Ormiston Road – Botany Junction Shopping Centre c) swales and wetlands d) areas for construction related activities including yards, site compounds, and bridge and structure works. Oppose the inclusion of improved walking and cycling facilities along both sides of the corridor due to the destruction of thousands of trees to pour concrete for this. Oppose the removal of trees lining both sides of the corridor along Ti Irirangi Drive creating good canopy coverage and reduced flooding risks to nearby residents. Request the designation of the Notice of Requirement is restricted to the median strip along Ti Irirangi Drive only (and including any areas required for stations) as this is sufficient enough to complete the rapid transit network - Airport to Botany as per the original intent of the project.

Submission date: 11 April 2023

Supporting documents urban-ngahere-forest-strategy_20230411195724.134.pdf howick-canopy-analysis-report-2021_20230411195729.681.pdf

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy



He Mihi

Nau mai e te hā o Tāne, Whakatau mai e te oranga o Tāne.

Tīkina mai te ate rahirahi o te Tāone nui o Tāmaki Makaurau hei whakaniko anō ai i te whenua tapu; ko tō whaea, ko Papatūānuku.

Kia toro ake ōna hua me ōna pai kia tauawhia e tō matua e Rangi-nui e tū iho nei, kia rongohia anō te tīhau a ngā manu, me te kētete a ngā pēpeke.

Kia wawara anō te reo o ngā rākau kua roa e ngū ana ki te wao kōhatu e tāwharau nei i ngā maunga tapu o tō whenua taketake.

Tane-o-te-waiora,

Tāne-whakapiripiri,

Tāne-nui-a-rangi, tukua mai anō tō ihi, tukua mai anō tō mana.

Māu e kitea anō ai he awa para-kore e rere ana, he hau mā e kōrewarewa ana, he taiao hauora e takoto ana.

Kia hipokina anō e tō korowai kākāriki te tāone nui kia whiwhi ko mātou, kia whiwhi te ao katoa.

He whakatupu ngātahi i te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau e matomato ai te hua ā ngā rā e tū mai nei

Together, growing Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #3Qurau

Tāne let your breath pervade all, may your life-essence be ever-present.

Reclaim the very heart of Auckland city and adorn once again the hallowed ground; that is your mother, Papatūānuku.

May all that is fruitful and good reach skyward to the embrace of your father Rangi-nui on high so the chorus of birds may be heard again, and the splendid symphony of insects in response.

Bring with you the sounds of rustling trees that have long stood silent to this concrete jungle that bounds the sacred mountains of your primal domain.

Tāne-purveyor of life,

Tāne-provider-of-shelter,

Tāne-source-of-all-knowledge, bestow us again with your wonder, and grace us with your prestige.

By you, we will again realise fresh waterways, pure air, and a healthier environment.

Garb the city with your verdant cloak that we, your heirs might benefit, and so too, the whole world.





Kupu whakataki Foreword

A healthy urban ngahere (forest) enriches our communities, our local economies and our natural environment. Auckland cannot become a world-class city without one.

Whether you are from Takanini or Takapuna, Herne Bay or Henderson, trees and vegetation are valuable to all of us. They clean our air and stormwater, cool and beautify our urban spaces and bring nature to our doorsteps. Developed in partnership with tangata whenua, the strategy gives voice to an important role trees play in the mauri of the land. They provide a wide range of measurable benefits that make our lives healthier, happier and more gratifying.

How can we protect what we value in the face of a growing and urbanising population, rising inequality, and the major impacts of invasive pests and climate change? How do we maintain and enhance the richness that our urban ngahere provides? How do we align our efforts?

This is precisely why we have developed a strategy for Auckland's urban ngahere. It delivers on the vision for our future Auckland, ensuring each one of us – and future Aucklanders - have access to the tangible benefits provided by a vibrant, green city.

The strategy ensures that when Auckland Council, corporate partners, community groups and each one of us plants or maintains a tree, our collective efforts truly add up to something – contributing towards increasing our average canopy cover from 18 to 30 per cent. Likewise, the strategy helps target our efforts to grow the urban ngahere where it's scarce - as in parts of South Auckland - so that all local board areas have at least 15 per cent canopy cover.

This strategy provides an overarching vision and 18 high level actions under three main themes, Knowing, Growing and Protecting but doesn't provide all the answers or deliver the vision. We will need to work with each of you and across all local boards to tailor specific and unique approaches to implementation that respond to the local context, harnessing and building local talents, partnerships and resources along the way.

I invite you to join me. Let's work together to grow, protect and maintain our valuable urban ngahere for a greener and greater Auckland for all of us.

Councillor Penny Hulse Chair, Environment and Community Committee





Kei te puku Contents

1.	A sti	rategic plan for Auckland's urban ngahere (forest)	8
	1.1.	What is Auckland's urban ngahere?	10
	1.2.	Benefits of Auckland's urban ngahere	14
	1.3.	Current policy context for our urban ngahere	20
2.	Curr	ent status of our urban ngahere	22
	2.1.	Distribution of canopy cover	23
	2.2.	Height distribution	28
	2.3.	Level of protection	
3.	Curr	ent and future pressures	
	3.1.	A growing population and urban intensification	
	3.2.	Climate change	
	3.3.	Pressure on water infrastructure	
	3.4.	Pests and diseases	37
4.	Stra	tegic framework	38
	4.1.	Vision	41
	4.2.	Objectives	42
	4.3.	Mechanisms	42
	4.4.	Principles	
5.	Stra	50	
	5.1.	Knowing outcomes	51
	5.2.	Growing outcomes	53
	5.3.	Protecting outcomes	54
	5.4.	Mechanism outcomes	55
6.	Impl	56	
	6.1.	Urban ngahere strategy collaboration	57
	6.2.	Funding and partnerships	58
	6.3.	Area specific implementation	58
	6.4.	High level actions	59
7.	Refe	rences	62







He mahere rautaki mō te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau A strategic plan for Auckland's urban ngahere (forest)

When Tāne went to the heavens – so the story goes – he was enraptured by the tūī that lived in his brother Rehua's hair. Tāne desperately wanted to bring the tūī back to earth but he was told he must first plant trees to provide food. So Tāne introduced trees to our world and, three years later when the kahikatea blossomed, Tāne's wish came true. The tūī came to live with him.

When it comes to trees, the message is much the same. If we plant trees now, in time, we create value for our communities. We might even hear the dawn chorus – $e k\bar{o} i te ata$ – once again within urban Auckland.

Auckland is growing and changing rapidly. To accommodate this, Auckland Council has committed to a strategy of urban intensification to increase housing density, deliver the benefits associated with a compact urban form and limit the negative impacts linked with continued outward growth. Successful development requires careful planning; intensification and growth need to complement the protection and planting of trees and vegetation to create liveable neighbourhoods. Trees and vegetation also provide a range of services required for Auckland to function and thrive. These include enhanced stormwater management, air pollution removal, improved water quality, cooling to reduce the urban heat island effect, and ecological corridors to connect habitats and improve biodiversity.

Our urban ngahere faces a number of pressures. Alongside the need for urban development, amendments to the Resource Management Act (RMA) came into effect in 2015, lifting blanket tree protection in urban areas. As a result, the vast majority of trees on private urban properties are no longer protected. Threats from pests and diseases, as well as the impacts of climate change are further challenges. If we want to continue to benefit from the services provided by our urban ngahere it is essential that we better understand its status and value and plan to protect and grow it. Our urban ngahere has the mauri (life force) to care for us but needs our help to be sustainable and healthy.





1.1 He aha te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Mākaurau? What is Auckland's urban ngahere?

Auckland's urban ngahere is the realm of Te Waonui o Tāne (the forest domain of Tāne Mahuta) and consists of the network of all trees, other vegetation and green roofs – both native and introduced – in existing and future urban areas.

It's important to recognise the urban ngahere as more than just trees and vegetation. Urban ngahere captures the interconnected whakapapa (genealogy) of all living things to the wider ecosystem. It consists of a complex network weaving through public and private land, and includes the water, soil, air and sunlight that support it. It also involves people, wildlife and the built environment – all of which impact upon, or are impacted by, the urban ngahere. The urban ngahere has its own mauri (life force) but also depends upon a range of conditions and relationships to support its health, growth and survival.

Auckland's urban ngahere is diverse; it includes trees and vegetation in road corridors, parks and

open spaces, natural stormwater assets, community gardens, living walls, green roofs and trees and vegetation in the gardens of private properties. The urban ngahere, like the pōhutukawa fringing Auckland's coastline, is an important part of Auckland's identity and natural heritage and shapes the fabric of the landscape. Trees also help distinguish our heritage places and areas, such as Albert, Western and Myers Parks, early cemeteries, for example, Symonds Street and Waikumete, and the settings of properties, including Monte Cecilia and Alberton. In addition, Auckland's scheduled character areas often feature memorial plantings and early street plantings.





Examples of Auckland's urban ngahere:

Parks and open space





Potters Park, Mt Eden

Orewa Beach

Street trees and road corridors



Franklin Road, Ponsonby



Private gardens



Island Bay, Birkdale

Blockhouse Bay

Native forest



Native forest

Natural stormwater assets



Te Auaunga Awa / Oakley Creek

Green roofs and living walls



The University of Auckland green roof

Private residential green roof





Tī Kōuka / Cabbage tree

Kererū / New Zealand pigeon

Rain garden, Wynyard Quarter




Ngā painga o te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau Benefits of Auckland's urban ngahere 1.2

The range of social, environmental, economic and cultural benefits that urban trees deliver is well-documented, with cities increasingly recognising the financial value of the services they provide. The USDA Forest Service estimated that trees in New York City provide US\$5.60 in benefits for every US\$1 spent on tree planting and care.¹ Growing and protecting our urban ngahere is essential to maintain and enhance the broad range of services it provides:



Improve health and wellbeing

Reduce the urban heat island effect

Provide shade

Enhance visual amenity



Enhance biodiversity

Improve air quality

Carbon sequestration

Improve water quality Increase property values

Reduce flood risk

Economic

Reduce energy costs

Reduce healthcare costs

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #3Qurau



Support education

Local food growing

Sustain and enhance mauri

Cultural heritage

Page 11423 15



Improve health and wellbeing

Research has shown that access to trees and nature can reduce stress, improve mental health and promote wellbeing² whilst tree lined streets have been shown to encourage walking.



Reduce the urban heat island effect

The cooling effect of trees, as a result of evapotranspiration, reduces the urban heat island effect³ and enhances Auckland's resilience to an increasing number of hot days (>25°C), one of the projected impacts of climate change.



Provide shade

Trees shading school grounds, playgrounds, public spaces, and cycling and walking routes provide relief from the sun and protect people from harmful ultraviolet (UV) radiation, in turn reducing the risk of heat stroke, sunburn and melanoma.



Enhance visual amenity

Trees can visually enhance a street, the character of an area and foster neighbourhood pride. They add beauty, soften harsh urban environments and screen unsightly views.

Environmental



Enhance biodiversity

A healthy urban ngahere enriches biodiversity and provides opportunities for connected habitats that support wildlife.



Improve water quality

Trees intercept rainwater and reduce the amount of pollutants being washed from hard surfaces into the stormwater system and watercourses. Increasing canopy cover will also contribute towards fewer storm water overflows from our combined sewer/stormwater systems and therefore lower levels of water pollution in our harbours and streams.



Carbon sequestration

Trees reduce carbon dioxide (CO₂) in the atmosphere through sequestering carbon in new growth. One tonne of carbon stored in wood is equivalent to removing 3.67 tonnes of CO2 from the atmosphere.



Improve air quality

Trees improve air quality by removing air pollutants, such as particulate matter, and absorb gases harmful to human health. A 2006 study estimated that Auckland's urban trees remove 1320 tonnes of particulates, 1230 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide and 1990 tonnes of ozone.⁴

Economic



healthcare costs

Improving air quality and enhancing health and wellbeing will reduce the need for healthcare and associated costs.



flood risk

An increase in canopy cover would intercept an increased volume of rainwater; reducing and slowing urban runoff and placing less pressure on stormwater systems. International studies show that trees intercept 15 to 27 per cent of the annual rainfall that falls upon their canopy, depending on a tree's species and architecture.⁵



Increase property values

Studies have shown that mature street trees increase residential property values and attract buyers and tenants.



Reduce energy costs

Well-positioned trees provide shade and reduce cooling requirements and associated energy costs in buildings.

Cultural



Tree nurseries and planting projects promote environmental awareness and provide opportunities to encourage and facilitate learning.



The cultural benefits of Auckland's urban ngahere are diverse and priceless. Native forest is important to mātauranga Māori (knowledge and understanding), and trees create a cultural connection to place and history.



Sustain and enhance mauri

Mauri is a life force derived from whakapapa (genealogical connections and links to ecosystems), an essential element sustaining all forms of life. Mauri provides life and energy to all living things, including our urban ngahere, and is the binding force that links the physical to the spiritual worlds.⁶ Mauri can be harmed if the life-supporting capacity and ecosystem health of our urban ngahere is diminished. Protecting and growing our urban ngahere will sustain and enhance its mauri.



Local food growing

Planting fruit trees and establishing community orchards provides people with access to fresh fruit. Maintaining and harvesting fruit trees can connect and strengthen communities.



The cultural significance of Auckland's urban ngahere

The urban ngahere is an important part of Tāmaki Makaurau / Auckland's cultural heritage. Remnants of native forest represent traditional supermarkets (kai o te ngahere), learning centres (wānanga o te ngahere), the medicine cabinet (kapata rongoā), schools (kura o te ngahere) and spiritual domain (wairua o te ngahere).⁷ Trees also represent landing places of waka (canoe) and birth whenua (to Māori, it is customary to bury the whenua or placenta in the earth, returning it to the land).

Many of Auckland's trees provide a visible reference to the city's history and development. European settlers planted London plane trees along streets in the 1860s which have now grown to create grand tree-lined avenues in the city centre and the adjoining suburbs of Ponsonby, Freemans Bay and Grey Lynn. Bishop Selwyn, New Zealand's first Anglican Bishop, is reported to have brought hundreds of Norfolk Island pine seedlings to Auckland in 1858-60. Many of the mature Norfolk Island pines now in Auckland, such as those at Mission Bay, are likely to have been grown from these seedlings.8

A TAKE P LOUP AS





Page 13425 19

Te horopaki ā-kaupapa here mō ā tātou ngahere ā-tāone ināia tonu nei 1.3 Current policy context for our urban ngahere

Auckland's plans and polices recognise and reference the value of trees and vegetation to varying degrees but do not provide a clear framework for the management of Auckland's urban ngahere. A range of plans and polices influence our urban ngahere (Figure 1) – explicitly and implicitly – yet urban ngahere objectives are only incidental to other considerations, such as green growth, climate change, indigenous biodiversity, and encouraging

sport and recreation. In the past, this contributed to a situation in which Auckland's urban ngahere was managed and maintained through piecemeal initiatives rather than in a strategic and holistic way. This strategy consolidates and builds upon existing directives that support our urban ngahere and sets out a clear framework to protect and grow Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future.



Figure 1 – Key plans, strategies and guidance documents that influence Auckland's urban ngahere

The central city from above - London plane trees on Greys Avenue and Vincent Street (bottom left) and trees in Myers Park (bottom right) and Albert Park (top right).



Figure 2 – Average percentage canopy cover of urban ngahere (3m+ height) in Auckland suburbs – based on analysis of the 2013 LiDAR survey.

Te tūranga a ō tātou ngahere ā-tāone ināia tonu nei Current status of our urban ngahere

2.1 | Te hora o te uhinga rākau Distribution of canopy cover

Analysis of data from the 2013 LiDAR survey found that Auckland's urban area has just over 18 per cent canopy cover, with 10,130 hectares of canopy cover belonging to trees over three metres tall. This varied across different land types, with urban ngahere on 11 per cent of Auckland's road area, 24 per cent of public land, and 18 per cent of private land.

Figure 2 illustrates that Auckland's urban ngahere is distributed unequally throughout the city, with lower levels of canopy cover in southern suburbs, and relatively high canopy cover in northern and western parts of the city. Auckland's three leafiest suburbs are Titirangi, which adjoins the Waitakere Ranges (68 per cent canopy cover), Wade Heads (57 per cent) and Chatswood (55 per cent), where

What is LiDAR?

LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) is used to examine the surface of the Earth through collecting data from a survey aircraft. It measures scattered light to find a range and other information on a distant target. The range to the target is measured using the time delay between transmission of a pulse and detection of a reflected signal. This technology allows for the direct measurement of three-dimensional features and structures and the underlying terrain. The ability to measure the height of features on the ground or above the ground is the principle advantage over conventional optical remote sensing technologies such as aerial imagery.

LiDAR data itself does not provide information on the status of Auckland's urban ngahere, further analysis of the data is required to create a tree canopy layer and quantify the distribution and height of the urban ngahere.

historically the landform was unsuitable for development. Unequal canopy cover distribution is particularly apparent at a local board area level (see Figure 3). The local boards with the lowest canopy cover are Māngere-Ōtāhuhu (eight per cent) and Ōtara-Papatoetoe (nine per cent). The local board with the highest canopy cover is Kaipātiki with 30 per cent canopy cover, two-thirds of which is in public open spaces.

The majority of Auckland's urban ngahere – 61 per cent – is located on privately-owned land. The remaining 39 per cent is on public land, with seven per cent on Auckland Council parkland, nine per cent on road corridors, and 23 per cent on other public land, such as schools (see Figure 4).



An aerial view of unequal canopy cover



80 r 70 60 Percentage (%) 50 40 30 20 10 Waitemata Whau Orakei Kaipatiki Puketapapa Albert - Eden

Figure 3 - canopy cover on different land tenures by local board area.



Figure 4 – proportion of canopy cover on different land ownership types (2013 LiDAR survey).







Why the unequal distribution?

There are a number of reasons for the difference in tree cover across the region, including land ownership (public/private), land use (urban/industrial/agricultural), geography and legal protections (eg Significant Ecological Areas and notable trees). Historically, the type of development and street layout also influenced the funding and space available for tree planting. For example, in areas developed for social housing, there was typically a low level of investment in tree planting, resulting in relatively few street trees. The age of a suburb can also be a factor, for example trees planted close to the city centre in the early days of Auckland's development have now matured (eg in Ponsonby). More recently, prior to the amalgamation of the region's councils into Auckland Council, some legacy council areas had active tree planting programmes.





Trees in private gardens, a significant contribution to our urban ngahere, Ponsonby.



2.2 | Te hora tū teitei Height distribution

The 2013 LiDAR survey reveals that tall trees are rare in our urban ngahere; only six per cent of the urban ngahere is over 20 metres in height, the majority, 64 per cent, is less than 10 metres (see Figure 5). This is partly due to the species that make up the urban ngahere and their height at maturity. In addition,

trees over 20 metres in height need to be in the right place to allow for growth and are likely to be at least 60 years old. Historically, most mature trees were removed as land was cleared for agriculture and Auckland developed.



Figure 5 – Percentage of urban ngahere across different height classes.

When it comes to trees, size does matter!

Benefits are disproportionally greater for larger trees. For example, big trees provide more shade because of their larger, wider canopy spread; their greater leaf areas and more extensive root systems intercept larger amounts of rainfall and stormwater; they absorb more gaseous pollutants, have higher carbon sequestration rates, and typically contribute more to calming and slowing traffic on local streets than small trees. Larger trees also usually have few or no low branches to interfere with activity at ground level, especially if pruned to provide higher canopy clearance over roads, public space and pedestrian footpaths.





2.3 | Te paerewa āraitanga Level of protection

Just 50 per cent of Auckland's urban ngahere has some degree of statutory protection. A high level of protection applies to urban ngahere in Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) which account for 62 per cent of all protected forest (although SEAs capture only about one-third of Auckland's total urban ngahere). A moderate level of protection is provided to urban ngahere in outstanding natural features or landscapes, open space conservation zones, coastal yards, riparian yards and lake protection zones. Some protection is provided to urban ngahere in coastal natural character areas or open space informal recreation zones. A low level of protection is given to urban ngahere in open space active recreation zones and road corridors.

The Notable Trees Schedule in the Unitary Plan is another form of protection. This schedule contains nearly 3000 items (representing some 6000 trees and groups of trees), the majority of which were 'rolled over' from legacy council schedules as part of the Unitary Plan process.

The proportion of protected urban ngahere varies widely from suburb to suburb, much like the level of urban ngahere canopy cover:

- Suburbs with large patches of indigenous ngahere that have been designated as Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) tend to have a high level of urban ngahere canopy cover and a high level of protection (eg Chatswood, Birkenhead and Titirangi).
- Leafy suburbs where the urban ngahere is dominated by exotic and native trees in private backyards (eg Remuera, Epsom and Mt Eden) have moderate to high canopy cover but a low level of protection.
- Some suburbs have a low level of urban ngahere canopy cover, but a relatively high proportion of the canopy cover has some form of protection (eg Māngere, Wiri and Manukau).
- A number of suburbs that have experienced recent urban growth currently have a low level of urban ngahere canopy cover and protection (eg Northpark, Golflands, Howick, New Lynn and New Windsor).







A Pin Oak being lowered into position by a mobile crane and planted at Britomart Place in approximately the 1950's. Credit: Robert Hepple

The Pin Oak pictured above in 2018 – now protected and on the Notable Trees Schedule. This tree is the central feature of a busy intersection, visually contributing to the local streetscape and visible from Quay Street, Beach Road, Anzac Avenue and Fort Street. It is also notable as a solitary specimen of a species that is not well represented in the locality.





Ngā pēhitanga o ināianei, anga atu anō hoki Current and future pressures

Te tupu haere o te tātai tāngata me 3.1 ngā whakakīkītanga āhua tāone A growing population and urban intensification

Auckland is experiencing unprecedented growth and is projected to grow substantially into the future. Around 1.66 million people currently live in Auckland; over the next 30 years this number could grow by another 720,000 people to reach 2.4 million. Auckland will need many more dwellings, possibly another 313,000, in addition to new infrastructure and community



facilities. Development will be focused within existing and future urban areas within the urban boundary (see Figure 6) and this will put significant pressure on the urban ngahere. Much of this growth will occur in existing urban areas through intensification; as land is redeveloped, unprotected trees are at risk of being removed to maximise the developable area of a site.





Figure 6 – Anticipated development in existing and future urban areas as outlined in the Development Strategy (2018).



Without properly recognising the value of trees and understanding the benefits they provide; urban growth is likely to occur at the expense of the urban ngahere. However, urban development and intensification also present opportunities to green our city – to plant and grow our urban ngahere and create new green urban environments in areas set to be urbanised over the next 30 years. Future urban areas are outlined in Auckland's Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (2017) and the Development Strategy (2018). These areas cover around 15,000 hectares, with the potential to accommodate approximately 137,000 dwellings and 1400 hectares of new business land.

3.2 | Te takahurihanga o te huarere Climate change

Climate change threatens our urban ngahere through changing seasonal rainfall patterns, more severe weather events, and increased susceptibility to pests and diseases. Auckland is projected to

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #30 urau

Urban regeneration within the existing city limits, such as the implementation of the City Centre Waterfront Refresh Plan and redevelopment plans for suburbs, presents an opportunity to retrofit green spaces and replace lost trees. The benefits of keeping established trees and the opportunities for these to complement and add value to new developments needs to be recognised. Where development occurs around trees, implementing a best practice approach to tree protection significantly increases their survival rate.

experience increased occurrence of drought and reduced soil moisture. This requires us to better understand the threats to our urban ngahere and what can be done to protect it.



Ngā taimahatanga kei runga i ngā whakahaere ā-wai Pressure on water infrastructure 3.3

Auckland's water infrastructure is vital to ensure that Aucklanders have clean water to drink and use, that wastewater is disposed of safely, homes, businesses and infrastructure are protected from flooding, and waterways and harbours are healthy. Population growth is putting all components of Auckland's water infrastructure under pressure. At the same time, this infrastructure is ageing and needs to be managed to ensure its continued performance. Climate change will place additional pressure on water infrastructure as the frequency and intensity of storm events is predicted to increase.

The Auckland Plan 2050 sets a clear direction to use Auckland's growth and development to protect and enhance the environment.⁹ This includes a focus on using green infrastructure to deliver greater resilience, long-term cost savings and quality environmental outcomes.¹⁰ The Auckland Unitary Plan emphasises the use and enhancement of natural hydrological systems and green infrastructure during development to address pressures on stormwater infrastructure.¹¹ This strategic direction and focus on using green infrastructure provides an opportunity to grow Auckland's urban ngahere.

What is green infrastructure?

Green infrastructure is a strategically planned network of natural and semi-natural areas designed and managed to deliver multi-functional benefits such as stormwater management, water purification, filtration of airborne pollutants, space for recreation and climate mitigation and adaptation. Auckland's urban ngahere is an integral part of our green infrastructure network.



3.4 Ngā mate orotā me ngā mate urutā Pests and diseases

Animal pests and weeds threaten the urban ngahere, including the precious native forest remnants that are found in pockets on public and private land. Possums eat leaves, buds, flowers and young shoots, while weeds like climbing asparagus and monkey apple, smother or out-compete valued species.

Plant diseases are a serious threat to the future of our urban ngahere. Kauri dieback is causing localised extinctions, Dutch elm disease has been in Auckland for many years now, myrtle rust has also reached Auckland and is a risk to pohutukawa, bottlebrush, eucalyptus, and willow myrtle, all common street trees in central Auckland. Climate change is expected to create more favourable conditions for plant diseases to establish and spread. Successfully managing the urban ngahere means these threats must be understood and addressed, if we do not take sufficient action to address these threats, we place our urban ngahere at greater risk. Actions include pest and disease control, using a mix of species and, where possible, disease resistant variants of susceptible species in new plantings, and





by responding quickly and effectively to new and emerging threats. To better understand and address kauri dieback and myrtle rust, Auckland Council is working with central government agencies, Crown Research Institutes and academia.



Te tarāwaho rautaki Strategic framework

The strategic framework consists of a vision, three main objectives (Knowing, Growing and Protecting), two key mechanisms for delivering these objectives (Engage and Manage), and a set of nine supporting principles (Figure 7).







Page 2340355

A flowering põhutukawa variety.

He whakatupu ngātahi i te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau e matomato ai te hua ā ngā rā e tū mai nei

Together, growing Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future

4.1 | Te tirohanga whānui Vision

Our vision is that Aucklanders are proud of their urban ngahere, that Auckland has a healthy and diverse network of green infrastructure, that it is flourishing across the region and is celebrated, protected, and cared for by all. The urban ngahere is equally distributed across our communities and brings significant benefits to the city. It contributes to our resilience, enhances stormwater management, delivers energy savings, supports biodiversity, and improves health outcomes and quality of life for all Aucklanders. Expanding and improving the urban ngahere is enabled through strong, collaborative partnerships across Auckland. Communities, government, businesses and citizens work together to make our urban ngahere flourish.

We will know we have been successful when we have:

 increased canopy cover across Auckland's urban area



- enhanced the associated social, environmental, economic and cultural benefits
- addressed unequal distribution of canopy cover through increasing canopy cover in neighbourhoods with previously low levels of cover
- increased the network of green infrastructure on public land
- improved linkages between green spaces by establishing ecological corridors
- effectively engaged with private landowners to support a thriving urban ngahere on private land
- planted diverse tree and plant species on public land
- shared knowledge of our urban ngahere
- instilled a sense of pride in Aucklanders for their urban ngahere.



Ngā whāinga Objectives 4.2



Auckland needs to know the status of its urban ngahere, the extent, number and distribution of trees, as well as their size, health and condition. Understanding the social, environmental, economic and cultural value of Auckland's ngahere and quantifying the benefits it provides will support better informed, strategic decisionmaking about its management and growth.

Growing

Auckland needs to grow its urban ngahere to multiply these benefits and address distributional inequity. By expanding and enriching its urban ngahere, Auckland will maximise the social, environmental, economic and cultural benefits that trees, shrubs and other vegetation bring to an urban environment.



Protecting existing ngahere is crucial to safeguarding the added values and benefits mature trees provide. Caring for saplings is critical for ensuring older trees are replenished before the end of their life, our urban ngahere grows over time, and publicly-funded planting is successful.

Ngā tikanga whakahaere Mechanisms 4.3

To achieve these objectives, Auckland Council needs to engage and manage.



Engage with partners and stakeholders – with mana whenua, residents, private landowners, community organisations and the private sector to ensure the urban ngahere is well managed, its benefits are well recognised and that growing and protecting the urban ngahere on public and private land is widely supported.



Manage the city's urban ngahere on public land through coordinated planning, strategic planting, smart and innovative urban design while facilitating best practice standards for work on and around trees through maintenance contracts.



Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #30 urau

Page 25495743

4.4 Ngā mātāpono Principles

1. Right tree in the right place

It's important to consider growing conditions and their impact on proposed tree species, soil type, drainage, slope, sunlight access, the presence of pests and weeds and the potential current and future impacts of proposed tree species on the nature and function of a place. Growth rate and size of a proposed tree species at maturity should be basic considerations in determining suitability for a specific site. Planting the right tree in the right place is an important factor in minimising future maintenance requirements and costs.



Figure 8 – Consider the context of the site and plant the right tree in the right place

2. Preference for native species

The Auckland Unitary Plan encourages the use of indigenous trees and vegetation for roadside plantings and open spaces to recognise and reflect cultural, amenity, landscape and ecological values. Planting exotic trees may be appropriate in some cases, eg where there is a need for deciduous trees to provide solar access in winter, or fruit trees to establish community orchards. Exotic trees may also be suitable for cultural or heritage reasons in specific locations.





3. Ensure urban forest diversity

Planting a range of species increases the urban ngahere's resilience to the impacts of diseases, pests, and climate change. Planting a diverse range of species will ensure only a portion of the urban ngahere will be affected as diseases and pests tend to be limited to a certain tree species or genus. It is also important to maintain genetic diversity for each species to support better resilience, for example through our seed collection programme. Planting trees with varying lifespans helps to avoid a large-scale decline in numbers as trees with similar lifespans reach the end of their lives.

4. Protect mature, healthy trees

The benefits provided by trees become exponentially greater as they mature. It's also more cost effective to care for mature trees, as this typically costs less than planting and caring for new trees. The only way to replace a 40-year-old tree is to spend 40 years caring for a new tree.

People often have strong emotional connections to landmark, mature trees in their neighbourhoods, and are more likely to mourn the loss of a large tree. Additionally, some native species, such as kākā, and bats, prefer taller trees and their presence can significantly improve the biodiversity value of an area.







5. Create ecological corridors and connections

The urban ngahere is home to a range of ecological groups, such as birds , insects, moths and butterflies. It brings nature into urban environments, a place where the majority of Aucklanders (90 per cent) live and spend most of their time. It can also provide ecological corridors for species migrating through urban environments (see Figure 9). Connecting Auckland's urban ngahere, particularly remnant natural areas, to create ecological corridors and connections between green spaces is important to enhance biodiversity.

6. Access for all residents

The unequal distribution of canopy cover across Auckland needs to be addressed when new plantings are planned. Considerations include the delivery of urban ngahere benefits, public demand for a higher canopy cover and physical access to the urban ngahere in a local area.



7. Manage urban forest on public and private land

Around 61 per cent of Auckland's urban ngahere canopy is on privately-owned land, with 39 per cent on public land. However, many of the benefits of trees are realised beyond private property boundaries and by many more people than just individual landowners. A loss of urban ngahere on private land is also a loss for the city. While there are opportunities for Auckland Council to grow and protect the urban ngahere on public land, the overall status of the urban ngahere is, to a large degree, dependent on the decisions of private landowners. Managing Auckland's urban ngahere requires private landowners' support and cooperation. Engagement is crucial and is one of two key delivery mechanisms for the proposed strategic framework.



8. Deploy regulatory and non-regulatory tools

Auckland Council has a range of regulatory tools to protect the urban ngahere, such as rules relating to Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs), the schedule of Notable trees, and rules to limit the extent of vegetation removal in sensitive environments, like streams and coastlines. These regulatory tools apply to trees and vegetation on private properties. However, since amendments to the Resource Management Act (RMA) came into effect in 2015, lifting blanket tree protection in urban areas councils depend mainly on non-regulatory tools to control the removal of trees and vegetation on private properties. Examples include landowner advice and assistance with tree care and planting, community education and outreach programmes, and raising awareness of the value and benefits of the urban ngahere.



9. Manage the whole lifecycle of urban trees

Achieving the long-term vision to grow Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future not only depends on planting more trees and vegetation but also looking after them during their lifecycle. New plantings may not be able to flourish (or even survive) without ongoing aftercare and maintenance. Investing in maintenance and proactive management will yield greater long-term benefits, as well as ensure money is well spent, with less wastage and repeated effort.



Figure 9 - the potential for ecological connections across urban and rural landscapes (adapted from Meurk & Hall, 2006¹²)



48





Ngā hua ā-rautaki Strategy Outcomes

The strategy outcomes are underpinned by an implementation framework and high level actions outlined in the next section.

5.1 | Te mōhio ki ngā mea ka hua Knowing outcomes

To better understand the status and value of Auckland's urban ngahere.

Improved knowledge will assist us to make more informed and strategic decisions on how to manage our urban ngahere.

The knowing outcomes will give us a better understanding of the status and trends of important indicators, such as canopy cover, height and age distribution and species diversity across both public and private land. Understanding these factors will enable us to better evaluate and understand the value of our urban ngahere. i-Tree Eco software¹³ could present an opportunity to do this, however at present additional research is required to fully adapt i-Tree data and analysis to a New Zealand context.

A better understanding of the trends and status of the canopy cover can direct planting efforts to where the most value can be realised. Potential future impacts and pressures on Auckland's urban ngahere, such as climate change and new pests and diseases, can also be better managed and minimised.

Table 1 – Knowing outcomes

Objective	Outcomes
Knowing	Better understanding of the status and trends on private and public land over time.
	Better understanding of the diverse values and benefits of Auckland's urban forest.
	Better understanding of existing and future risks and pressures.

Page **4**9404 54 51



Figure 10 - unequal canopy cover at a local board level (2013 LiDAR survey)



5.2 Te whakatupu i ngā mea ka hua Growing outcomes

To grow Auckland's urban ngahere and grow it more equitably.

Growing our urban ngahere will increase the average canopy cover and also provide a fairer distribution of the urban ngahere and associated benefits across Auckland (see Figure 10).

We can grow our urban ngahere and increase resilience to existing and future pressures, such as pests, diseases and climate change, through the application of the strategic framework's nine principles.

Table 2 – Growing outcomes

Objective	Outcomes
Growing	Increase the average canopy cover to 30 per cent across Auckland's urban area with no local board area having less than 15 per cent canopy cover.
	Increased resilience to existing and future pressures.



5.3 | Te tiaki i ngā mea ka hua Protecting outcomes

To protect and maintain Auckland's existing and future urban ngahere.

Protecting our existing urban ngahere is crucial to realising the values and benefits of mature trees. Caring for new plantings and young trees is essential to ensure that older trees are replaced at the end of their life and our urban ngahere grows over time.

Achieving no net loss ensures that any losses are balanced by a gain elsewhere. At a local board level, any loss will need to be balanced out by a gain in canopy cover elsewhere within the local board area. Table 3 – Protecting outcomes





5.4 Ngā tikanga whakahaere ka hua Mechanism outcomes

Engage and Manage are the two mechanisms Auckland Council will use to achieve the Knowing, Growing and Protecting objectives. For example, increasing the canopy cover and prioritising options for future planting on public and private land will only be possible through engaging and working collaboratively with communities and partners.

Engage

Community support is critical for fulfilling all three main objectives. Auckland Council must engage with relevant partners and stakeholders – mana whenua, private landowners, community groups, and the private sector –to support the growth and protection of Auckland's urban ngahere. The council must also engage with the public more widely about the benefits of urban ngahere to ensure they are understood and recognised.

Table 4 – Engage outcomes



A community engagement programme is needed that addresses Growing and Protecting and is supported by partnerships with relevant stakeholders. The programme must also integrate the aspirations of Māori, in accordance with the principle of partnership enshrined in te Tiriti o Waitangi and recognise the special role of mana whenua as kaitiaki (guardians) whereby ngahere and whenua ora (environmental services) are intimately connected to Māori wellbeing. As the programme evolves, we will develop a better understanding of community aspirations, and knowledge gaps relating to urban ngahere benefits and value.

Manage

Another key mechanism in successfully implementing the vision is the effective management of existing and future urban ngahere on public land through coordinated planning, strategic planting, smart and innovative urban design, and facilitating best practice standards for work on and around trees through maintenance contracts.

Table 5 – Manage outcomes

Mechanism	Outcomes
Manage	Increased survival rate of new plantings and sustainability of Auckland's urban ngahere on public land.

As noted in section 2.2, tree size matters when it comes to the scale of benefits delivered. Central to effective management is the requirement to nurture growing trees and increase the proportion of larger trees.





Tarāwaho whakatinana Implementation framework

The implementation framework consists of high level actions that are central to achieving the strategy outcomes. In addition to the high level actions, collaboration, funding and partnerships and area specific implementation are all fundamental to the strategy's success.

6.1 | Te mahi tahi mō te rautaki ngahere ā-tāone Urban ngahere strategy collaboration

Success will require close collaboration with many partners at various levels across operational boundaries and disciplines, within the municipality and beyond. Some of the key cross boundary groups are:

Cross-council collaboration:

This involves collaboration between internal stakeholders, interdepartmental cooperation and working closely with council controlled organisations. In the urban context, planners should work with foresters and arborists to effectively integrate policy and knowledge management tools to grow and protect the urban ngahere.

Community and council collaboration:

Effective implementation of the strategy requires effective engagement with community groups



and institutions that play a role in growing and protecting the urban ngahere.

Business and council collaboration:

Insight provided by business groups, including developers, is important to support the strategy's successful implementation. The decisions and actions of business groups can have a significant influence on the urban ngahere.

International cooperation:

This strategy draws on the knowledge and experience of many leading cities that have developed their own urban forest strategies. Continued sharing of technical, governance and community know-how will help to achieve better outcomes for Auckland.



6.2 Ngā tahua pūtea me ngā hononga ā-hoa Funding and partnerships

Continuing support from Auckland Council, developers, businesses and the wider community is fundamental to successfully growing and protecting Auckland's urban ngahere. For example, leading developers understand that delivering a successful and sustainable project is not just about building design, but also the surrounding environment and the outcomes this can deliver. Businesses can also contribute to the growth and protection of the urban ngahere through financial support, planting initiatives and effective maintenance of trees on their properties. Most importantly, having financial

support from the council ensures the development of knowledge, growth and protection of urban ngahere on public and private land.

Effective communication on the benefits of urban ngahere, such as better stormwater management, carbon sequestration, lower infrastructure costs, enhanced biodiversity and community health not to mention the city's aesthetic enhancement - is an important tool to justify project costs to stakeholders and partners. It's important to document and disseminate urban ngahere benefits to gain continuous support from all Aucklanders.

6.3 Whakatinanatanga ā-wāhi motuhake Area specific implementation

The strategy must take an area specific approach to implementation. This will require engaging with each local board, partners and stakeholders to discuss needs and drivers for growing and

protecting Auckland's urban ngahere. This will ensure the strategy's high level actions are defined and implemented in a way that matches the needs of each local area.



6.4 Kaupapa mahi matua High level actions

The Engage and Manage mechanisms identified in the strategy framework run through all the high level actions and are central to their successful implementation. Table 6 – Knowing high level actions



- land over time
- urban forest

High level actions

- Incorporate three-yearly LiDAR surveys in council 1 work programmes.
- Create database for existing assets within two year 2
- Integrate scientific knowledge of the urban ngahe 3 mātauranga Māori in partnership with mana wher the urban ngahere.
- Quantify values and benefits (within 12-18 month 4
- 5 Determine survival rates of new council plantings.
- Identify key pressures and risks in partnership with 6 whenua and local boards.

High level actions to support the following outcomes:

• better understanding of the status and trends on private and public

· better understanding of the diverse values and benefits of Auckland's

· better understanding of existing and future risks and pressures.

	Implementation timeframe (years)						
	1-2	3-5	Ongoing				
			•				
ars.	•						
re with nua of			•				
ıs).	•						
			•				
h mana	•						

Page 23/05/5459

Table 7 – Growing high level actions

$\langle \cdot \rangle$
Growing

- High level actions to support the following outcomes:
- increase the average canopy cover to 30 per cent across Auckland's urban area with no local board area having less than 15 per cent canopy cover
- increased resilience to existing and future pressures.

Lick level estions		Implementation timeframe (years)					
μıβ	High level actions		1-2	3-5	Ongoing		
1	Increase canopy cover in road corridors, passes to support an average of 30 per ce across Auckland's urban area with no loca having less than 15 per cent canopy cover	arks and open nt canopy cover l board area			•		
2	Identify and prioritise locations for future on public land in partnership with mana w local boards.	planting ⁄henua and	•				
3	Use science and ongoing engagement wit mana whenua and communities to inform relation to types of planting.	h local boards, n decisions in			•		
4	Increase the capacity of nursery programmers and the supply of eco-sour maraes) to increase the supply of eco-sour	nes (including rced plants.			•		
5	Leverage partnerships established through initiatives (eg the Mayor's Million Trees pr	n existing ogramme).		•			

Table 8 – Protecting high level actions



Raise arboriculture maintenance programme from 6 to five years or until new plantings are well establi (a target survival rate of 70-80 per cent).

guidelines, proper tree care).

7 Establish a labelling programme for protected tree 12 months (eg species, age and benefits).

	Implementation timeframe (years)						
	1-2	3-5	Ongoing				
ion t.	•						
th	٠						
mes (eg			•				
s urban			•				
of the anting			•				
n two ished	•						
es within	•						

Page 3440456 61



Ngā tohutoro References

- Pacific Southwest Research Station and Center for Urban Forest Research https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/topics/urban_forestry/products/2/psw_cufr687_NYC_MFRA.pdf
- 2. McDonald, R. et al. 2017. Funding Trees for Health, The Nature Conservancy, www.nature.org/trees4health
- 3. urban environment, Environmental Health 2016 15 (Suppl 1):S36 https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12940-016-0103-6
- Cavanagh, J. E. and Clemons, J. 2006. Do Urban Forests Enhance Air Quality? Australian Journal of 4. Environmental Management, Volume 13, 2006 – Issue 2 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14486563.2006.9725122?needAccess=true
- 5. Ecosyst (2011) 14:755-769
- Harmsworth, G., R. Awatere, S. 2013. Indigenous Māori Knowledge and Perspectives of Ecosystems. 6. Ecosystem services in New Zealand – conditions and trends. Manaaki Whenua Press, Lincoln, New Zealand
- 7. Wilcox, M. D. 2012. Auckland's Remarkable Urban Forest, Auckland Botanical Society
- 8. Manaaki Whenua - Landcare Research, Māori values and native forest (Ngahere) https://www. landcareresearch.co.nz/ data/assets/pdf file/0017/43910/maori values native forest.pdf
- 9. The Auckland Plan 2050, Outcome: Environment and Cultural Heritage, Direction 3: Use Auckland's growth and development to protect and enhance the natural environment https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plansstrategies/auckland-plan/environment-cultural-heritage/Pages/direction-use-growthdevelopment-protect-enhance.aspx
- 10. https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plansstrategies/auckland-plan/environment-cultural-heritage/Pages/focus-area-use-greeninfrastructure-deliver-greater-resilience.aspx
- The Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in part (Updated 13 July 2018), E1 Water quality and 11. integrated management http://unitaryplan.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/Images/Auckland%20Unitary%20Plan%20 Operative/Chapter%20E%20Auckland-wide/1.%20Natural%20Resources/E1%20Water%20 quality%20and%20integrated%20management.pdf
- 12. 30(1): 131-146

https://newzealandecology.org/nzje/2297

13. i-Tree Eco https://www.itreetools.org/eco/index.php

Peper, P. et al. 2007. New York City, New York Municipal Forest Resource Analysis. USDA Forest Service,

Salmond, J. et al. 2016. Health and climate related ecosystem services provided by street trees in the

Xiao, Q. and McPherson, E. G. 2011. Rainfall interception of three trees in Oakland, California, Urban

https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/mcpherson/psw_2011_mcpherson008(xiao).pdf

https://www.landcareresearch.co.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/77047/2_1_Harmsworth.pdf

The Auckland Plan 2050, Outcome: Environment and Cultural Heritage, Focus area 6: Use green infrastructure to deliver greater resilience, long-term cost savings and quality environmental outcomes

Meurk, C.D. Hall, G.M.J. 2006. Options for enhancing forest biodiversity across New Zealand's managed landscapes based on ecosystem modelling and spatial design. New Zealand Journal of Ecology (2006)

Page 25/01/57 63

© 2019 Auckland Council March 2019 Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department

Auckland Council (2019). Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy

ISBN 978-1-98-856480-7 (Print) ISBN 978-1-98-856481-4 (PDF)

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy was approved by the Auckland Council Environment and Community Committee on 20 February 2018.



Howick Local Board Ngahere Analysis Update 2021 Canopy cover changes with the 2013 to 2016/2018 LiDAR data

Urban Ngahere Strategy 2019 Knowing Programme



A summary of the urban environment in Howick

Approximately **142,700** residents Less than **1%** of canopy cover more than **30 metres** tall

Average canopy cover of

54% of canopy cover with no statutory protection

More than 230 local parks and 55 playgrounds

293 hectares of Significant Ecological Area

Two statistical areas - Shelly Park and Tuscany Heights - with more than **30%** canopy cover

> More than **70%** of total canopy cover on private land

across local board, including canopy cover of: 26% 8% 12% 17% on road reserves on other public land on private land

New zoning under Auckland Unitary Plan includes Mixed Housing Urban, Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings

1.8% of original indigenous vegetation cover remaining

Notable Tree records

1,123 hectares of urban forest in 2013, **remaining the same in 2016/2018**



Nearly 7,000 hectares of land

727

hectares of parks, including:

- Mangemangeroa Reserve
- Point View Reserve
- Murphys Bush

Auckland Council disclaims any liability whatsoever in connection with any action taken in reliance of this document for any error, deficiency, flaw or omission contained in it.

Date: September 2021

ISBN 978-1-99-100252-5 (Print)

ISBN 978-1-99-100253-2 (PDF)

This document is licensed for re-use under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence.

In summary, you are free to copy, distribute and adapt the material, as long as you attribute it to the Auckland Council and abide by the other licence terms.



Contents

1.0 Pi	reface		1	
2.0 Ir	ntroducti	on	2	
	2.1	Howick Local Board	2	
	2.2	Study Background	3	
	2.3	Data Collection	3	
3.0 R	esults ar	nd Discussion	4	
	3.1	Urban Canopy Cover Overview	4	
	3.2	Canopy Distribution across Howick Local Board	5	
	3.3	Urban Ngahere Canopy Height	8	
	3.4	Urban Ngahere Tenure	9	
	3.5	Urban Ngahere in Relation to Growth Pressures	10	
	3.6	Recommendations	13	
4.0 Acknowledgements			14	
5.0 F	5.0 References			

1.0 Preface

Tāmaki-Makaurau / Auckland is New Zealand's largest city, and plantings of exotic and native trees have taken place as the region has developed. Early Māori settlers would have planted trees such as karaka, pūriri and tōtara to indicate a special place or to mark a celebration, while European settlers planted trees that were familiar and provided a sense of place. London Plane, English Oak, and European Lime trees were some of the earliest recorded plantings in Auckland. Settlers arriving from around the world commenced the history of Auckland's diverse and unique tree cover.

When European settlers arrived to Tāmaki-Makaurau / Auckland, the gullies of the isthmus were filled with raupō, edged with a varied growth of sedges and other moisture loving plants; and slopes of gullies covered with karamū and cabbage trees. By the late nineteenth century, much of the Auckland area was under cultivation with a large number of introduced plants. Along with residential development commencing in the mid-20th century, these actions have now reduced indigenous forest cover within the Howick Local Board to small fragments, primarily in local reserves.

The Howick Local Board has provided locally driven initiatives funding to Auckland Council's Principal Advisor Urban Ngahere (Forest) in the Parks, Sports and Recreation Department to develop an analysis of the tree cover in its area of responsibility. This update report is the result of a programme of work by Auckland Council involving detailed analysis of urban tree coverages on public and private land, aiming to identify opportunities to nurture, grow and protect urban trees in the local board area. The analysis work is directed by the Auckland Council's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy 2019, which has 18 key objectives to help Council and local boards to deliver a healthy ngahere for a flourishing future.



2.0 Introduction

2.1 Howick Local Board

The Howick Local Board covers approximately (c.) 7,000 hectares (ha) in eastern Auckland, located between the Tāmaki River to the west, the Mangemangeroa Stream to the east and the Redoubt Road ridge to the southeast. The population of the local board is approximately 142,700 residents.

Land-use within the board is very varied, with well-established (pre-1990) residential suburbs dominating the northern half of the board, newer and developing residential suburbs to the east and south, large retail centres at Botany Downs and Pakuranga Plaza, and a swathe of commercial and industrial land to the west, encompassing Highbrook Park and parts of East Tāmaki. Howick's southern and eastern boundaries extend just beyond the recognised rural-urban boundary into the adjacent rural regions around Brookby and Whitford, with the south-eastern spread of development butting up against the physical and regulatory limits imposed by topography and zoning.

Approximately 11% of the local board area is public parkland, with bush reserves containing pockets of remnant native forest. These reserves are predominantly



Urban forest around central Howick

located along Howick's eastern margins at the interface between the suburbs and the rural areas beyond and on the coastal fringe. Examples include Mangemangeroa Reserve, Point View Reserve, and Murphys Bush.

Large reserves for passive or active recreation, or a mixture of both, are distributed throughout Howick and include Barry Curtis Park, Lloyd Elsmore Park, Macleans Park (with substantial areas of native revegetation planting), Tī Rakau Park, Pigeon Mountain, Murvale Reserve (with an outstanding collection of early exotic plantings), and William Green Domain.

Large portions of the local board area are now zoned for development intensification under the Auckland Unitary Plan. The new zoning, including the Mixed Housing Urban Zone and the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone, now allows for smaller sections. Consequently, much of the urban forest is under a range of pressures from development, which could potentially lead to irreversible changes in urban forest cover (Brown et al., 2015).

An information graphic summarising local board details related to urban forest is provided at the beginning of this report.



The 'Rural-Urban Boundary' viewed from Point View Reserve, East Tāmaki Heights

2.2 Study Background

'Urban ngahere' ('urban forest') comprises all the trees within a city – including parks, coastal cliffs, stream corridors, private gardens and streets – both native and naturalised exotic species. For the purposes of this report, 'urban ngahere' is defined as all of the trees and other vegetation three metres or taller in stature within the Howick Local Board, and the soil and water systems that support these trees. This urban ngahere definition encompasses trees and shrubs in streets, parks, private gardens, stream banks, coastal cliffs, rail corridors, and motorway margins and embankments. It also includes both planted and naturally established plants, of both exotic and native provenance.

The scale of the tree and shrub cover across Auckland is sufficiently extensive on both public and private land to make a meaningful contribution to the liveability and sense of place for its residents. Benefits of the urban ngahere include:

Social

- Improve health and wellbeing
- Reduce the urban heat island effect
- Provide shade
- Enhance visual amenity

Environmental

- Enhance biodiversity
- Improve air quality
- Carbon sequestration
- Improve water quality

Economic

- Increase property values
- Reduce flood risk
- Reduce energy costs
- Reduce healthcare costs

Cultural

- Support education
- Local food growing
- Sustain and enhance maur
- Cultural heritage

The Auckland Unitary Plan offers various degrees of protection to urban ngahere and groups of trees meeting specific characteristics (e.g., pre-identified significance, vegetation by coasts or streams); however, other important urban ngahere assets have no statutory protection and can therefore be removed. The completion of a study in urban canopy cover in Howick is important to provide information on baseline tree distribution that future canopy cover measurements can be compared to. This baseline data also provides information on where there are pressures on canopy cover and opportunities for tree planting. Increases in canopy cover are also intended to contribute to other Auckland Council programmes such as Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan (Auckland Council 2019c).

2.3 Data Collection

Urban canopy cover across Auckland was mapped in 2013 (Auckland Council 2019b), and again in 2016/18 by use of LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging). Airborne LiDAR is an optical remote sensing technology that irradiates a target with a beam of light; usually a pulsed laser, to measure an object's variable distances from the earth surface. Two LiDAR data sets are covered in this report, collected in the years 2013 and 2016/2018. The second survey (2016/2018) had to be completed over two years due to unfavourable weather conditions that limited data quality. As these two LiDAR data sets provide a solid baseline for future comparative work, investigations into alternatives to LiDAR for mapping urban ngahere are currently underway.



New native restoration planting

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Urban Canopy Cover Overview

Based on the 2013 data set, urban ngahere covered 16% of the Howick Local Board area, including 6% of roads, 25% of public parks, and 17% of private land. Further information on the 2013 data has been provided in a baseline report (Howick Local Board Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report September 2019; Auckland Council 2019b). There was no net change in overall canopy cover based on the 2016/2018 data set (Table 1).

As an overview, the initial analysis contained in this report (in line with the knowing phase of the Auckland Urban Ngahere Strategy) shows that there are some obvious areas of urban ngahere concentration, while there are also areas that are lacking urban ngahere. The lowest cover (3-6%) tends to be in central/southern areas of the

local board (Botany Central/South, Redcastle, Ormiston North and Donegal Park), while the eastern parts of the local board, Shelly Park and Tuscany Heights, have the highest cover (more than 30%). Although the canopy cover in East Tāmaki is low (5%), the percentage of canopy cover >30 m tall is high compared to other statistical areas in the local board. Other suburbs with a relatively high level of tree cover are the older coastal suburbs of Shelly Park, Mellons Bay and Cockle Bay.

The 2016/18 LiDAR data indicates growth in canopy cover on road reserves and parks across the Howick Local Board, with a combined net increase in canopy cover of c.26 hectares. Conversely, there has been a net reduction in canopy cover of c.8 hectares on privately owned land. An example of this decrease has been observed on private land in Ormiston East, where canopy cover has shown a net reduction of 13 hectares since 2013.

Urban Local Board	Public open space		Private land		Roads		Other public land		Overall coverage	
	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018
Kaipātiki	63	64	25	25	12	14	33	34	30	30
Upper Harbour	50	52	29	30	11	13	10	11	27	28
Hibiscus and Bays	28	29	24	23	15	14	43	42	25	24
Puketāpapa	50	50	17	16	10	12	15	15	20	20
Albert-Eden	33	34	19	18	17	20	19	18	20	20
Ōrākei	25	25	20	19	14	16	20	20	20	19
Waitematā	42	43	16	15	15	17	11	10	19	19
Whau	34	34	17	16	12	13	12	12	17	17
Devonport-Takapuna	24	27	17	17	11	13	13	14	16	16
Howick	25	26	17	17	6	8	11	12	16	16
Henderson-Massey	30	32	14	14	7	8	11	12	15	15
Papakura	16	17	15	15	8	11	8	9	13	14
Manurewa	24	26	11	12	6	9	7	7	12	13
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	21	23	9	9	10	12	11	11	11	12
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	13	14	8	8	7	9	10	10	9	10
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	14	14	7	7	7	9	8	8	8	8

Table 1: Urban ngahere in Auckland's urban local board areas: data includes percentage cover (to nearest whole number) of urban ngahere for different land tenures, and the overall percentage cover of urban ngahere within each board, with a comparison between the 2013 and 2016/2018 data sets.

Te matomatotanga o Te Ngahere-a-Tāone Te Rohe o Howick

3.2 Canopy Distribution across Howick Local Board

The urban ngahere is not distributed evenly throughout the local board, as shown in **Figures 1 and 2**, which display variation by statistical area. Urban ngahere covers 16% of the Howick Local Board area as a whole. However, when excluding the rural parts of Howick and considering only the urbanised areas, the level of canopy cover is closer to 11%. This is a low figure for an urban area and well below the level of cover targeted within Auckland's Urban Ngahere Strategy. This strategy has a goal of achieving an average 30% canopy cover across all of urban Auckland, with no local board area having less than 15% cover (Auckland Council, 2019a).

The reliance on the rural fringe of Howick in raising its overall level of tree cover is highlighted by the fact that, despite making up less than a quarter of the board's land area, it contains nearly half of its urban ngahere cover. Small losses of rural land to urbanisation would be likely to have a disproportionate effect on the urban ngahere, both in terms of overall tree cover and by affecting a greater proportion of large trees.

Over half (51%) of the local board is covered in impervious surfaces, which presents an opportunity to plant urban ngahere, particularly in the road corridor, as a direct remedy. Trees are a well-known solution for stormwater management, as their extensive canopies and subsurface root systems are capable of capturing and pumping substantial amounts of water, providing cooling effects (Berland et al. 2017). Establishing trees within impervious surfaces will act to intercept rainfall before it reaches the ground and slows inflow rates. This has follow on benefits for stormwater management systems such as underground pipes and nearby waterways (Dwyer and Miller 1999). Opportunities exist for new tree planting in the road corridor which will assist in stormwater management by capturing stormwater flows via interception and infiltration. Trees and other 'green infrastructure' solutions, including rain gardens, permeable pavements, bioswales, and green roofs, are worth implementing at a greater scale and should be encouraged. There has not been a significant change in urban tree coverage on a local scale, as shown in **Figure 2**. In general, statistical areas of Howick have had only a minor net increase or minor net decrease in canopy cover. The only current concern may be Donegal Park, with already low tree coverage, had a minor net decrease in cover between the two data sets. Upon examination this appears to be attributed to small scale residential tree removal and trimming of larger trees.



Matanginui/Green Mount, East Tāmaki, Auckland

Te matomatotanga o Te Ngahere-a-Tāone Te Rohe o Howick



Figure 1: 2016/18 Canopy Cover by Statistical Areas

Te matomatotanga o Te Ngahere-a-Tāone Te Rohe o Howick



Figure 2: Spatial distribution of urban ngahere canopy within the statistical areas of Howick Local Board


3.3 Urban Ngahere Canopy Height

LiDAR data includes a height component, and this information was used to split the recorded canopy cover into different height categories: 3-5 metres; 5-10 metres; 10-15 metres; 15-20 metres; 20-30 metres; and taller than 30 metres. This data is representative of canopy cover height, rather than tree height, as each individual tree may be recorded in several categories.

The height class distribution of the urban ngahere canopy within Howick Local Board is displayed in **Figure 3**. In 2013, 26% of the canopy cover was between 3-5 metres tall, 40% 5-10 metres tall, and the remaining 34% was canopy taller than 10 metres. This distribution remained similar in the 2016/2018 data sets, although the percentage of canopy cover over between 3-5 metres tall increased to 32% of the forest canopy. This data shows only low presence of tall canopy cover within the local board area, with all canopy cover taller than 15 metres (including height categories 15-20 metres, 20-30 metres, and 30 metres plus) representing approximately 12% of the total urban ngahere canopy cover assessed and are mainly found in bush remnants and the rural fringes, particularly within East Tāmaki Heights and Flat Bush.

Research has shown that many of the benefits attributed to urban ngahere are disproportionally provided by larger trees (Davies et al. 2011, Moser et al. 2015). Large trees typically create more shade per tree due to a larger and wider canopy spread (Moser et al. 2015); intercept larger amounts of particulate pollutants and rainfall due to significantly larger leaf areas; contain more carbon and have higher carbon sequestration rates (Beets et al. 2012, Schwendenmann and Mitchell 2014, Dahlhausen et al. 2016).

Additionally, trees are often less susceptible to careless or malicious vandalism by the general public once established; can be pruned to provide higher canopy clearance over roadways; carparks and pedestrian footpaths; typically contribute more to calming and slowing traffic on local streets than small trees; and absorb more gaseous pollutants. It is therefore an immediate priority to retain existing large trees across the local board area to ensure the positive benefits of these are not lost, as also emphasised in the Urban Ngahere Strategy (Auckland Council 2019a). The relatively high proportion of shorter canopy cover across the local board (32% 3-5m tall and 39% 5-10m tall) in the 2016/2018 data set, indicates a relatively recent surge of tree planting, assuming the smaller stature canopy corresponds to younger trees, rather than shrubs which are limited at their mature height. When grouped by land use type, it can be seen how the contribution of the trees in rural Howick skews the figures for the board as a whole, with this area containing approximately 50% less canopy cover under five metres tall as a proportion of overall cover than in urban Howick, and has nearly twice the proportion of canopy cover over ten metres tall.



Figure 3: Height class distribution of urban ngahere canopy across all land tenures within Howick Local Board

Ngahereagely 72056 te 2021 8

3.4 Urban Ngahere Tenure

The tenure of urban ngahere described in this report relates to the zoning and ownership of different land parcels within the local board. Publicly owned land is described as either 'public parks' or 'other public land' (e.g. schools, Council-owned property), trees in the road corridor/road reserves are described as 'street trees', and privately owned land (residential or commercial) is described as 'private land'.

The tenure distribution of urban ngahere canopy within the Howick Local Board is displayed in **Figure 4**. Nearly three quarters (74%) of the urban ngahere in Howick, much of which is unprotected, is located on private property. Public parks and other publicly owned land (e.g., schools) contain a similar proportion of urban ngahere, being 15% and 11% of the total urban ngahere cover, respectively.

Howick Local Board stands out in the regional data as having a very low degree of tree coverage (8% in 2016/18) within its road reserves (Table 1), which may reflect the relatively recent construction of a large part of the road network and, to some degree, poor planting choices and practices in the newer suburbs. This situation presents an opportunity for enhancing the urban ngahere by infill planting of carefully chosen street trees, that will provide benefits long term to local communities.

Planting may also be considered on rural roads, the canopy within which makes up only 2% of the rural tree coverage. With only 5% canopy cover on other public land



Figure 4: Tenure of urban ngahere canopy within Howick Local Board (2013 data set)

in rural parts of the local board, there may also be an opportunity to encourage planting within this category of land such as schools and colleges, where additional educational benefits may be gained.

In addition to having low levels of canopy cover, roads also exhibit generally small tree size, with only 13% being over ten metres tall, compared to 39% for parks. This reflects the more cramped growing environment within the road corridor (particularly below ground) and the more frequent cycling of tree stock as trees are regularly removed and replaced to allow for infrastructure works.

Public parks have the highest proportion of urban ngahere relative to area out of all the land tenures, as shown in **Figure 5**, followed by private land. There has been a minor net increase in urban ngahere canopy in public parks, as well as road reserves and other public land, between the two survey data sets. The percentage canopy cover of private land has stayed the same.

Public parks are good place to focus additional urban ngahere planting as they comprise approximately 10% of the local board land area and are widely distributed. In addition, public parks offer the best opportunities for long-term sustainable management of the urban ngahere due to the lower chance of conflict with future housing intensification.



Figure 5: Change in urban ngahere cover of different land tenures in Howick Local Board between 2013 and 2016/18



3.5 Urban Ngahere in Relation to Growth Pressures

The Significant Ecological Area overlay (SEA; **Figure 6**) prioritises the areas of urban ngahere in Howick with the highest ecological value, providing a starting point for protection. With future development and urban intensification, however, SEA and other continuous areas of urban ngahere are at risk. Canopy cover in relation to the Auckland Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (Auckland Council 2017) forecasting areas of growth is shown in **Figure 7**.

There is increased pressure on the urban ngahere in Howick through a combination of greenfield development, lack of suitable growing space, and conflicts with infrastructure. An increase in urban ngahere cover in local parks and residential suburbs will provide more universal benefits as a greater number of people are likely to encounter the forest and connect to nature. Urban ngahere on public land provides opportunities to connect with communities, enhanced biodiversity, educational opportunities and helps to develop a sense of place.

The lack of scheduled notable trees in the southern half of Howick is another issue that may warrant investigation, as there may potentially be trees that have so far been overlooked but would meet the necessary standards for inclusion on the schedule. This may particularly be the case in parts of Flat Bush currently under development, where large, high value trees are scattered within former farmland and riparian margins.

Protecting existing and adding to the numbers of trees in the road corridor is an important and ongoing measure to retain and extend urban ngahere cover, as the tree cover in the road corridor is currently low. The importance of trees in the street environment is going to increase, and will, in time, incorporate the only accessible trees for some residents.

To this end, the Howick Local Board is encouraged to work with Auckland Council to readdress the current rules for tree and vegetation protection, especially in relation to highlighting the importance of large trees and the multiple benefits they offer to the local community.



Notable trees, Howick, Auckland

Te matomatotanga o Te Ngahere-a-Tāone Te Rohe o Howick



Figure 6: 2016/18 Canopy Height & Significant Ecological Areas



Te matomatotanga o Te Ngahere-a-Tāone Te Rohe o Howick



Figure 7: 2016/18 Canopy & Sequencing and Timing of Growth

Te matomatotanga o Te Ngahere-a-Tāone Te Rohe o Howick

3.6 Recommendations

The assessment of urban tree cover in the Howick Local Board presented in this update report aims to assist in the knowing phase of the Auckland Urban Forest Strategy. The analysis of existing tree cover distribution, structure, tenure, and protection, provides the local board with a basis for determining where to focus efforts in improving urban ngahere cover during the growing phase, to be initiated in the near future.

Recommendations for future urban ngahere management to the Howick Local Board include:

- Prioritise the efforts of the Howick Urban Ngahere Action Plan 2021 to plant new trees in parks and streets
- raise awareness of the current rules for tree and vegetation notable Tree overlay
- strengthen local funding initiatives to engage with, educate, and support private owners of land featuring valuable trees

- set an initial goal of achieving a minimum of 15% urban ngahere cover within the fully urban portion of Howick
- initiate tree planting where possible in unused corners or edges of parks, including the designation of the former Greenmount landfill as a reserve
- identify parks containing playgrounds with low tree shading (e.g., Simon Owen Place Reserve and Monash Park) and obtain funding for large grade specimen trees to plant
- prioritise tree planting in predominantly industrial/ commercial suburbs with low canopy cover, e.g., East Tāmaki, Huntington Park, Clover Park and Highland Park.

The metrics of the canopy analysis will be used to help inform and prioritise the efforts of the Howick Urban Ngahere Action Plan. The action plan highlights the areas to plant new trees and sets out the process to fund, implement, and find ways to protect and nurture existing ngahere on public and private land.



Palm avenue planted along Te Irirangi Drive, East Tāmaki, Auckland



4.0 Acknowledgements

The following parties are acknowledged for their roles in the preparation of this document:

- Content prepared by Carolina Stavert and Jessica Reaburn (Wildland Consultants Ltd).
- Technical advice and peer review completed by Howell Davies (Principal Advisor Urban Ngahere (Forest), Community Services – Parks, Sports & Recreation, Auckland Council).
- Data and GIS-based figures prepared by Grant Lawrence (Research and Evaluation Unit, Auckland Council).
- Photographs supplied by Auckland Council and Wildland Consultants Ltd.
- Graphics and formatting completed by Q Brand Builders.

The authors would also like to thank the Howick Local Board for their support and direction during the development of this report and its content.

5.0 References

Auckland Council (2017). Auckland Future Urban Land Supply Strategy. <u>https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.</u> <u>nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plansstrategies/topic-based-plans-strategies/housing-plans/</u> <u>Documents/future-urban-land-supply-strategy.pdf</u>

Auckland Council (2019a). Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy. Published by Auckland Council's Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department, March 2019. <u>https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/</u> <u>plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plans-</u> <u>strategies/topic-based-plans-strategies/environmental-</u> <u>plans-strategies/Documents/urban-ngahere-forest-</u> <u>strategy.pdf</u>

Auckland Council (2019b), unpublished. Howick Local Board Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report September 2019. Prepared for the Howick Local Board Locally Driven Initiatives – Ngahere Work Programme: Year 1 Knowing Phase.

Auckland Council (2019c). Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan. Developed from Auckland's Climate Action Framework consultation summary published by Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department, June 2019. <u>https://www.aucklandcouncil.</u> govt.nz/environment/Documents/te-taruke-a-tawhiriauckland-climate-plan.pdf

Beets, P. N., M. O. Kimberley, G. R. Oliver, S. H. Pearce, J. D. Graham and A. Brandon (2012). *Allometric Equations for Estimating Carbon Stocks in Natural Forest in New Zealand.* Forests 3: 818-839.

Berland, A., Shiflett, S.A., Shuster, W.D., Garmestani, A.S., Goddard, H.C., Herrmann, D.L. and Hopton, M.E. (2017). *The role of trees in urban stormwater management.* Landscape and Urban Planning 162: 167-177.

Brown, M. A., Simcock, R. and S. Greenhalgh (2015). Protecting the Urban Forest. Landcare Research Manaaki Whenua Policy Brief No. 13 (Issn: 2357-1713).

Dahlhausen, J., P. Biber, T. Rötzer, E. Uhl and H. Pretzsch (2016). *Tree Species and Their Space Requirements in Six Urban Environments Worldwide.* Forests 7: 111-130.

Davies, Z. G., J. L. Edmondson, A. Heinemeyer, J. R. Leake and K. J. Gaston (2011). *Mapping an urban ecosystem service: quantifying above-ground carbon storage at a citywide scale.* Journal of Applied Ecology 48(5): 1125-1134.

Dwyer, M.C. and Miller, R.W. 1999. *Using GIS to assess urban tree canopy benefits and surrounding greenscape distributions.* Journal of Arboriculture 25(2): 102-107.

Moser, A., T. Rötzer, S. Pauleit and H. Pretzsch (2015). Structure and ecosystem services of small-leaved lime (Tilia cordata Mill.) and black locust (Robinia pseudoacacia L.) in urban environments. Urban Forestry and Urban Greening 14: 1110-1121.

Schwendenmann, L. and N. D. Mitchell (2014). *Carbon accumulation by native trees and soils in an urban park, Auckland.* New Zealand Journal of Ecology 38 (2): 213-220.

Wilcox, M., D. (2012). Auckland's Remarkable Urban Forest. Epsom, Auckland, Auckland Botanical Society.





The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Matthew Cheeseman

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: mattc003@hotmail.com

Contact phone number: 0211404516

Postal address: 12 Wando Lane East Tamaki Auckland 2014

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Project scope • Walking and cycling networks • Reduction in urban ngahere • Increased flooding risk

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

The project has always been Airport to Botany - rapid transit network (RTN) (the project). The current RLTP highlights delivering a significant increase in rapid transit travel options (fast, frequent, high capacity bus and train services separated from general traffic). Walking and Cycling are not forms of rapid transit. These should not be included in this projects scope. An example of how the project has been described to stakeholders and the public is "The next stages to be delivered under this RLTP involve protecting the future A2B rapid transit corridor, between Auckland Airport and Botany via Manukau, and extending the new AirportLink bus to Botany via Te Irirangi Drive. Extending the AirportLink bus to Botany will be supported by bus interchanges and priority improvements along Te Irirangi Drive, with a move toward a rapid transit corridor in future decades." There is no mention of walking and cycling. Therefore, the stakeholders and public have been misled. Support was gained prior to the inclusion of walking and cycling facilities. The consequences of including improved walking and cycling facilities along both sides of the corridor into the project scope is a significant increase in project costs, an enormous reduction in trees and the urban ngahere canopy coverage across this area, increased flooding risk and climate impacts, an increase in the urban heat and island effect, decreased visual amenity, loss of shade, decreased health and wellbeing to the public and decreased air quality. These impacts are significant and outweigh the benefits of pouring concrete in place of these trees for walking and cycling facilities. There is already footpaths. It is legal for cyclists to ride on the roads. An alternative would be to incorporate a cycling network into the median strip of Ti Irirangi Drive where the RTN busway will go as this will have such few buses, at most, one every 15 minutes I assume and the road is very long and straight so the bus and cyclist will see each other. I don't believe this project has been



transparent with making stakeholders aware of the impacts of including the improved walking and cycling networks into this project. It has been a late addition and one I would deem as misleading after support for the project was gained. I am appalled decision makers have agreed to the destruction of thousands of trees to pour concrete to allow a better footpath / cycling path when this already exists. I don't agree with the statement that that is what public feedback has said. The public would not want improved walking and cycling networks by the destruction of thousands of trees. Should this project proceed unchanged, the inclusion of the walking and cycling aspect no longer adheres to Te-Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan, specifically Action Area N2 and Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy. The specific principals this violates is - Grow our rural and urban ngahere (forest) Action area N2: Grow and protect our rural and urban ngahere (forest) to maximise carbon capture and build resilience to climate change. And • Increase indigenous tree plantings in road corridors, parks and open spaces. Each CCO must work within Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Action Framework. I am not opposed to the RTN along the median strip of Ti Irirangi Drive and would like the project scope and the Notice of Requirement designation reduced to include only the median strip of land.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: Request the project scope be reduced to a rapid transit network - Airport to Botany which includes: a) a dedicated Bus Rapid Transit corridor, centre-running along Te Irirangi Drive b) Bus Rapid Transit stations at Smales Road, Accent Drive, and Ormiston Road – Botany Junction Shopping Centre c) swales and wetlands d) areas for construction related activities including yards, site compounds, and bridge and structure works. Oppose the inclusion of improved walking and cycling facilities along both sides of the corridor due to the destruction of thousands of trees to pour concrete for this. Oppose the removal of trees lining both sides of the corridor along Ti Irirangi Drive creating good canopy coverage and reduced flooding risks to nearby residents. Request the designation of the Notice of Requirement is restricted to the median strip along Ti Irirangi Drive only (and including any areas required for stations) as this is sufficient enough to complete the rapid transit network - Airport to Botany as per the original intent of the project.

Submission date: 11 April 2023

Supporting documents urban-ngahere-forest-strategy_20230411195219.096.pdf howick-canopy-analysis-report-2021_20230411195227.643.pdf

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy



He Mihi

Nau mai e te hā o Tāne, Whakatau mai e te oranga o Tāne.

Tīkina mai te ate rahirahi o te Tāone nui o Tāmaki Makaurau hei whakaniko anō ai i te whenua tapu; ko tō whaea, ko Papatūānuku.

Kia toro ake ōna hua me ōna pai kia tauawhia e tō matua e Rangi-nui e tū iho nei, kia rongohia anō te tīhau a ngā manu, me te kētete a ngā pēpeke.

Kia wawara anō te reo o ngā rākau kua roa e ngū ana ki te wao kōhatu e tāwharau nei i ngā maunga tapu o tō whenua taketake.

Tane-o-te-waiora,

Tāne-whakapiripiri,

Tāne-nui-a-rangi, tukua mai anō tō ihi, tukua mai anō tō mana.

Māu e kitea anō ai he awa para-kore e rere ana, he hau mā e kōrewarewa ana, he taiao hauora e takoto ana.

Kia hipokina anō e tō korowai kākāriki te tāone nui kia whiwhi ko mātou, kia whiwhi te ao katoa.

He whakatupu ngātahi i te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau e matomato ai te hua ā ngā rā e tū mai nei

Together, growing Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #akaurau

Tāne let your breath pervade all, may your life-essence be ever-present.

Reclaim the very heart of Auckland city and adorn once again the hallowed ground; that is your mother, Papatūānuku.

May all that is fruitful and good reach skyward to the embrace of your father Rangi-nui on high so the chorus of birds may be heard again, and the splendid symphony of insects in response.

Bring with you the sounds of rustling trees that have long stood silent to this concrete jungle that bounds the sacred mountains of your primal domain.

Tāne-purveyor of life,

Tāne-provider-of-shelter,

Tāne-source-of-all-knowledge, bestow us again with your wonder, and grace us with your prestige.

By you, we will again realise fresh waterways, pure air, and a healthier environment.

Garb the city with your verdant cloak that we, your heirs might benefit, and so too, the whole world.





Kupu whakataki Foreword

A healthy urban ngahere (forest) enriches our communities, our local economies and our natural environment. Auckland cannot become a world-class city without one.

Whether you are from Takanini or Takapuna, Herne Bay or Henderson, trees and vegetation are valuable to all of us. They clean our air and stormwater, cool and beautify our urban spaces and bring nature to our doorsteps. Developed in partnership with tangata whenua, the strategy gives voice to an important role trees play in the mauri of the land. They provide a wide range of measurable benefits that make our lives healthier, happier and more gratifying.

How can we protect what we value in the face of a growing and urbanising population, rising inequality, and the major impacts of invasive pests and climate change? How do we maintain and enhance the richness that our urban ngahere provides? How do we align our efforts?

This is precisely why we have developed a strategy for Auckland's urban ngahere. It delivers on the vision for our future Auckland, ensuring each one of us – and future Aucklanders - have access to the tangible benefits provided by a vibrant, green city.

The strategy ensures that when Auckland Council, corporate partners, community groups and each one of us plants or maintains a tree, our collective efforts truly add up to something – contributing towards increasing our average canopy cover from 18 to 30 per cent. Likewise, the strategy helps target our efforts to grow the urban ngahere where it's scarce - as in parts of South Auckland - so that all local board areas have at least 15 per cent canopy cover.

This strategy provides an overarching vision and 18 high level actions under three main themes, Knowing, Growing and Protecting but doesn't provide all the answers or deliver the vision. We will need to work with each of you and across all local boards to tailor specific and unique approaches to implementation that respond to the local context, harnessing and building local talents, partnerships and resources along the way.

I invite you to join me. Let's work together to grow, protect and maintain our valuable urban ngahere for a greener and greater Auckland for all of us.

Councillor Penny Hulse Chair, Environment and Community Committee





Kei te puku Contents

1.	A strategic plan for Auckland's urban ngahere (forest)		
	1.1.	What is Auckland's urban ngahere?	10
	1.2.	Benefits of Auckland's urban ngahere	14
	1.3.	Current policy context for our urban ngahere	20
2.	Current status of our urban ngahere		22
	2.1.	Distribution of canopy cover	23
	2.2.	Height distribution	
	2.3.	Level of protection	
3.	Current and future pressures		
	3.1.	A growing population and urban intensification	
	3.2.	Climate change	
	3.3.	Pressure on water infrastructure	
	3.4.	Pests and diseases	
4.	Strategic framework		
	4.1.	Vision	41
	4.2.	Objectives	42
	4.3.	Mechanisms	
	4.4.	Principles	
5.	Strategy outcomes		50
	5.1.	Knowing outcomes	51
	5.2.	Growing outcomes	53
	5.3.	Protecting outcomes	54
	5.4.	Mechanism outcomes	55
6.	Implementation framework		56
	6.1.	Urban ngahere strategy collaboration	57
	6.2.	Funding and partnerships	58
	6.3.	Area specific implementation	58
	6.4.	High level actions	59
7.	Refe	rences	62







He mahere rautaki mō te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau A strategic plan for Auckland's urban ngahere (forest)

When Tāne went to the heavens – so the story goes – he was enraptured by the tūī that lived in his brother Rehua's hair. Tāne desperately wanted to bring the tūī back to earth but he was told he must first plant trees to provide food. So Tāne introduced trees to our world and, three years later when the kahikatea blossomed, Tāne's wish came true. The tūī came to live with him.

When it comes to trees, the message is much the same. If we plant trees now, in time, we create value for our communities. We might even hear the dawn chorus – $e k\bar{o} i te ata – once again within urban Auckland.$

Auckland is growing and changing rapidly. To accommodate this, Auckland Council has committed to a strategy of urban intensification to increase housing density, deliver the benefits associated with a compact urban form and limit the negative impacts linked with continued outward growth. Successful development requires careful planning; intensification and growth need to complement the protection and planting of trees and vegetation to create liveable neighbourhoods. Trees and vegetation also provide a range of services required for Auckland to function and thrive. These include enhanced stormwater management, air pollution removal, improved water quality, cooling to reduce the urban heat island effect, and ecological corridors to connect habitats and improve biodiversity.

Our urban ngahere faces a number of pressures. Alongside the need for urban development, amendments to the Resource Management Act (RMA) came into effect in 2015, lifting blanket tree protection in urban areas. As a result, the vast majority of trees on private urban properties are no longer protected. Threats from pests and diseases, as well as the impacts of climate change are further challenges. If we want to continue to benefit from the services provided by our urban ngahere it is essential that we better understand its status and value and plan to protect and grow it. Our urban ngahere has the mauri (life force) to care for us but needs our help to be sustainable and healthy.





1.1 He aha te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Mākaurau? What is Auckland's urban ngahere?

Auckland's urban ngahere is the realm of Te Waonui o Tāne (the forest domain of Tāne Mahuta) and consists of the network of all trees, other vegetation and green roofs – both native and introduced – in existing and future urban areas.

It's important to recognise the urban ngahere as more than just trees and vegetation. Urban ngahere captures the interconnected whakapapa (genealogy) of all living things to the wider ecosystem. It consists of a complex network weaving through public and private land, and includes the water, soil, air and sunlight that support it. It also involves people, wildlife and the built environment – all of which impact upon, or are impacted by, the urban ngahere. The urban ngahere has its own mauri (life force) but also depends upon a range of conditions and relationships to support its health, growth and survival.

Auckland's urban ngahere is diverse; it includes trees and vegetation in road corridors, parks and

open spaces, natural stormwater assets, community gardens, living walls, green roofs and trees and vegetation in the gardens of private properties. The urban ngahere, like the pōhutukawa fringing Auckland's coastline, is an important part of Auckland's identity and natural heritage and shapes the fabric of the landscape. Trees also help distinguish our heritage places and areas, such as Albert, Western and Myers Parks, early cemeteries, for example, Symonds Street and Waikumete, and the settings of properties, including Monte Cecilia and Alberton. In addition, Auckland's scheduled character areas often feature memorial plantings and early street plantings.





Examples of Auckland's urban ngahere:

Parks and open space





Potters Park, Mt Eden

Orewa Beach

Street trees and road corridors



Franklin Road, Ponsonby

Federal Street shared space

Private gardens



Island Bay, Birkdale

Blockhouse Bay





Native forest

Natural stormwater assets



Te Auaunga Awa / Oakley Creek

Green roofs and living walls



The University of Auckland green roof

Private residential green roof





Tī Kōuka / Cabbage tree

Kererū / New Zealand pigeon

Rain garden, Wynyard Quarter



Page **1040756** ¹³

Ngā painga o te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau Benefits of Auckland's urban ngahere 1.2

The range of social, environmental, economic and cultural benefits that urban trees deliver is well-documented, with cities increasingly recognising the financial value of the services they provide. The USDA Forest Service estimated that trees in New York City provide US\$5.60 in benefits for every US\$1 spent on tree planting and care.¹ Growing and protecting our urban ngahere is essential to maintain and enhance the broad range of services it provides:



Improve health and wellbeing

Reduce the urban heat island effect

Provide shade

Enhance visual amenity



Enhance biodiversity

Improve air quality

Carbon sequestration

Improve water quality Increase property values

Reduce flood risk

Economic

Reduce energy costs

Reduce healthcare costs

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #34aurau



Support education

Local food growing

Sustain and enhance mauri

Cultural heritage

Page 1140757 15



Improve health and wellbeing

Research has shown that access to trees and nature can reduce stress, improve mental health and promote wellbeing² whilst tree lined streets have been shown to encourage walking.



Reduce the urban heat island effect

The cooling effect of trees, as a result of evapotranspiration, reduces the urban heat island effect³ and enhances Auckland's resilience to an increasing number of hot days (>25°C), one of the projected impacts of climate change.



Provide shade

Trees shading school grounds, playgrounds, public spaces, and cycling and walking routes provide relief from the sun and protect people from harmful ultraviolet (UV) radiation, in turn reducing the risk of heat stroke, sunburn and melanoma.



Enhance visual amenity

Trees can visually enhance a street, the character of an area and foster neighbourhood pride. They add beauty, soften harsh urban environments and screen unsightly views.

Environmental



Enhance biodiversity

A healthy urban ngahere enriches biodiversity and provides opportunities for connected habitats that support wildlife.



Improve water quality

Trees intercept rainwater and reduce the amount of pollutants being washed from hard surfaces into the stormwater system and watercourses. Increasing canopy cover will also contribute towards fewer storm water overflows from our combined sewer/stormwater systems and therefore lower levels of water pollution in our harbours and streams.



Carbon sequestration

Trees reduce carbon dioxide (CO₂) in the atmosphere through sequestering carbon in new growth. One tonne of carbon stored in wood is equivalent to removing 3.67 tonnes of CO2 from the atmosphere.



Improve air quality

Trees improve air quality by removing air pollutants, such as particulate matter, and absorb gases harmful to human health. A 2006 study estimated that Auckland's urban trees remove 1320 tonnes of particulates, 1230 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide and 1990 tonnes of ozone.⁴

Economic



healthcare costs

Improving air quality and enhancing health and wellbeing will reduce the need for healthcare and associated costs.



flood risk

An increase in canopy cover would intercept an increased volume of rainwater; reducing and slowing urban runoff and placing less pressure on stormwater systems. International studies show that trees intercept 15 to 27 per cent of the annual rainfall that falls upon their canopy, depending on a tree's species and architecture.⁵



Increase property values

Studies have shown that mature street trees increase residential property values and attract buyers and tenants.



Reduce energy costs

Well-positioned trees provide shade and reduce cooling requirements and associated energy costs in buildings.

Cultural



Tree nurseries and planting projects promote environmental awareness and provide opportunities to encourage and facilitate learning.



The cultural benefits of Auckland's urban ngahere are diverse and priceless. Native forest is important to mātauranga Māori (knowledge and understanding), and trees create a cultural connection to place and history.



Sustain and enhance mauri

Mauri is a life force derived from whakapapa (genealogical connections and links to ecosystems), an essential element sustaining all forms of life. Mauri provides life and energy to all living things, including our urban ngahere, and is the binding force that links the physical to the spiritual worlds.⁶ Mauri can be harmed if the life-supporting capacity and ecosystem health of our urban ngahere is diminished. Protecting and growing our urban ngahere will sustain and enhance its mauri.



Local food growing

Planting fruit trees and establishing community orchards provides people with access to fresh fruit. Maintaining and harvesting fruit trees can connect and strengthen communities.

Page 12/0758 17

The cultural significance of Auckland's urban ngahere

The urban ngahere is an important part of Tāmaki Makaurau / Auckland's cultural heritage. Remnants of native forest represent traditional supermarkets (kai o te ngahere), learning centres (wānanga o te ngahere), the medicine cabinet (kapata rongoā), schools (kura o te ngahere) and spiritual domain (wairua o te ngahere).⁷ Trees also represent landing places of waka (canoe) and birth whenua (to Māori, it is customary to bury the whenua or placenta in the earth, returning it to the land).

Many of Auckland's trees provide a visible reference to the city's history and development. European settlers planted London plane trees along streets in the 1860s which have now grown to create grand tree-lined avenues in the city centre and the adjoining suburbs of Ponsonby, Freemans Bay and Grey Lynn. Bishop Selwyn, New Zealand's first Anglican Bishop, is reported to have brought hundreds of Norfolk Island pine seedlings to Auckland in 1858-60. Many of the mature Norfolk Island pines now in Auckland, such as those at Mission Bay, are likely to have been grown from these seedlings.8

A TAKE P LOUP AS





Page **1**340**759**¹⁹

Te horopaki ā-kaupapa here mō ā tātou ngahere ā-tāone ināia tonu nei 1.3 Current policy context for our urban ngahere

Auckland's plans and polices recognise and reference the value of trees and vegetation to varying degrees but do not provide a clear framework for the management of Auckland's urban ngahere. A range of plans and polices influence our urban ngahere (Figure 1) – explicitly and implicitly – yet urban ngahere objectives are only incidental to other considerations, such as green growth, climate change, indigenous biodiversity, and encouraging

sport and recreation. In the past, this contributed to a situation in which Auckland's urban ngahere was managed and maintained through piecemeal initiatives rather than in a strategic and holistic way. This strategy consolidates and builds upon existing directives that support our urban ngahere and sets out a clear framework to protect and grow Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future.



Figure 1 – Key plans, strategies and guidance documents that influence Auckland's urban ngahere

The central city from above - London plane trees on Greys Avenue and Vincent Street (bottom left) and trees in Myers Park (bottom right) and Albert Park (top right).



Figure 2 – Average percentage canopy cover of urban ngahere (3m+ height) in Auckland suburbs – based on analysis of the 2013 LiDAR survey.

Te tūranga a ō tātou ngahere ā-tāone ināia tonu nei Current status of our urban ngahere

2.1 | Te hora o te uhinga rākau Distribution of canopy cover

Analysis of data from the 2013 LiDAR survey found that Auckland's urban area has just over 18 per cent canopy cover, with 10,130 hectares of canopy cover belonging to trees over three metres tall. This varied across different land types, with urban ngahere on 11 per cent of Auckland's road area, 24 per cent of public land, and 18 per cent of private land.

Figure 2 illustrates that Auckland's urban ngahere is distributed unequally throughout the city, with lower levels of canopy cover in southern suburbs, and relatively high canopy cover in northern and western parts of the city. Auckland's three leafiest suburbs are Titirangi, which adjoins the Waitakere Ranges (68 per cent canopy cover), Wade Heads (57 per cent) and Chatswood (55 per cent), where

What is LiDAR?

LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) is used to examine the surface of the Earth through collecting data from a survey aircraft. It measures scattered light to find a range and other information on a distant target. The range to the target is measured using the time delay between transmission of a pulse and detection of a reflected signal. This technology allows for the direct measurement of three-dimensional features and structures and the underlying terrain. The ability to measure the height of features on the ground or above the ground is the principle advantage over conventional optical remote sensing technologies such as aerial imagery.

LiDAR data itself does not provide information on the status of Auckland's urban ngahere, further analysis of the data is required to create a tree canopy layer and quantify the distribution and height of the urban ngahere.

- historically the landform was unsuitable for development. Unequal canopy cover distribution is particularly apparent at a local board area level (see Figure 3). The local boards with the lowest canopy cover are Māngere-Ōtāhuhu (eight per cent) and Ōtara-Papatoetoe (nine per cent). The local board with the highest canopy cover is Kaipātiki with 30 per cent canopy cover, two-thirds of which is in public open spaces.
- The majority of Auckland's urban ngahere 61 per cent – is located on privately-owned land. The remaining 39 per cent is on public land, with seven per cent on Auckland Council parkland, nine per cent on road corridors, and 23 per cent on other public land, such as schools (see Figure 4).



An aerial view of unequal canopy cover



80 r 70 60 Percentage (%) 50 40 30 20 10 Waitemata Whau Orakei Kaipatiki Puketapapa Albert - Eden

Figure 3 - canopy cover on different land tenures by local board area.



Figure 4 – proportion of canopy cover on different land ownership types (2013 LiDAR survey).







Why the unequal distribution?

There are a number of reasons for the difference in tree cover across the region, including land ownership (public/private), land use (urban/industrial/agricultural), geography and legal protections (eg Significant Ecological Areas and notable trees). Historically, the type of development and street layout also influenced the funding and space available for tree planting. For example, in areas developed for social housing, there was typically a low level of investment in tree planting, resulting in relatively few street trees. The age of a suburb can also be a factor, for example trees planted close to the city centre in the early days of Auckland's development have now matured (eg in Ponsonby). More recently, prior to the amalgamation of the region's councils into Auckland Council, some legacy council areas had active tree planting programmes.





Trees in private gardens, a significant contribution to our urban ngahere, Ponsonby.



2.2 | Te hora tū teitei Height distribution

The 2013 LiDAR survey reveals that tall trees are rare in our urban ngahere; only six per cent of the urban ngahere is over 20 metres in height, the majority, 64 per cent, is less than 10 metres (see Figure 5). This is partly due to the species that make up the urban ngahere and their height at maturity. In addition,

trees over 20 metres in height need to be in the right place to allow for growth and are likely to be at least 60 years old. Historically, most mature trees were removed as land was cleared for agriculture and Auckland developed.



Figure 5 – Percentage of urban ngahere across different height classes.

When it comes to trees, size does matter!

Benefits are disproportionally greater for larger trees. For example, big trees provide more shade because of their larger, wider canopy spread; their greater leaf areas and more extensive root systems intercept larger amounts of rainfall and stormwater; they absorb more gaseous pollutants, have higher carbon sequestration rates, and typically contribute more to calming and slowing traffic on local streets than small trees. Larger trees also usually have few or no low branches to interfere with activity at ground level, especially if pruned to provide higher canopy clearance over roads, public space and pedestrian footpaths.





2.3 | Te paerewa āraitanga Level of protection

Just 50 per cent of Auckland's urban ngahere has some degree of statutory protection. A high level of protection applies to urban ngahere in Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) which account for 62 per cent of all protected forest (although SEAs capture only about one-third of Auckland's total urban ngahere). A moderate level of protection is provided to urban ngahere in outstanding natural features or landscapes, open space conservation zones, coastal yards, riparian yards and lake protection zones. Some protection is provided to urban ngahere in coastal natural character areas or open space informal recreation zones. A low level of protection is given to urban ngahere in open space active recreation zones and road corridors.

The Notable Trees Schedule in the Unitary Plan is another form of protection. This schedule contains nearly 3000 items (representing some 6000 trees and groups of trees), the majority of which were 'rolled over' from legacy council schedules as part of the Unitary Plan process.

The proportion of protected urban ngahere varies widely from suburb to suburb, much like the level of urban ngahere canopy cover:

- Suburbs with large patches of indigenous ngahere that have been designated as Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) tend to have a high level of urban ngahere canopy cover and a high level of protection (eg Chatswood, Birkenhead and Titirangi).
- Leafy suburbs where the urban ngahere is dominated by exotic and native trees in private backyards (eg Remuera, Epsom and Mt Eden) have moderate to high canopy cover but a low level of protection.
- Some suburbs have a low level of urban ngahere canopy cover, but a relatively high proportion of the canopy cover has some form of protection (eg Māngere, Wiri and Manukau).
- A number of suburbs that have experienced recent urban growth currently have a low level of urban ngahere canopy cover and protection (eg Northpark, Golflands, Howick, New Lynn and New Windsor).







A Pin Oak being lowered into position by a mobile crane and planted at Britomart Place in approximately the 1950's. Credit: Robert Hepple

The Pin Oak pictured above in 2018 – now protected and on the Notable Trees Schedule. This tree is the central feature of a busy intersection, visually contributing to the local streetscape and visible from Quay Street, Beach Road, Anzac Avenue and Fort Street. It is also notable as a solitary specimen of a species that is not well represented in the locality.





Ngā pēhitanga o ināianei, anga atu anō hoki Current and future pressures

Te tupu haere o te tātai tāngata me 3.1 ngā whakakīkītanga āhua tāone A growing population and urban intensification

Auckland is experiencing unprecedented growth and is projected to grow substantially into the future. Around 1.66 million people currently live in Auckland; over the next 30 years this number could grow by another 720,000 people to reach 2.4 million. Auckland will need many more dwellings, possibly another 313,000, in addition to new infrastructure and community



facilities. Development will be focused within existing and future urban areas within the urban boundary (see Figure 6) and this will put significant pressure on the urban ngahere. Much of this growth will occur in existing urban areas through intensification; as land is redeveloped, unprotected trees are at risk of being removed to maximise the developable area of a site.





Figure 6 – Anticipated development in existing and future urban areas as outlined in the Development Strategy (2018).



Without properly recognising the value of trees and understanding the benefits they provide; urban growth is likely to occur at the expense of the urban ngahere. However, urban development and intensification also present opportunities to green our city – to plant and grow our urban ngahere and create new green urban environments in areas set to be urbanised over the next 30 years. Future urban areas are outlined in Auckland's Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (2017) and the Development Strategy (2018). These areas cover around 15,000 hectares, with the potential to accommodate approximately 137,000 dwellings and 1400 hectares of new business land.

3.2 | Te takahurihanga o te huarere Climate change

Climate change threatens our urban ngahere through changing seasonal rainfall patterns, more severe weather events, and increased susceptibility to pests and diseases. Auckland is projected to

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #34aurau

Urban regeneration within the existing city limits, such as the implementation of the City Centre Waterfront Refresh Plan and redevelopment plans for suburbs, presents an opportunity to retrofit green spaces and replace lost trees. The benefits of keeping established trees and the opportunities for these to complement and add value to new developments needs to be recognised. Where development occurs around trees, implementing a best practice approach to tree protection significantly increases their survival rate.

experience increased occurrence of drought and reduced soil moisture. This requires us to better understand the threats to our urban ngahere and what can be done to protect it.



Ngā taimahatanga kei runga i ngā whakahaere ā-wai Pressure on water infrastructure 3.3

Auckland's water infrastructure is vital to ensure that Aucklanders have clean water to drink and use, that wastewater is disposed of safely, homes, businesses and infrastructure are protected from flooding, and waterways and harbours are healthy. Population growth is putting all components of Auckland's water infrastructure under pressure. At the same time, this infrastructure is ageing and needs to be managed to ensure its continued performance. Climate change will place additional pressure on water infrastructure as the frequency and intensity of storm events is predicted to increase.

The Auckland Plan 2050 sets a clear direction to use Auckland's growth and development to protect and enhance the environment.⁹ This includes a focus on using green infrastructure to deliver greater resilience, long-term cost savings and quality environmental outcomes.¹⁰ The Auckland Unitary Plan emphasises the use and enhancement of natural hydrological systems and green infrastructure during development to address pressures on stormwater infrastructure.¹¹ This strategic direction and focus on using green infrastructure provides an opportunity to grow Auckland's urban ngahere.

What is green infrastructure?

Green infrastructure is a strategically planned network of natural and semi-natural areas designed and managed to deliver multi-functional benefits such as stormwater management, water purification, filtration of airborne pollutants, space for recreation and climate mitigation and adaptation. Auckland's urban ngahere is an integral part of our green infrastructure network.



3.4 Ngā mate orotā me ngā mate urutā Pests and diseases

Animal pests and weeds threaten the urban ngahere, including the precious native forest remnants that are found in pockets on public and private land. Possums eat leaves, buds, flowers and young shoots, while weeds like climbing asparagus and monkey apple, smother or out-compete valued species.

Plant diseases are a serious threat to the future of our urban ngahere. Kauri dieback is causing localised extinctions, Dutch elm disease has been in Auckland for many years now, myrtle rust has also reached Auckland and is a risk to pohutukawa, bottlebrush, eucalyptus, and willow myrtle, all common street trees in central Auckland. Climate change is expected to create more favourable conditions for plant diseases to establish and spread. Successfully managing the urban ngahere means these threats must be understood and addressed, if we do not take sufficient action to address these threats, we place our urban ngahere at greater risk. Actions include pest and disease control, using a mix of species and, where possible, disease resistant variants of susceptible species in new plantings, and





by responding quickly and effectively to new and emerging threats. To better understand and address kauri dieback and myrtle rust, Auckland Council is working with central government agencies, Crown Research Institutes and academia.



Te tarāwaho rautaki Strategic framework

The strategic framework consists of a vision, three main objectives (Knowing, Growing and Protecting), two key mechanisms for delivering these objectives (Engage and Manage), and a set of nine supporting principles (Figure 7).





Page 23405939

A flowering põhutukawa variety.

He whakatupu ngātahi i te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau e matomato ai te hua ā ngā rā e tū mai nei

Together, growing Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future

4.1 | Te tirohanga whānui Vision

Our vision is that Aucklanders are proud of their urban ngahere, that Auckland has a healthy and diverse network of green infrastructure, that it is flourishing across the region and is celebrated, protected, and cared for by all. The urban ngahere is equally distributed across our communities and brings significant benefits to the city. It contributes to our resilience, enhances stormwater management, delivers energy savings, supports biodiversity, and improves health outcomes and quality of life for all Aucklanders. Expanding and improving the urban ngahere is enabled through strong, collaborative partnerships across Auckland. Communities, government, businesses and citizens work together to make our urban ngahere flourish.

We will know we have been successful when we have:

 increased canopy cover across Auckland's urban area



- enhanced the associated social, environmental, economic and cultural benefits
- addressed unequal distribution of canopy cover through increasing canopy cover in neighbourhoods with previously low levels of cover
- increased the network of green infrastructure on public land
- improved linkages between green spaces by establishing ecological corridors
- effectively engaged with private landowners to support a thriving urban ngahere on private land
- planted diverse tree and plant species on public land
- shared knowledge of our urban ngahere
- instilled a sense of pride in Aucklanders for their urban ngahere.



Ngā whāinga Objectives 4.2



Auckland needs to know the status of its urban ngahere, the extent, number and distribution of trees, as well as their size, health and condition. Understanding the social, environmental, economic and cultural value of Auckland's ngahere and quantifying the benefits it provides will support better informed, strategic decisionmaking about its management and growth.

Growing

Auckland needs to grow its urban ngahere to multiply these benefits and address distributional inequity. By expanding and enriching its urban ngahere, Auckland will maximise the social, environmental, economic and cultural benefits that trees, shrubs and other vegetation bring to an urban environment.



Protecting existing ngahere is crucial to safeguarding the added values and benefits mature trees provide. Caring for saplings is critical for ensuring older trees are replenished before the end of their life, our urban ngahere grows over time, and publicly-funded planting is successful.

Ngā tikanga whakahaere Mechanisms 4.3

To achieve these objectives, Auckland Council needs to engage and manage.



Engage with partners and stakeholders – with mana whenua, residents, private landowners, community organisations and the private sector to ensure the urban ngahere is well managed, its benefits are well recognised and that growing and protecting the urban ngahere on public and private land is widely supported.



Manage the city's urban ngahere on public land through coordinated planning, strategic planting, smart and innovative urban design while facilitating best practice standards for work on and around trees through maintenance contracts.



Page 25495443

4.4 Ngā mātāpono Principles

1. Right tree in the right place

It's important to consider growing conditions and their impact on proposed tree species, soil type, drainage, slope, sunlight access, the presence of pests and weeds and the potential current and future impacts of proposed tree species on the nature and function of a place. Growth rate and size of a proposed tree species at maturity should be basic considerations in determining suitability for a specific site. Planting the right tree in the right place is an important factor in minimising future maintenance requirements and costs.



Figure 8 – Consider the context of the site and plant the right tree in the right place

2. Preference for native species

The Auckland Unitary Plan encourages the use of indigenous trees and vegetation for roadside plantings and open spaces to recognise and reflect cultural, amenity, landscape and ecological values. Planting exotic trees may be appropriate in some cases, eg where there is a need for deciduous trees to provide solar access in winter, or fruit trees to establish community orchards. Exotic trees may also be suitable for cultural or heritage reasons in specific locations.





3. Ensure urban forest diversity

Planting a range of species increases the urban ngahere's resilience to the impacts of diseases, pests, and climate change. Planting a diverse range of species will ensure only a portion of the urban ngahere will be affected as diseases and pests tend to be limited to a certain tree species or genus. It is also important to maintain genetic diversity for each species to support better resilience, for example through our seed collection programme. Planting trees with varying lifespans helps to avoid a large-scale decline in numbers as trees with similar lifespans reach the end of their lives.

4. Protect mature, healthy trees

The benefits provided by trees become exponentially greater as they mature. It's also more cost effective to care for mature trees, as this typically costs less than planting and caring for new trees. The only way to replace a 40-year-old tree is to spend 40 years caring for a new tree.

People often have strong emotional connections to landmark, mature trees in their neighbourhoods, and are more likely to mourn the loss of a large tree. Additionally, some native species, such as kākā, and bats, prefer taller trees and their presence can significantly improve the biodiversity value of an area.







5. Create ecological corridors and connections

The urban ngahere is home to a range of ecological groups, such as birds , insects, moths and butterflies. It brings nature into urban environments, a place where the majority of Aucklanders (90 per cent) live and spend most of their time. It can also provide ecological corridors for species migrating through urban environments (see Figure 9). Connecting Auckland's urban ngahere, particularly remnant natural areas, to create ecological corridors and connections between green spaces is important to enhance biodiversity.

6. Access for all residents

The unequal distribution of canopy cover across Auckland needs to be addressed when new plantings are planned. Considerations include the delivery of urban ngahere benefits, public demand for a higher canopy cover and physical access to the urban ngahere in a local area.



7. Manage urban forest on public and private land

Around 61 per cent of Auckland's urban ngahere canopy is on privately-owned land, with 39 per cent on public land. However, many of the benefits of trees are realised beyond private property boundaries and by many more people than just individual landowners. A loss of urban ngahere on private land is also a loss for the city. While there are opportunities for Auckland Council to grow and protect the urban ngahere on public land, the overall status of the urban ngahere is, to a large degree, dependent on the decisions of private landowners. Managing Auckland's urban ngahere requires private landowners' support and cooperation. Engagement is crucial and is one of two key delivery mechanisms for the proposed strategic framework.



8. Deploy regulatory and non-regulatory tools

Auckland Council has a range of regulatory tools to protect the urban ngahere, such as rules relating to Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs), the schedule of Notable trees, and rules to limit the extent of vegetation removal in sensitive environments, like streams and coastlines. These regulatory tools apply to trees and vegetation on private properties. However, since amendments to the Resource Management Act (RMA) came into effect in 2015, lifting blanket tree protection in urban areas councils depend mainly on non-regulatory tools to control the removal of trees and vegetation on private properties. Examples include landowner advice and assistance with tree care and planting, community education and outreach programmes, and raising awareness of the value and benefits of the urban ngahere.



9. Manage the whole lifecycle of urban trees

Achieving the long-term vision to grow Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future not only depends on planting more trees and vegetation but also looking after them during their lifecycle. New plantings may not be able to flourish (or even survive) without ongoing aftercare and maintenance. Investing in maintenance and proactive management will yield greater long-term benefits, as well as ensure money is well spent, with less wastage and repeated effort.



Figure 9 - the potential for ecological connections across urban and rural landscapes (adapted from Meurk & Hall, 2006¹²)



48




Ngā hua ā-rautaki Strategy Outcomes

The strategy outcomes are underpinned by an implementation framework and high level actions outlined in the next section.

5.1 | Te mōhio ki ngā mea ka hua Knowing outcomes

To better understand the status and value of Auckland's urban ngahere.

Improved knowledge will assist us to make more informed and strategic decisions on how to manage our urban ngahere.

The knowing outcomes will give us a better understanding of the status and trends of important indicators, such as canopy cover, height and age distribution and species diversity across both public and private land. Understanding these factors will enable us to better evaluate and understand the value of our urban ngahere. i-Tree Eco software¹³ could present an opportunity to do this, however at present additional research is required to fully adapt i-Tree data and analysis to a New Zealand context.

A better understanding of the trends and status of the canopy cover can direct planting efforts to where the most value can be realised. Potential future impacts and pressures on Auckland's urban ngahere, such as climate change and new pests and diseases, can also be better managed and minimised.

Table 1 – Knowing outcomes

Objective	Outcomes
	Better understanding of the status and trends on private and public land over time.
Knowing	Better understanding of the diverse values and benefits of Auckland's urban forest.
	Better understanding of existing and future risks and pressures.





Figure 10 - unequal canopy cover at a local board level (2013 LiDAR survey)



5.2 Te whakatupu i ngā mea ka hua Growing outcomes

To grow Auckland's urban ngahere and grow it more equitably.

Growing our urban ngahere will increase the average canopy cover and also provide a fairer distribution of the urban ngahere and associated benefits across Auckland (see Figure 10).

We can grow our urban ngahere and increase resilience to existing and future pressures, such as pests, diseases and climate change, through the application of the strategic framework's nine principles.

Table 2 – Growing outcomes

Objective	Outcomes
Growing	Increase the average canopy cover to 30 per cent across Auckland's urban area with no local board area having less than 15 per cent canopy cover.
	Increased resilience to existing and future pressures.



5.3 | Te tiaki i ngā mea ka hua Protecting outcomes

To protect and maintain Auckland's existing and future urban ngahere.

Protecting our existing urban ngahere is crucial to realising the values and benefits of mature trees. Caring for new plantings and young trees is essential to ensure that older trees are replaced at the end of their life and our urban ngahere grows over time.

Achieving no net loss ensures that any losses are balanced by a gain elsewhere. At a local board level, any loss will need to be balanced out by a gain in canopy cover elsewhere within the local board area. Table 3 – Protecting outcomes





5.4 Ngā tikanga whakahaere ka hua Mechanism outcomes

Engage and Manage are the two mechanisms Auckland Council will use to achieve the Knowing, Growing and Protecting objectives. For example, increasing the canopy cover and prioritising options for future planting on public and private land will only be possible through engaging and working collaboratively with communities and partners.

Engage

Community support is critical for fulfilling all three main objectives. Auckland Council must engage with relevant partners and stakeholders – mana whenua, private landowners, community groups, and the private sector –to support the growth and protection of Auckland's urban ngahere. The council must also engage with the public more widely about the benefits of urban ngahere to ensure they are understood and recognised.

Table 4 – Engage outcomes



A community engagement programme is needed that addresses Growing and Protecting and is supported by partnerships with relevant stakeholders. The programme must also integrate the aspirations of Māori, in accordance with the principle of partnership enshrined in te Tiriti o Waitangi and recognise the special role of mana whenua as kaitiaki (guardians) whereby ngahere and whenua ora (environmental services) are intimately connected to Māori wellbeing. As the programme evolves, we will develop a better understanding of community aspirations, and knowledge gaps relating to urban ngahere benefits and value.

Manage

Another key mechanism in successfully implementing the vision is the effective management of existing and future urban ngahere on public land through coordinated planning, strategic planting, smart and innovative urban design, and facilitating best practice standards for work on and around trees through maintenance contracts.

Table 5 – Manage outcomes

Mechanism	Outcomes
Manage	Increased survival rate of new plantings and sustainability of Auckland's urban ngahere on public land.

As noted in section 2.2, tree size matters when it comes to the scale of benefits delivered. Central to effective management is the requirement to nurture growing trees and increase the proportion of larger trees.





Tarāwaho whakatinana Implementation framework

The implementation framework consists of high level actions that are central to achieving the strategy outcomes. In addition to the high level actions, collaboration, funding and partnerships and area specific implementation are all fundamental to the strategy's success.

6.1 | Te mahi tahi mō te rautaki ngahere ā-tāone Urban ngahere strategy collaboration

Success will require close collaboration with many partners at various levels across operational boundaries and disciplines, within the municipality and beyond. Some of the key cross boundary groups are:

Cross-council collaboration:

This involves collaboration between internal stakeholders, interdepartmental cooperation and working closely with council controlled organisations. In the urban context, planners should work with foresters and arborists to effectively integrate policy and knowledge management tools to grow and protect the urban ngahere.

Community and council collaboration:

Effective implementation of the strategy requires effective engagement with community groups



and institutions that play a role in growing and protecting the urban ngahere.

Business and council collaboration:

Insight provided by business groups, including developers, is important to support the strategy's successful implementation. The decisions and actions of business groups can have a significant influence on the urban ngahere.

International cooperation:

This strategy draws on the knowledge and experience of many leading cities that have developed their own urban forest strategies. Continued sharing of technical, governance and community know-how will help to achieve better outcomes for Auckland.



6.2 Ngā tahua pūtea me ngā hononga ā-hoa Funding and partnerships

Continuing support from Auckland Council, developers, businesses and the wider community is fundamental to successfully growing and protecting Auckland's urban ngahere. For example, leading developers understand that delivering a successful and sustainable project is not just about building design, but also the surrounding environment and the outcomes this can deliver. Businesses can also contribute to the growth and protection of the urban ngahere through financial support, planting initiatives and effective maintenance of trees on their properties. Most importantly, having financial

support from the council ensures the development of knowledge, growth and protection of urban ngahere on public and private land.

Effective communication on the benefits of urban ngahere, such as better stormwater management, carbon sequestration, lower infrastructure costs, enhanced biodiversity and community health not to mention the city's aesthetic enhancement - is an important tool to justify project costs to stakeholders and partners. It's important to document and disseminate urban ngahere benefits to gain continuous support from all Aucklanders.

6.3 Whakatinanatanga ā-wāhi motuhake Area specific implementation

The strategy must take an area specific approach to implementation. This will require engaging with each local board, partners and stakeholders to discuss needs and drivers for growing and

protecting Auckland's urban ngahere. This will ensure the strategy's high level actions are defined and implemented in a way that matches the needs of each local area.



6.4 Kaupapa mahi matua High level actions

The Engage and Manage mechanisms identified in the strategy framework run through all the high level actions and are central to their successful implementation. Table 6 – Knowing high level actions



- land over time
- urban forest

High level actions

- Incorporate three-yearly LiDAR surveys in council 1 work programmes.
- Create database for existing assets within two year 2
- Integrate scientific knowledge of the urban ngahe 3 mātauranga Māori in partnership with mana wher the urban ngahere.
- Quantify values and benefits (within 12-18 month 4
- 5 Determine survival rates of new council plantings.
- Identify key pressures and risks in partnership with 6 whenua and local boards.

High level actions to support the following outcomes:

• better understanding of the status and trends on private and public

· better understanding of the diverse values and benefits of Auckland's

· better understanding of existing and future risks and pressures.

	Implementation timeframe (years)							
	1-2	3-5	Ongoing					
			•					
ars.	•							
re with nua of			•					
ıs).	•							
			•					
h mana	•							



Table 7 – Growing high level actions

$\langle \cdot \rangle$
Growing

- High level actions to support the following outcomes:
- increase the average canopy cover to 30 per cent across Auckland's urban area with no local board area having less than 15 per cent canopy cover
- increased resilience to existing and future pressures.

Uish level estions		Implementation timeframe (years)				
μıβ	gn level actions		1-2	3-5	Ongoing	
1	Increase canopy cover in road corridors, passes to support an average of 30 per ce across Auckland's urban area with no loca having less than 15 per cent canopy cover	arks and open nt canopy cover l board area			•	
2	Identify and prioritise locations for future on public land in partnership with mana w local boards.	planting ⁄henua and	•			
3	Use science and ongoing engagement wit mana whenua and communities to inform relation to types of planting.	h local boards, n decisions in			•	
4	Increase the capacity of nursery programmers and the supply of eco-sour maraes) to increase the supply of eco-sour	nes (including rced plants.			•	
5	Leverage partnerships established through initiatives (eg the Mayor's Million Trees pr	n existing ogramme).		•		

Table 8 – Protecting high level actions



Raise arboriculture maintenance programme from 6 to five years or until new plantings are well establi (a target survival rate of 70-80 per cent).

guidelines, proper tree care).

7 Establish a labelling programme for protected tree 12 months (eg species, age and benefits).

	Implementation timeframe (years)						
	1-2	3-5	Ongoing				
ion t.	•						
th	٠						
mes (eg			•				
s urban			•				
of the anting			•				
n two ished	•						
es within	•						





Ngā tohutoro References

- Pacific Southwest Research Station and Center for Urban Forest Research https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/topics/urban_forestry/products/2/psw_cufr687_NYC_MFRA.pdf
- 2. McDonald, R. et al. 2017. Funding Trees for Health, The Nature Conservancy, www.nature.org/trees4health
- 3. urban environment, Environmental Health 2016 15 (Suppl 1):S36 https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12940-016-0103-6
- Cavanagh, J. E. and Clemons, J. 2006. Do Urban Forests Enhance Air Quality? Australian Journal of 4. Environmental Management, Volume 13, 2006 – Issue 2 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14486563.2006.9725122?needAccess=true
- 5. Ecosyst (2011) 14:755-769
- Harmsworth, G., R. Awatere, S. 2013. Indigenous Māori Knowledge and Perspectives of Ecosystems. 6. Ecosystem services in New Zealand – conditions and trends. Manaaki Whenua Press, Lincoln, New Zealand
- 7. Wilcox, M. D. 2012. Auckland's Remarkable Urban Forest, Auckland Botanical Society
- 8. Manaaki Whenua - Landcare Research, Māori values and native forest (Ngahere) https://www. landcareresearch.co.nz/ data/assets/pdf file/0017/43910/maori values native forest.pdf
- 9. The Auckland Plan 2050, Outcome: Environment and Cultural Heritage, Direction 3: Use Auckland's growth and development to protect and enhance the natural environment https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plansstrategies/auckland-plan/environment-cultural-heritage/Pages/direction-use-growthdevelopment-protect-enhance.aspx
- 10. https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plansstrategies/auckland-plan/environment-cultural-heritage/Pages/focus-area-use-greeninfrastructure-deliver-greater-resilience.aspx
- The Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in part (Updated 13 July 2018), E1 Water quality and 11. integrated management http://unitaryplan.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/Images/Auckland%20Unitary%20Plan%20 Operative/Chapter%20E%20Auckland-wide/1.%20Natural%20Resources/E1%20Water%20 quality%20and%20integrated%20management.pdf
- 12. 30(1): 131-146

https://newzealandecology.org/nzje/2297

13. i-Tree Eco https://www.itreetools.org/eco/index.php

Peper, P. et al. 2007. New York City, New York Municipal Forest Resource Analysis. USDA Forest Service,

Salmond, J. et al. 2016. Health and climate related ecosystem services provided by street trees in the

Xiao, Q. and McPherson, E. G. 2011. Rainfall interception of three trees in Oakland, California, Urban

https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/mcpherson/psw_2011_mcpherson008(xiao).pdf

https://www.landcareresearch.co.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/77047/2_1_Harmsworth.pdf

The Auckland Plan 2050, Outcome: Environment and Cultural Heritage, Focus area 6: Use green infrastructure to deliver greater resilience, long-term cost savings and quality environmental outcomes

Meurk, C.D. Hall, G.M.J. 2006. Options for enhancing forest biodiversity across New Zealand's managed landscapes based on ecosystem modelling and spatial design. New Zealand Journal of Ecology (2006)

Page 25505463

© 2019 Auckland Council March 2019 Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department

Auckland Council (2019). Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy

ISBN 978-1-98-856480-7 (Print) ISBN 978-1-98-856481-4 (PDF)

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy was approved by the Auckland Council Environment and Community Committee on 20 February 2018.



Howick Local Board Ngahere Analysis Update 2021 Canopy cover changes with the 2013 to 2016/2018 LiDAR data

Urban Ngahere Strategy 2019 Knowing Programme



A summary of the urban environment in Howick

Approximately **142,700** residents Less than **1%** of canopy cover more than **30 metres** tall

Average canopy cover of

54% of canopy cover with no statutory protection

More than 230 local parks and 55 playgrounds

293 hectares of Significant Ecological Area

Two statistical areas - Shelly Park and Tuscany Heights - with more than **30%** canopy cover

> More than **70%** of total canopy cover on private land

across local board, including canopy cover of: 26% on public parkland on road public land on private 000 on public land on p

New zoning under Auckland Unitary Plan includes Mixed Housing Urban, Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings

Notable Tree records

1.8% of original indigenous vegetation cover remaining

1,123 hectares of urban forest in 2013, **remaining the same in 2016/2018**



Nearly 7,000 hectares of land



hectares of parks, including:

- Mangemangeroa Reserve
- Point View Reserve
- Murphys Bush

#31

© 2021 Auckland Council Howick Local Board

Auckland Council disclaims any liability whatsoever in connection with any action taken in reliance of this document for any error, deficiency, flaw or omission contained in it.

Date: September 2021

ISBN 978-1-99-100252-5 (Print)

ISBN 978-1-99-100253-2 (PDF)

This document is licensed for re-use under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence.

In summary, you are free to copy, distribute and adapt the material, as long as you attribute it to the Auckland Council and abide by the other licence terms.



Contents

1.0 Pre	etace		1	
2.0 In	troducti	on	2	
	2.1	Howick Local Board	2	
	2.2	Study Background	3	
	2.3	Data Collection	3	
3.0 Re	esults ar	nd Discussion	4	
	3.1	Urban Canopy Cover Overview	4	
	3.2	Canopy Distribution across Howick Local Board	5	
	3.3	Urban Ngahere Canopy Height	8	
	3.4	Urban Ngahere Tenure	9	
	3.5	Urban Ngahere in Relation to Growth Pressures	10	
	3.6	Recommendations	13	
4.0 Ac	cknowle	dgements	14	
5.0 References				

1.0 Preface

Tāmaki-Makaurau / Auckland is New Zealand's largest city, and plantings of exotic and native trees have taken place as the region has developed. Early Māori settlers would have planted trees such as karaka, pūriri and tōtara to indicate a special place or to mark a celebration, while European settlers planted trees that were familiar and provided a sense of place. London Plane, English Oak, and European Lime trees were some of the earliest recorded plantings in Auckland. Settlers arriving from around the world commenced the history of Auckland's diverse and unique tree cover.

When European settlers arrived to Tāmaki-Makaurau / Auckland, the gullies of the isthmus were filled with raupō, edged with a varied growth of sedges and other moisture loving plants; and slopes of gullies covered with karamū and cabbage trees. By the late nineteenth century, much of the Auckland area was under cultivation with a large number of introduced plants. Along with residential development commencing in the mid-20th century, these actions have now reduced indigenous forest cover within the Howick Local Board to small fragments, primarily in local reserves.

The Howick Local Board has provided locally driven initiatives funding to Auckland Council's Principal Advisor Urban Ngahere (Forest) in the Parks, Sports and Recreation Department to develop an analysis of the tree cover in its area of responsibility. This update report is the result of a programme of work by Auckland Council involving detailed analysis of urban tree coverages on public and private land, aiming to identify opportunities to nurture, grow and protect urban trees in the local board area. The analysis work is directed by the Auckland Council's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy 2019, which has 18 key objectives to help Council and local boards to deliver a healthy ngahere for a flourishing future.



2.0 Introduction

2.1 Howick Local Board

The Howick Local Board covers approximately (c.) 7,000 hectares (ha) in eastern Auckland, located between the Tāmaki River to the west, the Mangemangeroa Stream to the east and the Redoubt Road ridge to the southeast. The population of the local board is approximately 142,700 residents.

Land-use within the board is very varied, with well-established (pre-1990) residential suburbs dominating the northern half of the board, newer and developing residential suburbs to the east and south, large retail centres at Botany Downs and Pakuranga Plaza, and a swathe of commercial and industrial land to the west, encompassing Highbrook Park and parts of East Tāmaki. Howick's southern and eastern boundaries extend just beyond the recognised rural-urban boundary into the adjacent rural regions around Brookby and Whitford, with the south-eastern spread of development butting up against the physical and regulatory limits imposed by topography and zoning.

Approximately 11% of the local board area is public parkland, with bush reserves containing pockets of remnant native forest. These reserves are predominantly



Urban forest around central Howick

located along Howick's eastern margins at the interface between the suburbs and the rural areas beyond and on the coastal fringe. Examples include Mangemangeroa Reserve, Point View Reserve, and Murphys Bush.

Large reserves for passive or active recreation, or a mixture of both, are distributed throughout Howick and include Barry Curtis Park, Lloyd Elsmore Park, Macleans Park (with substantial areas of native revegetation planting), Tī Rakau Park, Pigeon Mountain, Murvale Reserve (with an outstanding collection of early exotic plantings), and William Green Domain.

Large portions of the local board area are now zoned for development intensification under the Auckland Unitary Plan. The new zoning, including the Mixed Housing Urban Zone and the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone, now allows for smaller sections. Consequently, much of the urban forest is under a range of pressures from development, which could potentially lead to irreversible changes in urban forest cover (Brown et al., 2015).

An information graphic summarising local board details related to urban forest is provided at the beginning of this report.



The 'Rural-Urban Boundary' viewed from Point View Reserve, East Tāmaki Heights

2.2 Study Background

'Urban ngahere' ('urban forest') comprises all the trees within a city – including parks, coastal cliffs, stream corridors, private gardens and streets – both native and naturalised exotic species. For the purposes of this report, 'urban ngahere' is defined as all of the trees and other vegetation three metres or taller in stature within the Howick Local Board, and the soil and water systems that support these trees. This urban ngahere definition encompasses trees and shrubs in streets, parks, private gardens, stream banks, coastal cliffs, rail corridors, and motorway margins and embankments. It also includes both planted and naturally established plants, of both exotic and native provenance.

The scale of the tree and shrub cover across Auckland is sufficiently extensive on both public and private land to make a meaningful contribution to the liveability and sense of place for its residents. Benefits of the urban ngahere include:

Social

- Improve health and wellbeing
- Reduce the urban heat island effect
- Provide shade
- Enhance visual amenity

Environmental

- Enhance biodiversity
- Improve air quality
- Carbon sequestration
- Improve water quality

Economic

- Increase property values
- Reduce flood risk
- Reduce energy costs
- Reduce healthcare costs

Cultural

- Support education
- Local food growing
- Sustain and enhance maur
- Cultural heritage

The Auckland Unitary Plan offers various degrees of protection to urban ngahere and groups of trees meeting specific characteristics (e.g., pre-identified significance, vegetation by coasts or streams); however, other important urban ngahere assets have no statutory protection and can therefore be removed. The completion of a study in urban canopy cover in Howick is important to provide information on baseline tree distribution that future canopy cover measurements can be compared to. This baseline data also provides information on where there are pressures on canopy cover and opportunities for tree planting. Increases in canopy cover are also intended to contribute to other Auckland Council programmes such as Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan (Auckland Council 2019c).

2.3 Data Collection

Urban canopy cover across Auckland was mapped in 2013 (Auckland Council 2019b), and again in 2016/18 by use of LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging). Airborne LiDAR is an optical remote sensing technology that irradiates a target with a beam of light; usually a pulsed laser, to measure an object's variable distances from the earth surface. Two LiDAR data sets are covered in this report, collected in the years 2013 and 2016/2018. The second survey (2016/2018) had to be completed over two years due to unfavourable weather conditions that limited data quality. As these two LiDAR data sets provide a solid baseline for future comparative work, investigations into alternatives to LiDAR for mapping urban ngahere are currently underway.



New native restoration planting

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Urban Canopy Cover Overview

Based on the 2013 data set, urban ngahere covered 16% of the Howick Local Board area, including 6% of roads, 25% of public parks, and 17% of private land. Further information on the 2013 data has been provided in a baseline report (Howick Local Board Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report September 2019; Auckland Council 2019b). There was no net change in overall canopy cover based on the 2016/2018 data set (Table 1).

As an overview, the initial analysis contained in this report (in line with the knowing phase of the Auckland Urban Ngahere Strategy) shows that there are some obvious areas of urban ngahere concentration, while there are also areas that are lacking urban ngahere. The lowest cover (3-6%) tends to be in central/southern areas of the

local board (Botany Central/South, Redcastle, Ormiston North and Donegal Park), while the eastern parts of the local board, Shelly Park and Tuscany Heights, have the highest cover (more than 30%). Although the canopy cover in East Tāmaki is low (5%), the percentage of canopy cover >30 m tall is high compared to other statistical areas in the local board. Other suburbs with a relatively high level of tree cover are the older coastal suburbs of Shelly Park, Mellons Bay and Cockle Bay.

The 2016/18 LiDAR data indicates growth in canopy cover on road reserves and parks across the Howick Local Board, with a combined net increase in canopy cover of c.26 hectares. Conversely, there has been a net reduction in canopy cover of c.8 hectares on privately owned land. An example of this decrease has been observed on private land in Ormiston East, where canopy cover has shown a net reduction of 13 hectares since 2013.

Urban Local Board	Public op	c open space Private land		Roads		Other public land		Overall coverage		
	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018
Kaipātiki	63	64	25	25	12	14	33	34	30	30
Upper Harbour	50	52	29	30	11	13	10	11	27	28
Hibiscus and Bays	28	29	24	23	15	14	43	42	25	24
Puketāpapa	50	50	17	16	10	12	15	15	20	20
Albert-Eden	33	34	19	18	17	20	19	18	20	20
Ōrākei	25	25	20	19	14	16	20	20	20	19
Waitematā	42	43	16	15	15	17	11	10	19	19
Whau	34	34	17	16	12	13	12	12	17	17
Devonport-Takapuna	24	27	17	17	11	13	13	14	16	16
Howick	25	26	17	17	6	8	11	12	16	16
Henderson-Massey	30	32	14	14	7	8	11	12	15	15
Papakura	16	17	15	15	8	11	8	9	13	14
Manurewa	24	26	11	12	6	9	7	7	12	13
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	21	23	9	9	10	12	11	11	11	12
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	13	14	8	8	7	9	10	10	9	10
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	14	14	7	7	7	9	8	8	8	8

Table 1: Urban ngahere in Auckland's urban local board areas: data includes percentage cover (to nearest whole number) of urban ngahere for different land tenures, and the overall percentage cover of urban ngahere within each board, with a comparison between the 2013 and 2016/2018 data sets.

3.2 Canopy Distribution across Howick Local Board

The urban ngahere is not distributed evenly throughout the local board, as shown in **Figures 1 and 2**, which display variation by statistical area. Urban ngahere covers 16% of the Howick Local Board area as a whole. However, when excluding the rural parts of Howick and considering only the urbanised areas, the level of canopy cover is closer to 11%. This is a low figure for an urban area and well below the level of cover targeted within Auckland's Urban Ngahere Strategy. This strategy has a goal of achieving an average 30% canopy cover across all of urban Auckland, with no local board area having less than 15% cover (Auckland Council, 2019a).

The reliance on the rural fringe of Howick in raising its overall level of tree cover is highlighted by the fact that, despite making up less than a quarter of the board's land area, it contains nearly half of its urban ngahere cover. Small losses of rural land to urbanisation would be likely to have a disproportionate effect on the urban ngahere, both in terms of overall tree cover and by affecting a greater proportion of large trees.

Over half (51%) of the local board is covered in impervious surfaces, which presents an opportunity to plant urban ngahere, particularly in the road corridor, as a direct remedy. Trees are a well-known solution for stormwater management, as their extensive canopies and subsurface root systems are capable of capturing and pumping substantial amounts of water, providing cooling effects (Berland et al. 2017). Establishing trees within impervious surfaces will act to intercept rainfall before it reaches the ground and slows inflow rates. This has follow on benefits for stormwater management systems such as underground pipes and nearby waterways (Dwyer and Miller 1999). Opportunities exist for new tree planting in the road corridor which will assist in stormwater management by capturing stormwater flows via interception and infiltration. Trees and other 'green infrastructure' solutions, including rain gardens, permeable pavements, bioswales, and green roofs, are worth implementing at a greater scale and should be encouraged. There has not been a significant change in urban tree coverage on a local scale, as shown in **Figure 2**. In general, statistical areas of Howick have had only a minor net increase or minor net decrease in canopy cover. The only current concern may be Donegal Park, with already low tree coverage, had a minor net decrease in cover between the two data sets. Upon examination this appears to be attributed to small scale residential tree removal and trimming of larger trees.



Matanginui/Green Mount, East Tāmaki, Auckland





Figure 2: Spatial distribution of urban ngahere canopy within the statistical areas of Howick Local Board

3.3 Urban Ngahere Canopy Height

LiDAR data includes a height component, and this information was used to split the recorded canopy cover into different height categories: 3-5 metres; 5-10 metres; 10-15 metres; 15-20 metres; 20-30 metres; and taller than 30 metres. This data is representative of canopy cover height, rather than tree height, as each individual tree may be recorded in several categories.

The height class distribution of the urban ngahere canopy within Howick Local Board is displayed in **Figure 3**. In 2013, 26% of the canopy cover was between 3-5 metres tall, 40% 5-10 metres tall, and the remaining 34% was canopy taller than 10 metres. This distribution remained similar in the 2016/2018 data sets, although the percentage of canopy cover over between 3-5 metres tall increased to 32% of the forest canopy. This data shows only low presence of tall canopy cover within the local board area, with all canopy cover taller than 15 metres (including height categories 15-20 metres, 20-30 metres, and 30 metres plus) representing approximately 12% of the total urban ngahere canopy cover assessed and are mainly found in bush remnants and the rural fringes, particularly within East Tāmaki Heights and Flat Bush.

Research has shown that many of the benefits attributed to urban ngahere are disproportionally provided by larger trees (Davies et al. 2011, Moser et al. 2015). Large trees typically create more shade per tree due to a larger and wider canopy spread (Moser et al. 2015); intercept larger amounts of particulate pollutants and rainfall due to significantly larger leaf areas; contain more carbon and have higher carbon sequestration rates (Beets et al. 2012, Schwendenmann and Mitchell 2014, Dahlhausen et al. 2016).

Additionally, trees are often less susceptible to careless or malicious vandalism by the general public once established; can be pruned to provide higher canopy clearance over roadways; carparks and pedestrian footpaths; typically contribute more to calming and slowing traffic on local streets than small trees; and absorb more gaseous pollutants. It is therefore an immediate priority to retain existing large trees across the local board area to ensure the positive benefits of these are not lost, as also emphasised in the Urban Ngahere Strategy (Auckland Council 2019a). The relatively high proportion of shorter canopy cover across the local board (32% 3-5m tall and 39% 5-10m tall) in the 2016/2018 data set, indicates a relatively recent surge of tree planting, assuming the smaller stature canopy corresponds to younger trees, rather than shrubs which are limited at their mature height. When grouped by land use type, it can be seen how the contribution of the trees in rural Howick skews the figures for the board as a whole, with this area containing approximately 50% less canopy cover under five metres tall as a proportion of overall cover than in urban Howick, and has nearly twice the proportion of canopy cover over ten metres tall.



Figure 3: Height class distribution of urban ngahere canopy across all land tenures within Howick Local Board

Ngahereagely 750 hog te 2021 8

3.4 Urban Ngahere Tenure

The tenure of urban ngahere described in this report relates to the zoning and ownership of different land parcels within the local board. Publicly owned land is described as either 'public parks' or 'other public land' (e.g. schools, Council-owned property), trees in the road corridor/road reserves are described as 'street trees', and privately owned land (residential or commercial) is described as 'private land'.

The tenure distribution of urban ngahere canopy within the Howick Local Board is displayed in **Figure 4**. Nearly three quarters (74%) of the urban ngahere in Howick, much of which is unprotected, is located on private property. Public parks and other publicly owned land (e.g., schools) contain a similar proportion of urban ngahere, being 15% and 11% of the total urban ngahere cover, respectively.

Howick Local Board stands out in the regional data as having a very low degree of tree coverage (8% in 2016/18) within its road reserves (Table 1), which may reflect the relatively recent construction of a large part of the road network and, to some degree, poor planting choices and practices in the newer suburbs. This situation presents an opportunity for enhancing the urban ngahere by infill planting of carefully chosen street trees, that will provide benefits long term to local communities.

Planting may also be considered on rural roads, the canopy within which makes up only 2% of the rural tree coverage. With only 5% canopy cover on other public land



Figure 4: Tenure of urban ngahere canopy within Howick Local Board (2013 data set)

in rural parts of the local board, there may also be an opportunity to encourage planting within this category of land such as schools and colleges, where additional educational benefits may be gained.

In addition to having low levels of canopy cover, roads also exhibit generally small tree size, with only 13% being over ten metres tall, compared to 39% for parks. This reflects the more cramped growing environment within the road corridor (particularly below ground) and the more frequent cycling of tree stock as trees are regularly removed and replaced to allow for infrastructure works.

Public parks have the highest proportion of urban ngahere relative to area out of all the land tenures, as shown in **Figure 5**, followed by private land. There has been a minor net increase in urban ngahere canopy in public parks, as well as road reserves and other public land, between the two survey data sets. The percentage canopy cover of private land has stayed the same.

Public parks are good place to focus additional urban ngahere planting as they comprise approximately 10% of the local board land area and are widely distributed. In addition, public parks offer the best opportunities for long-term sustainable management of the urban ngahere due to the lower chance of conflict with future housing intensification.



Figure 5: Change in urban ngahere cover of different land tenures in Howick Local Board between 2013 and 2016/18



3.5 Urban Ngahere in Relation to Growth Pressures

The Significant Ecological Area overlay (SEA; **Figure 6**) prioritises the areas of urban ngahere in Howick with the highest ecological value, providing a starting point for protection. With future development and urban intensification, however, SEA and other continuous areas of urban ngahere are at risk. Canopy cover in relation to the Auckland Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (Auckland Council 2017) forecasting areas of growth is shown in **Figure 7**.

There is increased pressure on the urban ngahere in Howick through a combination of greenfield development, lack of suitable growing space, and conflicts with infrastructure. An increase in urban ngahere cover in local parks and residential suburbs will provide more universal benefits as a greater number of people are likely to encounter the forest and connect to nature. Urban ngahere on public land provides opportunities to connect with communities, enhanced biodiversity, educational opportunities and helps to develop a sense of place.

The lack of scheduled notable trees in the southern half of Howick is another issue that may warrant investigation, as there may potentially be trees that have so far been overlooked but would meet the necessary standards for inclusion on the schedule. This may particularly be the case in parts of Flat Bush currently under development, where large, high value trees are scattered within former farmland and riparian margins.

Protecting existing and adding to the numbers of trees in the road corridor is an important and ongoing measure to retain and extend urban ngahere cover, as the tree cover in the road corridor is currently low. The importance of trees in the street environment is going to increase, and will, in time, incorporate the only accessible trees for some residents.

To this end, the Howick Local Board is encouraged to work with Auckland Council to readdress the current rules for tree and vegetation protection, especially in relation to highlighting the importance of large trees and the multiple benefits they offer to the local community.



Notable trees, Howick, Auckland



Figure 6: 2016/18 Canopy Height & Significant Ecological Areas



Figure 7: 2016/18 Canopy & Sequencing and Timing of Growth

3.6 Recommendations

The assessment of urban tree cover in the Howick Local Board presented in this update report aims to assist in the knowing phase of the Auckland Urban Forest Strategy. The analysis of existing tree cover distribution, structure, tenure, and protection, provides the local board with a basis for determining where to focus efforts in improving urban ngahere cover during the growing phase, to be initiated in the near future.

Recommendations for future urban ngahere management to the Howick Local Board include:

- Prioritise the efforts of the Howick Urban Ngahere Action Plan 2021 to plant new trees in parks and streets
- raise awareness of the current rules for tree and vegetation notable Tree overlay
- strengthen local funding initiatives to engage with, educate, and support private owners of land featuring valuable trees

- set an initial goal of achieving a minimum of 15% urban ngahere cover within the fully urban portion of Howick
- initiate tree planting where possible in unused corners or edges of parks, including the designation of the former Greenmount landfill as a reserve
- identify parks containing playgrounds with low tree shading (e.g., Simon Owen Place Reserve and Monash Park) and obtain funding for large grade specimen trees to plant
- prioritise tree planting in predominantly industrial/ commercial suburbs with low canopy cover, e.g., East Tāmaki, Huntington Park, Clover Park and Highland Park.

The metrics of the canopy analysis will be used to help inform and prioritise the efforts of the Howick Urban Ngahere Action Plan. The action plan highlights the areas to plant new trees and sets out the process to fund, implement, and find ways to protect and nurture existing ngahere on public and private land.



Palm avenue planted along Te Irirangi Drive, East Tāmaki, Auckland

4.0 Acknowledgements

The following parties are acknowledged for their roles in the preparation of this document:

- Content prepared by Carolina Stavert and Jessica Reaburn (Wildland Consultants Ltd).
- Technical advice and peer review completed by Howell Davies (Principal Advisor Urban Ngahere (Forest), Community Services – Parks, Sports & Recreation, Auckland Council).
- Data and GIS-based figures prepared by Grant Lawrence (Research and Evaluation Unit, Auckland Council).
- Photographs supplied by Auckland Council and Wildland Consultants Ltd.
- Graphics and formatting completed by Q Brand Builders.

The authors would also like to thank the Howick Local Board for their support and direction during the development of this report and its content.

5.0 References

Auckland Council (2017). Auckland Future Urban Land Supply Strategy. <u>https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.</u> <u>nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plansstrategies/topic-based-plans-strategies/housing-plans/ Documents/future-urban-land-supply-strategy.pdf</u>

Auckland Council (2019a). Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy. Published by Auckland Council's Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department, March 2019. <u>https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/</u> <u>plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plans-</u> <u>strategies/topic-based-plans-strategies/environmental-</u> <u>plans-strategies/Documents/urban-ngahere-forest-</u> <u>strategy.pdf</u>

Auckland Council (2019b), unpublished. Howick Local Board Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report September 2019. Prepared for the Howick Local Board Locally Driven Initiatives – Ngahere Work Programme: Year 1 Knowing Phase.

Auckland Council (2019c). Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan. Developed from Auckland's Climate Action Framework consultation summary published by Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department, June 2019. <u>https://www.aucklandcouncil.</u> govt.nz/environment/Documents/te-taruke-a-tawhiriauckland-climate-plan.pdf

Beets, P. N., M. O. Kimberley, G. R. Oliver, S. H. Pearce, J. D. Graham and A. Brandon (2012). *Allometric Equations for Estimating Carbon Stocks in Natural Forest in New Zealand.* Forests 3: 818-839.

Berland, A., Shiflett, S.A., Shuster, W.D., Garmestani, A.S., Goddard, H.C., Herrmann, D.L. and Hopton, M.E. (2017). *The role of trees in urban stormwater management.* Landscape and Urban Planning 162: 167-177.

Brown, M. A., Simcock, R. and S. Greenhalgh (2015). Protecting the Urban Forest. Landcare Research Manaaki Whenua Policy Brief No. 13 (Issn: 2357-1713).

Dahlhausen, J., P. Biber, T. Rötzer, E. Uhl and H. Pretzsch (2016). *Tree Species and Their Space Requirements in Six Urban Environments Worldwide.* Forests 7: 111-130.

Davies, Z. G., J. L. Edmondson, A. Heinemeyer, J. R. Leake and K. J. Gaston (2011). *Mapping an urban ecosystem service: quantifying above-ground carbon storage at a citywide scale.* Journal of Applied Ecology 48(5): 1125-1134.

Dwyer, M.C. and Miller, R.W. 1999. *Using GIS to assess urban tree canopy benefits and surrounding greenscape distributions.* Journal of Arboriculture 25(2): 102-107.

Moser, A., T. Rötzer, S. Pauleit and H. Pretzsch (2015). Structure and ecosystem services of small-leaved lime (Tilia cordata Mill.) and black locust (Robinia pseudoacacia L.) in urban environments. Urban Forestry and Urban Greening 14: 1110-1121.

Schwendenmann, L. and N. D. Mitchell (2014). *Carbon accumulation by native trees and soils in an urban park, Auckland.* New Zealand Journal of Ecology 38 (2): 213-220.

Wilcox, M., D. (2012). Auckland's Remarkable Urban Forest. Epsom, Auckland, Auckland Botanical Society.





The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Maureen Irwin

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: maureen.irwin@xtra.co.nz

Contact phone number: 021792927

Postal address: 24 Lydiard Place Beachlands Auckland 2018

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Project scope • Walking and cycling networks • Reduction in urban ngahere • Increased flooding risk

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

The project has always been Airport to Botany - rapid transit network (RTN) (the project). The current RLTP highlights delivering a significant increase in rapid transit travel options (fast, frequent, high capacity bus and train services separated from general traffic). Walking and Cycling are not forms of rapid transit. These should not be included in this projects scope. An example of how the project has been described to stakeholders and the public is "The next stages to be delivered under this RLTP involve protecting the future A2B rapid transit corridor, between Auckland Airport and Botany via Manukau, and extending the new AirportLink bus to Botany via Te Irirangi Drive. Extending the AirportLink bus to Botany will be supported by bus interchanges and priority improvements along Te Irirangi Drive, with a move toward a rapid transit corridor in future decades." There is no mention of walking and cycling. Therefore, the stakeholders and public have been misled. Support was gained prior to the inclusion of walking and cycling facilities. The consequences of including improved walking and cycling facilities along both sides of the corridor into the project scope is a significant increase in project costs, an enormous reduction in trees and the urban ngahere canopy coverage across this area, increased flooding risk and climate impacts, an increase in the urban heat and island effect, decreased visual amenity, loss of shade, decreased health and wellbeing to the public and decreased air quality. These impacts are significant and outweigh the benefits of pouring concrete in place of these trees for walking and cycling facilities. There is already footpaths. It is legal for cyclists to ride on the roads. An alternative would be to incorporate a cycling network into the median strip of Ti Irirangi Drive where the RTN busway will go as this will have such few buses, at most, one every 15 minutes I assume and the road is very long and straight so the bus and cyclist will see each other. I don't believe this project has been



transparent with making stakeholders aware of the impacts of including the improved walking and cycling networks into this project. It has been a late addition and one I would deem as misleading after support for the project was gained. I am appalled decision makers have agreed to the destruction of thousands of trees to pour concrete to allow a better footpath / cycling path when this already exists. I don't agree with the statement that that is what public feedback has said. The public would not want improved walking and cycling networks by the destruction of thousands of trees. Should this project proceed unchanged, the inclusion of the walking and cycling aspect no longer adheres to Te-Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan, specifically Action Area N2 and Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy. The specific principals this violates is - Grow our rural and urban ngahere (forest) Action area N2: Grow and protect our rural and urban ngahere (forest) to maximise carbon capture and build resilience to climate change. And • Increase indigenous tree plantings in road corridors, parks and open spaces. Each CCO must work within Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Action Framework. I am not opposed to the RTN along the median strip of Ti Irirangi Drive and would like the project scope and the Notice of Requirement designation reduced to include only the median strip of land.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: Request the project scope be reduced to a rapid transit network - Airport to Botany which includes: a) a dedicated Bus Rapid Transit corridor, centre-running along Te Irirangi Drive b) Bus Rapid Transit stations at Smales Road, Accent Drive, and Ormiston Road – Botany Junction Shopping Centre c) swales and wetlands d) areas for construction related activities including yards, site compounds, and bridge and structure works. Oppose the inclusion of improved walking and cycling facilities along both sides of the corridor due to the destruction of thousands of trees to pour concrete for this. Oppose the removal of trees lining both sides of the corridor along Ti Irirangi Drive creating good canopy coverage and reduced flooding risks to nearby residents. Request the designation of the Notice of Requirement is restricted to the median strip along Ti Irirangi Drive only (and including any areas required for stations) as this is sufficient enough to complete the rapid transit network - Airport to Botany as per the original intent of the project.

Submission date: 11 April 2023

Supporting documents urban-ngahere-forest-strategy_20230411200326.435.pdf howick-canopy-analysis-report-2021_20230411200332.485.pdf

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy



He Mihi

Nau mai e te hā o Tāne, Whakatau mai e te oranga o Tāne.

Tīkina mai te ate rahirahi o te Tāone nui o Tāmaki Makaurau hei whakaniko anō ai i te whenua tapu; ko tō whaea, ko Papatūānuku.

Kia toro ake ōna hua me ōna pai kia tauawhia e tō matua e Rangi-nui e tū iho nei, kia rongohia anō te tīhau a ngā manu, me te kētete a ngā pēpeke.

Kia wawara anō te reo o ngā rākau kua roa e ngū ana ki te wao kōhatu e tāwharau nei i ngā maunga tapu o tō whenua taketake.

Tane-o-te-waiora,

Tāne-whakapiripiri,

Tāne-nui-a-rangi, tukua mai anō tō ihi, tukua mai anō tō mana.

Māu e kitea anō ai he awa para-kore e rere ana, he hau mā e kōrewarewa ana, he taiao hauora e takoto ana.

Kia hipokina anō e tō korowai kākāriki te tāone nui kia whiwhi ko mātou, kia whiwhi te ao katoa.

He whakatupu ngātahi i te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau e matomato ai te hua ā ngā rā e tū mai nei

Together, growing Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #3kaurau

Tāne let your breath pervade all, may your life-essence be ever-present.

Reclaim the very heart of Auckland city and adorn once again the hallowed ground; that is your mother, Papatūānuku.

May all that is fruitful and good reach skyward to the embrace of your father Rangi-nui on high so the chorus of birds may be heard again, and the splendid symphony of insects in response.

Bring with you the sounds of rustling trees that have long stood silent to this concrete jungle that bounds the sacred mountains of your primal domain.

Tāne-purveyor of life,

Tāne-provider-of-shelter,

Tāne-source-of-all-knowledge, bestow us again with your wonder, and grace us with your prestige.

By you, we will again realise fresh waterways, pure air, and a healthier environment.

Garb the city with your verdant cloak that we, your heirs might benefit, and so too, the whole world.





Kupu whakataki Foreword

A healthy urban ngahere (forest) enriches our communities, our local economies and our natural environment. Auckland cannot become a world-class city without one.

Whether you are from Takanini or Takapuna, Herne Bay or Henderson, trees and vegetation are valuable to all of us. They clean our air and stormwater, cool and beautify our urban spaces and bring nature to our doorsteps. Developed in partnership with tangata whenua, the strategy gives voice to an important role trees play in the mauri of the land. They provide a wide range of measurable benefits that make our lives healthier, happier and more gratifying.

How can we protect what we value in the face of a growing and urbanising population, rising inequality, and the major impacts of invasive pests and climate change? How do we maintain and enhance the richness that our urban ngahere provides? How do we align our efforts?

This is precisely why we have developed a strategy for Auckland's urban ngahere. It delivers on the vision for our future Auckland, ensuring each one of us – and future Aucklanders - have access to the tangible benefits provided by a vibrant, green city.

The strategy ensures that when Auckland Council, corporate partners, community groups and each one of us plants or maintains a tree, our collective efforts truly add up to something – contributing towards increasing our average canopy cover from 18 to 30 per cent. Likewise, the strategy helps target our efforts to grow the urban ngahere where it's scarce - as in parts of South Auckland - so that all local board areas have at least 15 per cent canopy cover.

This strategy provides an overarching vision and 18 high level actions under three main themes, Knowing, Growing and Protecting but doesn't provide all the answers or deliver the vision. We will need to work with each of you and across all local boards to tailor specific and unique approaches to implementation that respond to the local context, harnessing and building local talents, partnerships and resources along the way.

I invite you to join me. Let's work together to grow, protect and maintain our valuable urban ngahere for a greener and greater Auckland for all of us.

Councillor Penny Hulse Chair, Environment and Community Committee





Kei te puku Contents

1.	A sti	rategic plan for Auckland's urban ngahere (forest)	8
	1.1.	What is Auckland's urban ngahere?	10
	1.2.	Benefits of Auckland's urban ngahere	14
	1.3.	Current policy context for our urban ngahere	20
2.	Curr	ent status of our urban ngahere	22
	2.1.	Distribution of canopy cover	23
	2.2.	Height distribution	28
	2.3.	Level of protection	
3.	Curr	ent and future pressures	
	3.1.	A growing population and urban intensification	
	3.2.	Climate change	
	3.3.	Pressure on water infrastructure	
	3.4.	Pests and diseases	37
4.	Stra	tegic framework	38
	4.1.	Vision	41
	4.2.	Objectives	42
	4.3.	Mechanisms	42
	4.4.	Principles	
5.	Stra	tegy outcomes	50
	5.1.	Knowing outcomes	51
	5.2.	Growing outcomes	53
	5.3.	Protecting outcomes	54
	5.4.	Mechanism outcomes	55
6.	Impl	ementation framework	56
	6.1.	Urban ngahere strategy collaboration	57
	6.2.	Funding and partnerships	58
	6.3.	Area specific implementation	58
	6.4.	High level actions	59
7.	Refe	rences	62



Tagata Way, Māngere

1111



He mahere rautaki mō te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau A strategic plan for Auckland's urban ngahere (forest)

When Tāne went to the heavens – so the story goes – he was enraptured by the tūī that lived in his brother Rehua's hair. Tāne desperately wanted to bring the tūī back to earth but he was told he must first plant trees to provide food. So Tāne introduced trees to our world and, three years later when the kahikatea blossomed, Tāne's wish came true. The tūī came to live with him.

When it comes to trees, the message is much the same. If we plant trees now, in time, we create value for our communities. We might even hear the dawn chorus – $e k\bar{o} i te ata – once again within urban Auckland.$

Auckland is growing and changing rapidly. To accommodate this, Auckland Council has committed to a strategy of urban intensification to increase housing density, deliver the benefits associated with a compact urban form and limit the negative impacts linked with continued outward growth. Successful development requires careful planning; intensification and growth need to complement the protection and planting of trees and vegetation to create liveable neighbourhoods. Trees and vegetation also provide a range of services required for Auckland to function and thrive. These include enhanced stormwater management, air pollution removal, improved water quality, cooling to reduce the urban heat island effect, and ecological corridors to connect habitats and improve biodiversity.

Our urban ngahere faces a number of pressures. Alongside the need for urban development, amendments to the Resource Management Act (RMA) came into effect in 2015, lifting blanket tree protection in urban areas. As a result, the vast majority of trees on private urban properties are no longer protected. Threats from pests and diseases, as well as the impacts of climate change are further challenges. If we want to continue to benefit from the services provided by our urban ngahere it is essential that we better understand its status and value and plan to protect and grow it. Our urban ngahere has the mauri (life force) to care for us but needs our help to be sustainable and healthy.





1.1 He aha te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Mākaurau? What is Auckland's urban ngahere?

Auckland's urban ngahere is the realm of Te Waonui o Tāne (the forest domain of Tāne Mahuta) and consists of the network of all trees, other vegetation and green roofs – both native and introduced – in existing and future urban areas.

It's important to recognise the urban ngahere as more than just trees and vegetation. Urban ngahere captures the interconnected whakapapa (genealogy) of all living things to the wider ecosystem. It consists of a complex network weaving through public and private land, and includes the water, soil, air and sunlight that support it. It also involves people, wildlife and the built environment – all of which impact upon, or are impacted by, the urban ngahere. The urban ngahere has its own mauri (life force) but also depends upon a range of conditions and relationships to support its health, growth and survival.

Auckland's urban ngahere is diverse; it includes trees and vegetation in road corridors, parks and

open spaces, natural stormwater assets, community gardens, living walls, green roofs and trees and vegetation in the gardens of private properties. The urban ngahere, like the pōhutukawa fringing Auckland's coastline, is an important part of Auckland's identity and natural heritage and shapes the fabric of the landscape. Trees also help distinguish our heritage places and areas, such as Albert, Western and Myers Parks, early cemeteries, for example, Symonds Street and Waikumete, and the settings of properties, including Monte Cecilia and Alberton. In addition, Auckland's scheduled character areas often feature memorial plantings and early street plantings.





Examples of Auckland's urban ngahere:

Parks and open space





Potters Park, Mt Eden

Orewa Beach

Street trees and road corridors



Franklin Road, Ponsonby



Private gardens



Island Bay, Birkdale

Blockhouse Bay

Native forest



Native forest

Natural stormwater assets



Te Auaunga Awa / Oakley Creek

Green roofs and living walls



The University of Auckland green roof

Private residential green roof





Tī Kōuka / Cabbage tree

Rain garden, Wynyard Quarter




Ngā painga o te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau Benefits of Auckland's urban ngahere 1.2

The range of social, environmental, economic and cultural benefits that urban trees deliver is well-documented, with cities increasingly recognising the financial value of the services they provide. The USDA Forest Service estimated that trees in New York City provide US\$5.60 in benefits for every US\$1 spent on tree planting and care.¹ Growing and protecting our urban ngahere is essential to maintain and enhance the broad range of services it provides:



Improve health and wellbeing

Reduce the urban heat island effect

Provide shade

Enhance visual amenity



Enhance biodiversity

Improve air quality

Carbon sequestration

Improve water quality Increase property values

Reduce flood risk

Economic

Reduce energy costs

Reduce healthcare costs

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #32aurau



Support education

Local food growing

Sustain and enhance mauri

Cultural heritage

Page 115354 15



Improve health and wellbeing

Research has shown that access to trees and nature can reduce stress, improve mental health and promote wellbeing² whilst tree lined streets have been shown to encourage walking.



Reduce the urban heat island effect

The cooling effect of trees, as a result of evapotranspiration, reduces the urban heat island effect³ and enhances Auckland's resilience to an increasing number of hot days (>25°C), one of the projected impacts of climate change.



Provide shade

Trees shading school grounds, playgrounds, public spaces, and cycling and walking routes provide relief from the sun and protect people from harmful ultraviolet (UV) radiation, in turn reducing the risk of heat stroke, sunburn and melanoma.



Enhance visual amenity

Trees can visually enhance a street, the character of an area and foster neighbourhood pride. They add beauty, soften harsh urban environments and screen unsightly views.

Environmental



Enhance biodiversity

A healthy urban ngahere enriches biodiversity and provides opportunities for connected habitats that support wildlife.



Improve water quality

Trees intercept rainwater and reduce the amount of pollutants being washed from hard surfaces into the stormwater system and watercourses. Increasing canopy cover will also contribute towards fewer storm water overflows from our combined sewer/stormwater systems and therefore lower levels of water pollution in our harbours and streams.



Carbon sequestration

Trees reduce carbon dioxide (CO₂) in the atmosphere through sequestering carbon in new growth. One tonne of carbon stored in wood is equivalent to removing 3.67 tonnes of CO2 from the atmosphere.



Improve air quality

Trees improve air quality by removing air pollutants, such as particulate matter, and absorb gases harmful to human health. A 2006 study estimated that Auckland's urban trees remove 1320 tonnes of particulates, 1230 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide and 1990 tonnes of ozone.⁴

Economic



healthcare costs

Improving air quality and enhancing health and wellbeing will reduce the need for healthcare and associated costs.



flood risk

An increase in canopy cover would intercept an increased volume of rainwater; reducing and slowing urban runoff and placing less pressure on stormwater systems. International studies show that trees intercept 15 to 27 per cent of the annual rainfall that falls upon their canopy, depending on a tree's species and architecture.⁵



Increase property values

Studies have shown that mature street trees increase residential property values and attract buyers and tenants.



Reduce energy costs

Well-positioned trees provide shade and reduce cooling requirements and associated energy costs in buildings.

Cultural



Tree nurseries and planting projects promote environmental awareness and provide opportunities to encourage and facilitate learning.



The cultural benefits of Auckland's urban ngahere are diverse and priceless. Native forest is important to mātauranga Māori (knowledge and understanding), and trees create a cultural connection to place and history.



Sustain and enhance mauri

Mauri is a life force derived from whakapapa (genealogical connections and links to ecosystems), an essential element sustaining all forms of life. Mauri provides life and energy to all living things, including our urban ngahere, and is the binding force that links the physical to the spiritual worlds.⁶ Mauri can be harmed if the life-supporting capacity and ecosystem health of our urban ngahere is diminished. Protecting and growing our urban ngahere will sustain and enhance its mauri.



Local food growing

Planting fruit trees and establishing community orchards provides people with access to fresh fruit. Maintaining and harvesting fruit trees can connect and strengthen communities.



The cultural significance of Auckland's urban ngahere

The urban ngahere is an important part of Tāmaki Makaurau / Auckland's cultural heritage. Remnants of native forest represent traditional supermarkets (kai o te ngahere), learning centres (wānanga o te ngahere), the medicine cabinet (kapata rongoā), schools (kura o te ngahere) and spiritual domain (wairua o te ngahere).⁷ Trees also represent landing places of waka (canoe) and birth whenua (to Māori, it is customary to bury the whenua or placenta in the earth, returning it to the land).

Many of Auckland's trees provide a visible reference to the city's history and development. European settlers planted London plane trees along streets in the 1860s which have now grown to create grand tree-lined avenues in the city centre and the adjoining suburbs of Ponsonby, Freemans Bay and Grey Lynn. Bishop Selwyn, New Zealand's first Anglican Bishop, is reported to have brought hundreds of Norfolk Island pine seedlings to Auckland in 1858-60. Many of the mature Norfolk Island pines now in Auckland, such as those at Mission Bay, are likely to have been grown from these seedlings.8

A TAKE P LOUP AS







Te horopaki ā-kaupapa here mō ā tātou ngahere ā-tāone ināia tonu nei 1.3 Current policy context for our urban ngahere

Auckland's plans and polices recognise and reference the value of trees and vegetation to varying degrees but do not provide a clear framework for the management of Auckland's urban ngahere. A range of plans and polices influence our urban ngahere (Figure 1) – explicitly and implicitly – yet urban ngahere objectives are only incidental to other considerations, such as green growth, climate change, indigenous biodiversity, and encouraging

sport and recreation. In the past, this contributed to a situation in which Auckland's urban ngahere was managed and maintained through piecemeal initiatives rather than in a strategic and holistic way. This strategy consolidates and builds upon existing directives that support our urban ngahere and sets out a clear framework to protect and grow Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future.



Figure 1 – Key plans, strategies and guidance documents that influence Auckland's urban ngahere

The central city from above - London plane trees on Greys Avenue and Vincent Street (bottom left) and trees in Myers Park (bottom right) and Albert Park (top right).



Figure 2 – Average percentage canopy cover of urban ngahere (3m+ height) in Auckland suburbs – based on analysis of the 2013 LiDAR survey.

Te tūranga a ō tātou ngahere ā-tāone ināia tonu nei Current status of our urban ngahere

2.1 | Te hora o te uhinga rākau Distribution of canopy cover

Analysis of data from the 2013 LiDAR survey found that Auckland's urban area has just over 18 per cent canopy cover, with 10,130 hectares of canopy cover belonging to trees over three metres tall. This varied across different land types, with urban ngahere on 11 per cent of Auckland's road area, 24 per cent of public land, and 18 per cent of private land.

Figure 2 illustrates that Auckland's urban ngahere is distributed unequally throughout the city, with lower levels of canopy cover in southern suburbs, and relatively high canopy cover in northern and western parts of the city. Auckland's three leafiest suburbs are Titirangi, which adjoins the Waitakere Ranges (68 per cent canopy cover), Wade Heads (57 per cent) and Chatswood (55 per cent), where

What is LiDAR?

LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) is used to examine the surface of the Earth through collecting data from a survey aircraft. It measures scattered light to find a range and other information on a distant target. The range to the target is measured using the time delay between transmission of a pulse and detection of a reflected signal. This technology allows for the direct measurement of three-dimensional features and structures and the underlying terrain. The ability to measure the height of features on the ground or above the ground is the principle advantage over conventional optical remote sensing technologies such as aerial imagery.

LiDAR data itself does not provide information on the status of Auckland's urban ngahere, further analysis of the data is required to create a tree canopy layer and quantify the distribution and height of the urban ngahere.

historically the landform was unsuitable for development. Unequal canopy cover distribution is particularly apparent at a local board area level (see Figure 3). The local boards with the lowest canopy cover are Māngere-Ōtāhuhu (eight per cent) and Ōtara-Papatoetoe (nine per cent). The local board with the highest canopy cover is Kaipātiki with 30 per cent canopy cover, two-thirds of which is in public open spaces.

The majority of Auckland's urban ngahere – 61 per cent – is located on privately-owned land. The remaining 39 per cent is on public land, with seven per cent on Auckland Council parkland, nine per cent on road corridors, and 23 per cent on other public land, such as schools (see Figure 4).



An aerial view of unequal canopy cover



80 r 70 60 Percentage (%) 50 40 30 20 10 Waitemata Whau Kaipatiki Orakei Puketapapa Albert - Eden

Figure 3 - canopy cover on different land tenures by local board area.



Figure 4 – proportion of canopy cover on different land ownership types (2013 LiDAR survey).

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #32aurau







Why the unequal distribution?

There are a number of reasons for the difference in tree cover across the region, including land ownership (public/private), land use (urban/industrial/agricultural), geography and legal protections (eg Significant Ecological Areas and notable trees). Historically, the type of development and street layout also influenced the funding and space available for tree planting. For example, in areas developed for social housing, there was typically a low level of investment in tree planting, resulting in relatively few street trees. The age of a suburb can also be a factor, for example trees planted close to the city centre in the early days of Auckland's development have now matured (eg in Ponsonby). More recently, prior to the amalgamation of the region's councils into Auckland Council, some legacy council areas had active tree planting programmes.





Trees in private gardens, a significant contribution to our urban ngahere, Ponsonby.



2.2 | Te hora tū teitei Height distribution

The 2013 LiDAR survey reveals that tall trees are rare in our urban ngahere; only six per cent of the urban ngahere is over 20 metres in height, the majority, 64 per cent, is less than 10 metres (see Figure 5). This is partly due to the species that make up the urban ngahere and their height at maturity. In addition,

trees over 20 metres in height need to be in the right place to allow for growth and are likely to be at least 60 years old. Historically, most mature trees were removed as land was cleared for agriculture and Auckland developed.



Figure 5 – Percentage of urban ngahere across different height classes.

When it comes to trees, size does matter!

Benefits are disproportionally greater for larger trees. For example, big trees provide more shade because of their larger, wider canopy spread; their greater leaf areas and more extensive root systems intercept larger amounts of rainfall and stormwater; they absorb more gaseous pollutants, have higher carbon sequestration rates, and typically contribute more to calming and slowing traffic on local streets than small trees. Larger trees also usually have few or no low branches to interfere with activity at ground level, especially if pruned to provide higher canopy clearance over roads, public space and pedestrian footpaths.





2.3 Te paerewa āraitanga Level of protection

Just 50 per cent of Auckland's urban ngahere has some degree of statutory protection. A high level of protection applies to urban ngahere in Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) which account for 62 per cent of all protected forest (although SEAs capture only about one-third of Auckland's total urban ngahere). A moderate level of protection is provided to urban ngahere in outstanding natural features or landscapes, open space conservation zones, coastal yards, riparian yards and lake protection zones. Some protection is provided to urban ngahere in coastal natural character areas or open space informal recreation zones. A low level of protection is given to urban ngahere in open space active recreation zones and road corridors.

The Notable Trees Schedule in the Unitary Plan is another form of protection. This schedule contains nearly 3000 items (representing some 6000 trees and groups of trees), the majority of which were 'rolled over' from legacy council schedules as part of the Unitary Plan process.

The proportion of protected urban ngahere varies widely from suburb to suburb, much like the level of urban ngahere canopy cover:

- Suburbs with large patches of indigenous ngahere that have been designated as Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) tend to have a high level of urban ngahere canopy cover and a high level of protection (eg Chatswood, Birkenhead and Titirangi).
- Leafy suburbs where the urban ngahere is dominated by exotic and native trees in private backyards (eg Remuera, Epsom and Mt Eden) have moderate to high canopy cover but a low level of protection.
- Some suburbs have a low level of urban ngahere canopy cover, but a relatively high proportion of the canopy cover has some form of protection (eg Māngere, Wiri and Manukau).
- A number of suburbs that have experienced recent urban growth currently have a low level of urban ngahere canopy cover and protection (eg Northpark, Golflands, Howick, New Lynn and New Windsor).







Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #32

A Pin Oak being lowered into position by a mobile crane and planted at Britomart Place in approximately the 1950's. Credit: Robert Hepple

The Pin Oak pictured above in 2018 - now protected and on the Notable Trees Schedule. This tree is the central feature of a busy intersection, visually contributing to the local streetscape and visible from Quay Street, Beach Road, Anzac Avenue and Fort Street. It is also notable as a solitary specimen of a species that is not well represented in the locality.





Ngā pēhitanga o ināianei, anga atu anō hoki Current and future pressures

Te tupu haere o te tātai tāngata me 3.1 ngā whakakīkītanga āhua tāone A growing population and urban intensification

Auckland is experiencing unprecedented growth and is projected to grow substantially into the future. Around 1.66 million people currently live in Auckland; over the next 30 years this number could grow by another 720,000 people to reach 2.4 million. Auckland will need many more dwellings, possibly another 313,000, in addition to new infrastructure and community



facilities. Development will be focused within existing and future urban areas within the urban boundary (see Figure 6) and this will put significant pressure on the urban ngahere. Much of this growth will occur in existing urban areas through intensification; as land is redeveloped, unprotected trees are at risk of being removed to maximise the developable area of a site.

Page **40545**



Figure 6 – Anticipated development in existing and future urban areas as outlined in the Development Strategy (2018).



Without properly recognising the value of trees and understanding the benefits they provide; urban growth is likely to occur at the expense of the urban ngahere. However, urban development and intensification also present opportunities to green our city – to plant and grow our urban ngahere and create new green urban environments in areas set to be urbanised over the next 30 years. Future urban areas are outlined in Auckland's Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (2017) and the Development Strategy (2018). These areas cover around 15,000 hectares, with the potential to accommodate approximately 137,000 dwellings and 1400 hectares of new business land.

3.2 | Te takahurihanga o te huarere Climate change

Climate change threatens our urban ngahere through changing seasonal rainfall patterns, more severe weather events, and increased susceptibility to pests and diseases. Auckland is projected to

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #32.urau

Urban regeneration within the existing city limits, such as the implementation of the City Centre Waterfront Refresh Plan and redevelopment plans for suburbs, presents an opportunity to retrofit green spaces and replace lost trees. The benefits of keeping established trees and the opportunities for these to complement and add value to new developments needs to be recognised. Where development occurs around trees, implementing a best practice approach to tree protection significantly increases their survival rate.

experience increased occurrence of drought and reduced soil moisture. This requires us to better understand the threats to our urban ngahere and what can be done to protect it.



Ngā taimahatanga kei runga i ngā whakahaere ā-wai Pressure on water infrastructure 3.3

Auckland's water infrastructure is vital to ensure that Aucklanders have clean water to drink and use, that wastewater is disposed of safely, homes, businesses and infrastructure are protected from flooding, and waterways and harbours are healthy. Population growth is putting all components of Auckland's water infrastructure under pressure. At the same time, this infrastructure is ageing and needs to be managed to ensure its continued performance. Climate change will place additional pressure on water infrastructure as the frequency and intensity of storm events is predicted to increase.

The Auckland Plan 2050 sets a clear direction to use Auckland's growth and development to protect and enhance the environment.⁹ This includes a focus on using green infrastructure to deliver greater resilience, long-term cost savings and quality environmental outcomes.¹⁰ The Auckland Unitary Plan emphasises the use and enhancement of natural hydrological systems and green infrastructure during development to address pressures on stormwater infrastructure.¹¹ This strategic direction and focus on using green infrastructure provides an opportunity to grow Auckland's urban ngahere.

What is green infrastructure?

Green infrastructure is a strategically planned network of natural and semi-natural areas designed and managed to deliver multi-functional benefits such as stormwater management, water purification, filtration of airborne pollutants, space for recreation and climate mitigation and adaptation. Auckland's urban ngahere is an integral part of our green infrastructure network.



3.4 Ngā mate orotā me ngā mate urutā Pests and diseases

Animal pests and weeds threaten the urban ngahere, including the precious native forest remnants that are found in pockets on public and private land. Possums eat leaves, buds, flowers and young shoots, while weeds like climbing asparagus and monkey apple, smother or out-compete valued species.

Plant diseases are a serious threat to the future of our urban ngahere. Kauri dieback is causing localised extinctions, Dutch elm disease has been in Auckland for many years now, myrtle rust has also reached Auckland and is a risk to pohutukawa, bottlebrush, eucalyptus, and willow myrtle, all common street trees in central Auckland. Climate change is expected to create more favourable conditions for plant diseases to establish and spread. Successfully managing the urban ngahere means these threats must be understood and addressed, if we do not take sufficient action to address these threats, we place our urban ngahere at greater risk. Actions include pest and disease control, using a mix of species and, where possible, disease resistant variants of susceptible species in new plantings, and





by responding quickly and effectively to new and emerging threats. To better understand and address kauri dieback and myrtle rust, Auckland Council is working with central government agencies, Crown Research Institutes and academia.



Te tarāwaho rautaki Strategic framework

The strategic framework consists of a vision, three main objectives (Knowing, Growing and Protecting), two key mechanisms for delivering these objectives (Engage and Manage), and a set of nine supporting principles (Figure 7).







Page 135453

A flowering põhutukawa variety.

He whakatupu ngātahi i te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau e matomato ai te hua ā ngā rā e tū mai nei

Together, growing Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future

4.1 | Te tirohanga whānui Vision

Our vision is that Aucklanders are proud of their urban ngahere, that Auckland has a healthy and diverse network of green infrastructure, that it is flourishing across the region and is celebrated, protected, and cared for by all. The urban ngahere is equally distributed across our communities and brings significant benefits to the city. It contributes to our resilience, enhances stormwater management, delivers energy savings, supports biodiversity, and improves health outcomes and quality of life for all Aucklanders. Expanding and improving the urban ngahere is enabled through strong, collaborative partnerships across Auckland. Communities, government, businesses and citizens work together to make our urban ngahere flourish.

We will know we have been successful when we have:

 increased canopy cover across Auckland's urban area



- enhanced the associated social, environmental, economic and cultural benefits
- addressed unequal distribution of canopy cover through increasing canopy cover in neighbourhoods with previously low levels of cover
- increased the network of green infrastructure on public land
- improved linkages between green spaces by establishing ecological corridors
- effectively engaged with private landowners to support a thriving urban ngahere on private land
- planted diverse tree and plant species on public land
- shared knowledge of our urban ngahere
- instilled a sense of pride in Aucklanders for their urban ngahere.



Ngā whāinga Objectives 4.2



Auckland needs to know the status of its urban ngahere, the extent, number and distribution of trees, as well as their size, health and condition. Understanding the social, environmental, economic and cultural value of Auckland's ngahere and quantifying the benefits it provides will support better informed, strategic decisionmaking about its management and growth.

Growing

Auckland needs to grow its urban ngahere to multiply these benefits and address distributional inequity. By expanding and enriching its urban ngahere, Auckland will maximise the social, environmental, economic and cultural benefits that trees, shrubs and other vegetation bring to an urban environment.



Protecting existing ngahere is crucial to safeguarding the added values and benefits mature trees provide. Caring for saplings is critical for ensuring older trees are replenished before the end of their life, our urban ngahere grows over time, and publicly-funded planting is successful.

Ngā tikanga whakahaere Mechanisms 4.3

To achieve these objectives, Auckland Council needs to engage and manage.



Engage with partners and stakeholders – with mana whenua, residents, private landowners, community organisations and the private sector to ensure the urban ngahere is well managed, its benefits are well recognised and that growing and protecting the urban ngahere on public and private land is widely supported.



Manage the city's urban ngahere on public land through coordinated planning, strategic planting, smart and innovative urban design while facilitating best practice standards for work on and around trees through maintenance contracts.



Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #32aurau



4.4 Ngā mātāpono Principles

1. Right tree in the right place

It's important to consider growing conditions and their impact on proposed tree species, soil type, drainage, slope, sunlight access, the presence of pests and weeds and the potential current and future impacts of proposed tree species on the nature and function of a place. Growth rate and size of a proposed tree species at maturity should be basic considerations in determining suitability for a specific site. Planting the right tree in the right place is an important factor in minimising future maintenance requirements and costs.



Figure 8 – Consider the context of the site and plant the right tree in the right place

2. Preference for native species

The Auckland Unitary Plan encourages the use of indigenous trees and vegetation for roadside plantings and open spaces to recognise and reflect cultural, amenity, landscape and ecological values. Planting exotic trees may be appropriate in some cases, eg where there is a need for deciduous trees to provide solar access in winter, or fruit trees to establish community orchards. Exotic trees may also be suitable for cultural or heritage reasons in specific locations.





3. Ensure urban forest diversity

Planting a range of species increases the urban ngahere's resilience to the impacts of diseases, pests, and climate change. Planting a diverse range of species will ensure only a portion of the urban ngahere will be affected as diseases and pests tend to be limited to a certain tree species or genus. It is also important to maintain genetic diversity for each species to support better resilience, for example through our seed collection programme. Planting trees with varying lifespans helps to avoid a large-scale decline in numbers as trees with similar lifespans reach the end of their lives.

4. Protect mature, healthy trees

The benefits provided by trees become exponentially greater as they mature. It's also more cost effective to care for mature trees, as this typically costs less than planting and caring for new trees. The only way to replace a 40-year-old tree is to spend 40 years caring for a new tree.

People often have strong emotional connections to landmark, mature trees in their neighbourhoods, and are more likely to mourn the loss of a large tree. Additionally, some native species, such as kākā, and bats, prefer taller trees and their presence can significantly improve the biodiversity value of an area.







5. Create ecological corridors and connections

The urban ngahere is home to a range of ecological groups, such as birds , insects, moths and butterflies. It brings nature into urban environments, a place where the majority of Aucklanders (90 per cent) live and spend most of their time. It can also provide ecological corridors for species migrating through urban environments (see Figure 9). Connecting Auckland's urban ngahere, particularly remnant natural areas, to create ecological corridors and connections between green spaces is important to enhance biodiversity.

6. Access for all residents

The unequal distribution of canopy cover across Auckland needs to be addressed when new plantings are planned. Considerations include the delivery of urban ngahere benefits, public demand for a higher canopy cover and physical access to the urban ngahere in a local area.



7. Manage urban forest on public and private land

Around 61 per cent of Auckland's urban ngahere canopy is on privately-owned land, with 39 per cent on public land. However, many of the benefits of trees are realised beyond private property boundaries and by many more people than just individual landowners. A loss of urban ngahere on private land is also a loss for the city. While there are opportunities for Auckland Council to grow and protect the urban ngahere on public land, the overall status of the urban ngahere is, to a large degree, dependent on the decisions of private landowners. Managing Auckland's urban ngahere requires private landowners' support and cooperation. Engagement is crucial and is one of two key delivery mechanisms for the proposed strategic framework.



8. Deploy regulatory and non-regulatory tools

Auckland Council has a range of regulatory tools to protect the urban ngahere, such as rules relating to Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs), the schedule of Notable trees, and rules to limit the extent of vegetation removal in sensitive environments, like streams and coastlines. These regulatory tools apply to trees and vegetation on private properties. However, since amendments to the Resource Management Act (RMA) came into effect in 2015, lifting blanket tree protection in urban areas councils depend mainly on non-regulatory tools to control the removal of trees and vegetation on private properties. Examples include landowner advice and assistance with tree care and planting, community education and outreach programmes, and raising awareness of the value and benefits of the urban ngahere.



9. Manage the whole lifecycle of urban trees

Achieving the long-term vision to grow Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future not only depends on planting more trees and vegetation but also looking after them during their lifecycle. New plantings may not be able to flourish (or even survive) without ongoing aftercare and maintenance. Investing in maintenance and proactive management will yield greater long-term benefits, as well as ensure money is well spent, with less wastage and repeated effort.



Figure 9 - the potential for ecological connections across urban and rural landscapes (adapted from Meurk & Hall, 2006¹²)



48





Ngā hua ā-rautaki Strategy Outcomes

The strategy outcomes are underpinned by an implementation framework and high level actions outlined in the next section.

5.1 | Te mōhio ki ngā mea ka hua Knowing outcomes

To better understand the status and value of Auckland's urban ngahere.

Improved knowledge will assist us to make more informed and strategic decisions on how to manage our urban ngahere.

The knowing outcomes will give us a better understanding of the status and trends of important indicators, such as canopy cover, height and age distribution and species diversity across both public and private land. Understanding these factors will enable us to better evaluate and understand the value of our urban ngahere. i-Tree Eco software¹³ could present an opportunity to do this, however at present additional research is required to fully adapt i-Tree data and analysis to a New Zealand context.

A better understanding of the trends and status of the canopy cover can direct planting efforts to where the most value can be realised. Potential future impacts and pressures on Auckland's urban ngahere, such as climate change and new pests and diseases, can also be better managed and minimised.

Table 1 – Knowing outcomes

Objective	Outcomes
Knowing	Better understanding of the status and trends on private and public land over time.
	Better understanding of the diverse values and benefits of Auckland's urban forest.
	Better understanding of existing and future risks and pressures.





Figure 10 - unequal canopy cover at a local board level (2013 LiDAR survey)



5.2 Te whakatupu i ngā mea ka hua Growing outcomes

To grow Auckland's urban ngahere and grow it more equitably.

Growing our urban ngahere will increase the average canopy cover and also provide a fairer distribution of the urban ngahere and associated benefits across Auckland (see Figure 10).

We can grow our urban ngahere and increase resilience to existing and future pressures, such as pests, diseases and climate change, through the application of the strategic framework's nine principles.

Table 2 – Growing outcomes

Objective	Outcomes
Growing	Increase the average canopy cover to 30 per cent across Auckland's urban area with no local board area having less than 15 per cent canopy cover.
	Increased resilience to existing and future pressures.



5.3 | Te tiaki i ngā mea ka hua Protecting outcomes

To protect and maintain Auckland's existing and future urban ngahere.

Protecting our existing urban ngahere is crucial to realising the values and benefits of mature trees. Caring for new plantings and young trees is essential to ensure that older trees are replaced at the end of their life and our urban ngahere grows over time.

Achieving no net loss ensures that any losses are balanced by a gain elsewhere. At a local board level, any loss will need to be balanced out by a gain in canopy cover elsewhere within the local board area. Table 3 – Protecting outcomes





5.4 Ngā tikanga whakahaere ka hua Mechanism outcomes

Engage and Manage are the two mechanisms Auckland Council will use to achieve the Knowing, Growing and Protecting objectives. For example, increasing the canopy cover and prioritising options for future planting on public and private land will only be possible through engaging and working collaboratively with communities and partners.

Engage

Community support is critical for fulfilling all three main objectives. Auckland Council must engage with relevant partners and stakeholders – mana whenua, private landowners, community groups, and the private sector –to support the growth and protection of Auckland's urban ngahere. The council must also engage with the public more widely about the benefits of urban ngahere to ensure they are understood and recognised.

Table 4 – Engage outcomes



A community engagement programme is needed that addresses Growing and Protecting and is supported by partnerships with relevant stakeholders. The programme must also integrate the aspirations of Māori, in accordance with the principle of partnership enshrined in te Tiriti o Waitangi and recognise the special role of mana whenua as kaitiaki (guardians) whereby ngahere and whenua ora (environmental services) are intimately connected to Māori wellbeing. As the programme evolves, we will develop a better understanding of community aspirations, and knowledge gaps relating to urban ngahere benefits and value.

Manage

Another key mechanism in successfully implementing the vision is the effective management of existing and future urban ngahere on public land through coordinated planning, strategic planting, smart and innovative urban design, and facilitating best practice standards for work on and around trees through maintenance contracts.

Table 5 – Manage outcomes

Mechanism	Outcomes
Manage	Increased survival rate of new plantings and sustainability of Auckland's urban ngahere on public land.

As noted in section 2.2, tree size matters when it comes to the scale of benefits delivered. Central to effective management is the requirement to nurture growing trees and increase the proportion of larger trees.





Tarāwaho whakatinana Implementation framework

The implementation framework consists of high level actions that are central to achieving the strategy outcomes. In addition to the high level actions, collaboration, funding and partnerships and area specific implementation are all fundamental to the strategy's success.

6.1 | Te mahi tahi mō te rautaki ngahere ā-tāone Urban ngahere strategy collaboration

Success will require close collaboration with many partners at various levels across operational boundaries and disciplines, within the municipality and beyond. Some of the key cross boundary groups are:

Cross-council collaboration:

This involves collaboration between internal stakeholders, interdepartmental cooperation and working closely with council controlled organisations. In the urban context, planners should work with foresters and arborists to effectively integrate policy and knowledge management tools to grow and protect the urban ngahere.

Community and council collaboration:

Effective implementation of the strategy requires effective engagement with community groups



and institutions that play a role in growing and protecting the urban ngahere.

Business and council collaboration:

Insight provided by business groups, including developers, is important to support the strategy's successful implementation. The decisions and actions of business groups can have a significant influence on the urban ngahere.

International cooperation:

This strategy draws on the knowledge and experience of many leading cities that have developed their own urban forest strategies. Continued sharing of technical, governance and community know-how will help to achieve better outcomes for Auckland.



6.2 Ngā tahua pūtea me ngā hononga ā-hoa Funding and partnerships

Continuing support from Auckland Council, developers, businesses and the wider community is fundamental to successfully growing and protecting Auckland's urban ngahere. For example, leading developers understand that delivering a successful and sustainable project is not just about building design, but also the surrounding environment and the outcomes this can deliver. Businesses can also contribute to the growth and protection of the urban ngahere through financial support, planting initiatives and effective maintenance of trees on their properties. Most importantly, having financial

support from the council ensures the development of knowledge, growth and protection of urban ngahere on public and private land.

Effective communication on the benefits of urban ngahere, such as better stormwater management, carbon sequestration, lower infrastructure costs, enhanced biodiversity and community health not to mention the city's aesthetic enhancement - is an important tool to justify project costs to stakeholders and partners. It's important to document and disseminate urban ngahere benefits to gain continuous support from all Aucklanders.

6.3 Whakatinanatanga ā-wāhi motuhake Area specific implementation

The strategy must take an area specific approach to implementation. This will require engaging with each local board, partners and stakeholders to discuss needs and drivers for growing and

protecting Auckland's urban ngahere. This will ensure the strategy's high level actions are defined and implemented in a way that matches the needs of each local area.



6.4 Kaupapa mahi matua High level actions

The Engage and Manage mechanisms identified in the strategy framework run through all the high level actions and are central to their successful implementation. Table 6 – Knowing high level actions



- land over time
- urban forest

High level actions

- Incorporate three-yearly LiDAR surveys in council 1 work programmes.
- Create database for existing assets within two year 2
- Integrate scientific knowledge of the urban ngahe 3 mātauranga Māori in partnership with mana wher the urban ngahere.
- Quantify values and benefits (within 12-18 month 4
- 5 Determine survival rates of new council plantings.
- Identify key pressures and risks in partnership with 6 whenua and local boards.

High level actions to support the following outcomes:

• better understanding of the status and trends on private and public

· better understanding of the diverse values and benefits of Auckland's

· better understanding of existing and future risks and pressures.

	Implementation timeframe (years						
	1-2	3-5	Ongoing				
			•				
ars.	•						
re with nua of			•				
ıs).	•						
			•				
h mana	•						



Table 7 – Growing high level actions

$\langle \cdot \rangle$
Growing

- High level actions to support the following outcomes:
- increase the average canopy cover to 30 per cent across Auckland's urban area with no local board area having less than 15 per cent canopy cover
- increased resilience to existing and future pressures.

Lick level estions		Implementation timeframe (years)					
μıβ	High level actions		1-2	3-5	Ongoing		
1	Increase canopy cover in road corridors, passes to support an average of 30 per ce across Auckland's urban area with no loca having less than 15 per cent canopy cover	arks and open nt canopy cover l board area			•		
2	Identify and prioritise locations for future on public land in partnership with mana w local boards.	•					
3	Use science and ongoing engagement wit mana whenua and communities to inform relation to types of planting.	h local boards, n decisions in			•		
4	Increase the capacity of nursery programmers and the supply of eco-sour maraes) to increase the supply of eco-sour	nes (including rced plants.			•		
5	Leverage partnerships established through initiatives (eg the Mayor's Million Trees pr	n existing ogramme).		•			

Table 8 – Protecting high level actions



Raise arboriculture maintenance programme from 6 to five years or until new plantings are well establi (a target survival rate of 70-80 per cent).

guidelines, proper tree care).

7 Establish a labelling programme for protected tree 12 months (eg species, age and benefits).

	Implementation timeframe (years)						
	1-2	3-5	Ongoing				
ion t.	•						
th	•						
mes (eg			•				
s urban			•				
of the anting			•				
n two ished	•						
es within	•						





Ngā tohutoro References

- Pacific Southwest Research Station and Center for Urban Forest Research https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/topics/urban_forestry/products/2/psw_cufr687_NYC_MFRA.pdf
- 2. McDonald, R. et al. 2017. Funding Trees for Health, The Nature Conservancy, www.nature.org/trees4health
- 3. urban environment, Environmental Health 2016 15 (Suppl 1):S36 https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12940-016-0103-6
- Cavanagh, J. E. and Clemons, J. 2006. Do Urban Forests Enhance Air Quality? Australian Journal of 4. Environmental Management, Volume 13, 2006 – Issue 2 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14486563.2006.9725122?needAccess=true
- 5. Ecosyst (2011) 14:755-769
- Harmsworth, G., R. Awatere, S. 2013. Indigenous Māori Knowledge and Perspectives of Ecosystems. 6. Ecosystem services in New Zealand – conditions and trends. Manaaki Whenua Press, Lincoln, New Zealand
- 7. Wilcox, M. D. 2012. Auckland's Remarkable Urban Forest, Auckland Botanical Society
- 8. Manaaki Whenua - Landcare Research, Māori values and native forest (Ngahere) https://www. landcareresearch.co.nz/ data/assets/pdf file/0017/43910/maori values native forest.pdf
- 9. The Auckland Plan 2050, Outcome: Environment and Cultural Heritage, Direction 3: Use Auckland's growth and development to protect and enhance the natural environment https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plansstrategies/auckland-plan/environment-cultural-heritage/Pages/direction-use-growthdevelopment-protect-enhance.aspx
- 10. https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plansstrategies/auckland-plan/environment-cultural-heritage/Pages/focus-area-use-greeninfrastructure-deliver-greater-resilience.aspx
- The Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in part (Updated 13 July 2018), E1 Water quality and 11. integrated management http://unitaryplan.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/Images/Auckland%20Unitary%20Plan%20 Operative/Chapter%20E%20Auckland-wide/1.%20Natural%20Resources/E1%20Water%20 quality%20and%20integrated%20management.pdf
- 12. 30(1): 131-146

https://newzealandecology.org/nzje/2297

13. i-Tree Eco https://www.itreetools.org/eco/index.php

Peper, P. et al. 2007. New York City, New York Municipal Forest Resource Analysis. USDA Forest Service,

Salmond, J. et al. 2016. Health and climate related ecosystem services provided by street trees in the

Xiao, Q. and McPherson, E. G. 2011. Rainfall interception of three trees in Oakland, California, Urban

https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/mcpherson/psw_2011_mcpherson008(xiao).pdf

https://www.landcareresearch.co.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/77047/2_1_Harmsworth.pdf

The Auckland Plan 2050, Outcome: Environment and Cultural Heritage, Focus area 6: Use green infrastructure to deliver greater resilience, long-term cost savings and quality environmental outcomes

Meurk, C.D. Hall, G.M.J. 2006. Options for enhancing forest biodiversity across New Zealand's managed landscapes based on ecosystem modelling and spatial design. New Zealand Journal of Ecology (2006)



© 2019 Auckland Council March 2019 Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department

Auckland Council (2019). Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy

ISBN 978-1-98-856480-7 (Print) ISBN 978-1-98-856481-4 (PDF)

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy was approved by the Auckland Council Environment and Community Committee on 20 February 2018.



Howick Local Board Ngahere Analysis Update 2021 Canopy cover changes with the 2013 to 2016/2018 LiDAR data

Urban Ngahere Strategy 2019 Knowing Programme



A summary of the urban environment in Howick

Approximately **142,700** residents Less than **1%** of canopy cover more than **30 metres** tall

Average canopy cover of

54% of canopy cover with no statutory protection

More than 230 local parks and 55 playgrounds

#32

293 hectares of Significant Ecological Area

Two statistical areas - Shelly Park and Tuscany Heights - with more than **30%** canopy cover

> More than **70%** of total canopy cover on private land

across local board, including canopy cover of: 26% 8% 12% 17% on public parkland on road reserves on other public land on private land

New zoning under Auckland Unitary Plan includes Mixed Housing Urban, Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Notable Tree records

1.8% of original indigenous vegetation cover remaining

1,123 hectares of urban forest in 2013, **remaining the same in 2016/2018**



Nearly 7,000 hectares of land

727

hectares of parks, including:

- Mangemangeroa Reserve
- Point View Reserve
- Murphys Bush

Auckland Council disclaims any liability whatsoever in connection with any action taken in reliance of this document for any error, deficiency, flaw or omission contained in it.

Date: September 2021

ISBN 978-1-99-100252-5 (Print)

ISBN 978-1-99-100253-2 (PDF)

This document is licensed for re-use under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence.

In summary, you are free to copy, distribute and adapt the material, as long as you attribute it to the Auckland Council and abide by the other licence terms.



Contents

1.0 Pi	reface		1	
2.0 Ir	ntroducti	on	2	
	2.1	Howick Local Board	2	
	2.2	Study Background	3	
	2.3	Data Collection	3	
3.0 R	esults ar	nd Discussion	4	
	3.1	Urban Canopy Cover Overview	4	
	3.2	Canopy Distribution across Howick Local Board	5	
	3.3	Urban Ngahere Canopy Height	8	
	3.4	Urban Ngahere Tenure	9	
	3.5	Urban Ngahere in Relation to Growth Pressures	10	
	3.6	Recommendations	13	
4.0 Acknowledgements			14	
5.0 F	5.0 References			

1.0 Preface

Tāmaki-Makaurau / Auckland is New Zealand's largest city, and plantings of exotic and native trees have taken place as the region has developed. Early Māori settlers would have planted trees such as karaka, pūriri and tōtara to indicate a special place or to mark a celebration, while European settlers planted trees that were familiar and provided a sense of place. London Plane, English Oak, and European Lime trees were some of the earliest recorded plantings in Auckland. Settlers arriving from around the world commenced the history of Auckland's diverse and unique tree cover.

When European settlers arrived to Tāmaki-Makaurau / Auckland, the gullies of the isthmus were filled with raupō, edged with a varied growth of sedges and other moisture loving plants; and slopes of gullies covered with karamū and cabbage trees. By the late nineteenth century, much of the Auckland area was under cultivation with a large number of introduced plants. Along with residential development commencing in the mid-20th century, these actions have now reduced indigenous forest cover within the Howick Local Board to small fragments, primarily in local reserves.

The Howick Local Board has provided locally driven initiatives funding to Auckland Council's Principal Advisor Urban Ngahere (Forest) in the Parks, Sports and Recreation Department to develop an analysis of the tree cover in its area of responsibility. This update report is the result of a programme of work by Auckland Council involving detailed analysis of urban tree coverages on public and private land, aiming to identify opportunities to nurture, grow and protect urban trees in the local board area. The analysis work is directed by the Auckland Council's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy 2019, which has 18 key objectives to help Council and local boards to deliver a healthy ngahere for a flourishing future.



2.0 Introduction

2.1 Howick Local Board

The Howick Local Board covers approximately (c.) 7,000 hectares (ha) in eastern Auckland, located between the Tāmaki River to the west, the Mangemangeroa Stream to the east and the Redoubt Road ridge to the southeast. The population of the local board is approximately 142,700 residents.

Land-use within the board is very varied, with well-established (pre-1990) residential suburbs dominating the northern half of the board, newer and developing residential suburbs to the east and south, large retail centres at Botany Downs and Pakuranga Plaza, and a swathe of commercial and industrial land to the west, encompassing Highbrook Park and parts of East Tāmaki. Howick's southern and eastern boundaries extend just beyond the recognised rural-urban boundary into the adjacent rural regions around Brookby and Whitford, with the south-eastern spread of development butting up against the physical and regulatory limits imposed by topography and zoning.

Approximately 11% of the local board area is public parkland, with bush reserves containing pockets of remnant native forest. These reserves are predominantly



Urban forest around central Howick

located along Howick's eastern margins at the interface between the suburbs and the rural areas beyond and on the coastal fringe. Examples include Mangemangeroa Reserve, Point View Reserve, and Murphys Bush.

Large reserves for passive or active recreation, or a mixture of both, are distributed throughout Howick and include Barry Curtis Park, Lloyd Elsmore Park, Macleans Park (with substantial areas of native revegetation planting), Tī Rakau Park, Pigeon Mountain, Murvale Reserve (with an outstanding collection of early exotic plantings), and William Green Domain.

Large portions of the local board area are now zoned for development intensification under the Auckland Unitary Plan. The new zoning, including the Mixed Housing Urban Zone and the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone, now allows for smaller sections. Consequently, much of the urban forest is under a range of pressures from development, which could potentially lead to irreversible changes in urban forest cover (Brown et al., 2015).

An information graphic summarising local board details related to urban forest is provided at the beginning of this report.



The 'Rural-Urban Boundary' viewed from Point View Reserve, East Tāmaki Heights

2.2 Study Background

'Urban ngahere' ('urban forest') comprises all the trees within a city – including parks, coastal cliffs, stream corridors, private gardens and streets – both native and naturalised exotic species. For the purposes of this report, 'urban ngahere' is defined as all of the trees and other vegetation three metres or taller in stature within the Howick Local Board, and the soil and water systems that support these trees. This urban ngahere definition encompasses trees and shrubs in streets, parks, private gardens, stream banks, coastal cliffs, rail corridors, and motorway margins and embankments. It also includes both planted and naturally established plants, of both exotic and native provenance.

The scale of the tree and shrub cover across Auckland is sufficiently extensive on both public and private land to make a meaningful contribution to the liveability and sense of place for its residents. Benefits of the urban ngahere include:

Social

- Improve health and wellbeing
- Reduce the urban heat island effect
- Provide shade
- Enhance visual amenity

Environmental

- Enhance biodiversity
- Improve air quality
- Carbon sequestration
- Improve water quality

Economic

- Increase property values
- Reduce flood risk
- Reduce energy costs
- Reduce healthcare costs

Cultural

- Support education
- Local food growing
- Sustain and enhance maur
- Cultural heritage

The Auckland Unitary Plan offers various degrees of protection to urban ngahere and groups of trees meeting specific characteristics (e.g., pre-identified significance, vegetation by coasts or streams); however, other important urban ngahere assets have no statutory protection and can therefore be removed. The completion of a study in urban canopy cover in Howick is important to provide information on baseline tree distribution that future canopy cover measurements can be compared to. This baseline data also provides information on where there are pressures on canopy cover and opportunities for tree planting. Increases in canopy cover are also intended to contribute to other Auckland Council programmes such as Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan (Auckland Council 2019c).

2.3 Data Collection

Urban canopy cover across Auckland was mapped in 2013 (Auckland Council 2019b), and again in 2016/18 by use of LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging). Airborne LiDAR is an optical remote sensing technology that irradiates a target with a beam of light; usually a pulsed laser, to measure an object's variable distances from the earth surface. Two LiDAR data sets are covered in this report, collected in the years 2013 and 2016/2018. The second survey (2016/2018) had to be completed over two years due to unfavourable weather conditions that limited data quality. As these two LiDAR data sets provide a solid baseline for future comparative work, investigations into alternatives to LiDAR for mapping urban ngahere are currently underway.



New native restoration planting

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Urban Canopy Cover Overview

Based on the 2013 data set, urban ngahere covered 16% of the Howick Local Board area, including 6% of roads, 25% of public parks, and 17% of private land. Further information on the 2013 data has been provided in a baseline report (Howick Local Board Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report September 2019; Auckland Council 2019b). There was no net change in overall canopy cover based on the 2016/2018 data set (Table 1).

As an overview, the initial analysis contained in this report (in line with the knowing phase of the Auckland Urban Ngahere Strategy) shows that there are some obvious areas of urban ngahere concentration, while there are also areas that are lacking urban ngahere. The lowest cover (3-6%) tends to be in central/southern areas of the

local board (Botany Central/South, Redcastle, Ormiston North and Donegal Park), while the eastern parts of the local board, Shelly Park and Tuscany Heights, have the highest cover (more than 30%). Although the canopy cover in East Tāmaki is low (5%), the percentage of canopy cover >30 m tall is high compared to other statistical areas in the local board. Other suburbs with a relatively high level of tree cover are the older coastal suburbs of Shelly Park, Mellons Bay and Cockle Bay.

The 2016/18 LiDAR data indicates growth in canopy cover on road reserves and parks across the Howick Local Board, with a combined net increase in canopy cover of c.26 hectares. Conversely, there has been a net reduction in canopy cover of c.8 hectares on privately owned land. An example of this decrease has been observed on private land in Ormiston East, where canopy cover has shown a net reduction of 13 hectares since 2013.

Urban Local Board	Public open space		Private land		Roads		Other public land		Overall coverage	
	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018
Kaipātiki	63	64	25	25	12	14	33	34	30	30
Upper Harbour	50	52	29	30	11	13	10	11	27	28
Hibiscus and Bays	28	29	24	23	15	14	43	42	25	24
Puketāpapa	50	50	17	16	10	12	15	15	20	20
Albert-Eden	33	34	19	18	17	20	19	18	20	20
Ōrākei	25	25	20	19	14	16	20	20	20	19
Waitematā	42	43	16	15	15	17	11	10	19	19
Whau	34	34	17	16	12	13	12	12	17	17
Devonport-Takapuna	24	27	17	17	11	13	13	14	16	16
Howick	25	26	17	17	6	8	11	12	16	16
Henderson-Massey	30	32	14	14	7	8	11	12	15	15
Papakura	16	17	15	15	8	11	8	9	13	14
Manurewa	24	26	11	12	6	9	7	7	12	13
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	21	23	9	9	10	12	11	11	11	12
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	13	14	8	8	7	9	10	10	9	10
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	14	14	7	7	7	9	8	8	8	8

Table 1: Urban ngahere in Auckland's urban local board areas: data includes percentage cover (to nearest whole number) of urban ngahere for different land tenures, and the overall percentage cover of urban ngahere within each board, with a comparison between the 2013 and 2016/2018 data sets.

Te matomatotanga o Te Ngahere-a-Tāone Te Rohe o Howick

3.2 Canopy Distribution across Howick Local Board

The urban ngahere is not distributed evenly throughout the local board, as shown in **Figures 1 and 2**, which display variation by statistical area. Urban ngahere covers 16% of the Howick Local Board area as a whole. However, when excluding the rural parts of Howick and considering only the urbanised areas, the level of canopy cover is closer to 11%. This is a low figure for an urban area and well below the level of cover targeted within Auckland's Urban Ngahere Strategy. This strategy has a goal of achieving an average 30% canopy cover across all of urban Auckland, with no local board area having less than 15% cover (Auckland Council, 2019a).

The reliance on the rural fringe of Howick in raising its overall level of tree cover is highlighted by the fact that, despite making up less than a quarter of the board's land area, it contains nearly half of its urban ngahere cover. Small losses of rural land to urbanisation would be likely to have a disproportionate effect on the urban ngahere, both in terms of overall tree cover and by affecting a greater proportion of large trees.

Over half (51%) of the local board is covered in impervious surfaces, which presents an opportunity to plant urban ngahere, particularly in the road corridor, as a direct remedy. Trees are a well-known solution for stormwater management, as their extensive canopies and subsurface root systems are capable of capturing and pumping substantial amounts of water, providing cooling effects (Berland et al. 2017). Establishing trees within impervious surfaces will act to intercept rainfall before it reaches the ground and slows inflow rates. This has follow on benefits for stormwater management systems such as underground pipes and nearby waterways (Dwyer and Miller 1999). Opportunities exist for new tree planting in the road corridor which will assist in stormwater management by capturing stormwater flows via interception and infiltration. Trees and other 'green infrastructure' solutions, including rain gardens, permeable pavements, bioswales, and green roofs, are worth implementing at a greater scale and should be encouraged. There has not been a significant change in urban tree coverage on a local scale, as shown in **Figure 2**. In general, statistical areas of Howick have had only a minor net increase or minor net decrease in canopy cover. The only current concern may be Donegal Park, with already low tree coverage, had a minor net decrease in cover between the two data sets. Upon examination this appears to be attributed to small scale residential tree removal and trimming of larger trees.



Matanginui/Green Mount, East Tāmaki, Auckland



Te matomatotanga o Te Ngahere-a-Tāone Te Rohe o Howick



Figure 1: 2016/18 Canopy Cover by Statistical Areas

Te matomatotanga o Te Ngahere-a-Tāone Te Rohe o Howick



Figure 2: Spatial distribution of urban ngahere canopy within the statistical areas of Howick Local Board


3.3 Urban Ngahere Canopy Height

LiDAR data includes a height component, and this information was used to split the recorded canopy cover into different height categories: 3-5 metres; 5-10 metres; 10-15 metres; 15-20 metres; 20-30 metres; and taller than 30 metres. This data is representative of canopy cover height, rather than tree height, as each individual tree may be recorded in several categories.

The height class distribution of the urban ngahere canopy within Howick Local Board is displayed in **Figure 3**. In 2013, 26% of the canopy cover was between 3-5 metres tall, 40% 5-10 metres tall, and the remaining 34% was canopy taller than 10 metres. This distribution remained similar in the 2016/2018 data sets, although the percentage of canopy cover over between 3-5 metres tall increased to 32% of the forest canopy. This data shows only low presence of tall canopy cover within the local board area, with all canopy cover taller than 15 metres (including height categories 15-20 metres, 20-30 metres, and 30 metres plus) representing approximately 12% of the total urban ngahere canopy cover assessed and are mainly found in bush remnants and the rural fringes, particularly within East Tāmaki Heights and Flat Bush.

Research has shown that many of the benefits attributed to urban ngahere are disproportionally provided by larger trees (Davies et al. 2011, Moser et al. 2015). Large trees typically create more shade per tree due to a larger and wider canopy spread (Moser et al. 2015); intercept larger amounts of particulate pollutants and rainfall due to significantly larger leaf areas; contain more carbon and have higher carbon sequestration rates (Beets et al. 2012, Schwendenmann and Mitchell 2014, Dahlhausen et al. 2016).

Additionally, trees are often less susceptible to careless or malicious vandalism by the general public once established; can be pruned to provide higher canopy clearance over roadways; carparks and pedestrian footpaths; typically contribute more to calming and slowing traffic on local streets than small trees; and absorb more gaseous pollutants. It is therefore an immediate priority to retain existing large trees across the local board area to ensure the positive benefits of these are not lost, as also emphasised in the Urban Ngahere Strategy (Auckland Council 2019a). The relatively high proportion of shorter canopy cover across the local board (32% 3-5m tall and 39% 5-10m tall) in the 2016/2018 data set, indicates a relatively recent surge of tree planting, assuming the smaller stature canopy corresponds to younger trees, rather than shrubs which are limited at their mature height. When grouped by land use type, it can be seen how the contribution of the trees in rural Howick skews the figures for the board as a whole, with this area containing approximately 50% less canopy cover under five metres tall as a proportion of overall cover than in urban Howick, and has nearly twice the proportion of canopy cover over ten metres tall.



Figure 3: Height class distribution of urban ngahere canopy across all land tenures within Howick Local Board

Ngahereagely Top 77 te 2021 8

3.4 Urban Ngahere Tenure

The tenure of urban ngahere described in this report relates to the zoning and ownership of different land parcels within the local board. Publicly owned land is described as either 'public parks' or 'other public land' (e.g. schools, Council-owned property), trees in the road corridor/road reserves are described as 'street trees', and privately owned land (residential or commercial) is described as 'private land'.

The tenure distribution of urban ngahere canopy within the Howick Local Board is displayed in **Figure 4**. Nearly three quarters (74%) of the urban ngahere in Howick, much of which is unprotected, is located on private property. Public parks and other publicly owned land (e.g., schools) contain a similar proportion of urban ngahere, being 15% and 11% of the total urban ngahere cover, respectively.

Howick Local Board stands out in the regional data as having a very low degree of tree coverage (8% in 2016/18) within its road reserves (Table 1), which may reflect the relatively recent construction of a large part of the road network and, to some degree, poor planting choices and practices in the newer suburbs. This situation presents an opportunity for enhancing the urban ngahere by infill planting of carefully chosen street trees, that will provide benefits long term to local communities.

Planting may also be considered on rural roads, the canopy within which makes up only 2% of the rural tree coverage. With only 5% canopy cover on other public land



Figure 4: Tenure of urban ngahere canopy within Howick Local Board (2013 data set)

in rural parts of the local board, there may also be an opportunity to encourage planting within this category of land such as schools and colleges, where additional educational benefits may be gained.

In addition to having low levels of canopy cover, roads also exhibit generally small tree size, with only 13% being over ten metres tall, compared to 39% for parks. This reflects the more cramped growing environment within the road corridor (particularly below ground) and the more frequent cycling of tree stock as trees are regularly removed and replaced to allow for infrastructure works.

Public parks have the highest proportion of urban ngahere relative to area out of all the land tenures, as shown in **Figure 5**, followed by private land. There has been a minor net increase in urban ngahere canopy in public parks, as well as road reserves and other public land, between the two survey data sets. The percentage canopy cover of private land has stayed the same.

Public parks are good place to focus additional urban ngahere planting as they comprise approximately 10% of the local board land area and are widely distributed. In addition, public parks offer the best opportunities for long-term sustainable management of the urban ngahere due to the lower chance of conflict with future housing intensification.



Figure 5: Change in urban ngahere cover of different land tenures in Howick Local Board between 2013 and 2016/18



3.5 Urban Ngahere in Relation to Growth Pressures

The Significant Ecological Area overlay (SEA; **Figure 6**) prioritises the areas of urban ngahere in Howick with the highest ecological value, providing a starting point for protection. With future development and urban intensification, however, SEA and other continuous areas of urban ngahere are at risk. Canopy cover in relation to the Auckland Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (Auckland Council 2017) forecasting areas of growth is shown in **Figure 7**.

There is increased pressure on the urban ngahere in Howick through a combination of greenfield development, lack of suitable growing space, and conflicts with infrastructure. An increase in urban ngahere cover in local parks and residential suburbs will provide more universal benefits as a greater number of people are likely to encounter the forest and connect to nature. Urban ngahere on public land provides opportunities to connect with communities, enhanced biodiversity, educational opportunities and helps to develop a sense of place.

The lack of scheduled notable trees in the southern half of Howick is another issue that may warrant investigation, as there may potentially be trees that have so far been overlooked but would meet the necessary standards for inclusion on the schedule. This may particularly be the case in parts of Flat Bush currently under development, where large, high value trees are scattered within former farmland and riparian margins.

Protecting existing and adding to the numbers of trees in the road corridor is an important and ongoing measure to retain and extend urban ngahere cover, as the tree cover in the road corridor is currently low. The importance of trees in the street environment is going to increase, and will, in time, incorporate the only accessible trees for some residents.

To this end, the Howick Local Board is encouraged to work with Auckland Council to readdress the current rules for tree and vegetation protection, especially in relation to highlighting the importance of large trees and the multiple benefits they offer to the local community.



Notable trees, Howick, Auckland

Te matomatotanga o Te Ngahere-a-Tāone Te Rohe o Howick



Figure 6: 2016/18 Canopy Height & Significant Ecological Areas

Te matomatotanga o Te Ngahere-a-Tāone Te Rohe o Howick



Te matomatotanga o Te Ngahere-a-Tāone Te Rohe o Howick

3.6 Recommendations

The assessment of urban tree cover in the Howick Local Board presented in this update report aims to assist in the knowing phase of the Auckland Urban Forest Strategy. The analysis of existing tree cover distribution, structure, tenure, and protection, provides the local board with a basis for determining where to focus efforts in improving urban ngahere cover during the growing phase, to be initiated in the near future.

Recommendations for future urban ngahere management to the Howick Local Board include:

- Prioritise the efforts of the Howick Urban Ngahere Action Plan 2021 to plant new trees in parks and streets
- raise awareness of the current rules for tree and vegetation notable Tree overlay
- strengthen local funding initiatives to engage with, educate, and support private owners of land featuring valuable trees

- set an initial goal of achieving a minimum of 15% urban ngahere cover within the fully urban portion of Howick
- initiate tree planting where possible in unused corners or edges of parks, including the designation of the former Greenmount landfill as a reserve
- identify parks containing playgrounds with low tree shading (e.g., Simon Owen Place Reserve and Monash Park) and obtain funding for large grade specimen trees to plant
- prioritise tree planting in predominantly industrial/ commercial suburbs with low canopy cover, e.g., East Tāmaki, Huntington Park, Clover Park and Highland Park.

The metrics of the canopy analysis will be used to help inform and prioritise the efforts of the Howick Urban Ngahere Action Plan. The action plan highlights the areas to plant new trees and sets out the process to fund, implement, and find ways to protect and nurture existing ngahere on public and private land.



Palm avenue planted along Te Irirangi Drive, East Tāmaki, Auckland

4.0 Acknowledgements

The following parties are acknowledged for their roles in the preparation of this document:

- Content prepared by Carolina Stavert and Jessica Reaburn (Wildland Consultants Ltd).
- Technical advice and peer review completed by Howell Davies (Principal Advisor Urban Ngahere (Forest), Community Services – Parks, Sports & Recreation, Auckland Council).
- Data and GIS-based figures prepared by Grant Lawrence (Research and Evaluation Unit, Auckland Council).
- Photographs supplied by Auckland Council and Wildland Consultants Ltd.
- Graphics and formatting completed by Q Brand Builders.

The authors would also like to thank the Howick Local Board for their support and direction during the development of this report and its content.

5.0 References

Auckland Council (2017). Auckland Future Urban Land Supply Strategy. <u>https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.</u> <u>nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plansstrategies/topic-based-plans-strategies/housing-plans/ Documents/future-urban-land-supply-strategy.pdf</u>

Auckland Council (2019a). Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy. Published by Auckland Council's Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department, March 2019. <u>https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/</u> <u>plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plans-</u> <u>strategies/topic-based-plans-strategies/environmental-</u> <u>plans-strategies/Documents/urban-ngahere-forest-</u> <u>strategy.pdf</u>

Auckland Council (2019b), unpublished. Howick Local Board Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report September 2019. Prepared for the Howick Local Board Locally Driven Initiatives – Ngahere Work Programme: Year 1 Knowing Phase.

Auckland Council (2019c). Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan. Developed from Auckland's Climate Action Framework consultation summary published by Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department, June 2019. <u>https://www.aucklandcouncil.</u> govt.nz/environment/Documents/te-taruke-a-tawhiriauckland-climate-plan.pdf

Beets, P. N., M. O. Kimberley, G. R. Oliver, S. H. Pearce, J. D. Graham and A. Brandon (2012). *Allometric Equations for Estimating Carbon Stocks in Natural Forest in New Zealand.* Forests 3: 818-839.

Berland, A., Shiflett, S.A., Shuster, W.D., Garmestani, A.S., Goddard, H.C., Herrmann, D.L. and Hopton, M.E. (2017). *The role of trees in urban stormwater management.* Landscape and Urban Planning 162: 167-177.

Brown, M. A., Simcock, R. and S. Greenhalgh (2015). Protecting the Urban Forest. Landcare Research Manaaki Whenua Policy Brief No. 13 (Issn: 2357-1713).

Dahlhausen, J., P. Biber, T. Rötzer, E. Uhl and H. Pretzsch (2016). *Tree Species and Their Space Requirements in Six Urban Environments Worldwide.* Forests 7: 111-130.

Davies, Z. G., J. L. Edmondson, A. Heinemeyer, J. R. Leake and K. J. Gaston (2011). *Mapping an urban ecosystem service: quantifying above-ground carbon storage at a citywide scale.* Journal of Applied Ecology 48(5): 1125-1134.

Dwyer, M.C. and Miller, R.W. 1999. *Using GIS to assess urban tree canopy benefits and surrounding greenscape distributions.* Journal of Arboriculture 25(2): 102-107.

Moser, A., T. Rötzer, S. Pauleit and H. Pretzsch (2015). Structure and ecosystem services of small-leaved lime (Tilia cordata Mill.) and black locust (Robinia pseudoacacia L.) in urban environments. Urban Forestry and Urban Greening 14: 1110-1121.

Schwendenmann, L. and N. D. Mitchell (2014). *Carbon accumulation by native trees and soils in an urban park, Auckland.* New Zealand Journal of Ecology 38 (2): 213-220.

Wilcox, M., D. (2012). Auckland's Remarkable Urban Forest. Epsom, Auckland, Auckland Botanical Society.





The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Laura Unasa

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: lauraandperry@xtra.co.nz

Contact phone number: 021874082

Postal address: 198 Seventh View Ave Beachlands Auckland 2018

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are: • Project scope • Walking and cycling networks • Reduction in urban ngahere • Increased flooding risk

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

The project has always been Airport to Botany - rapid transit network (RTN) (the project). The current RLTP highlights delivering a significant increase in rapid transit travel options (fast, frequent, high capacity bus and train services separated from general traffic). Walking and Cycling are not forms of rapid transit. These should not be included in this projects scope. An example of how the project has been described to stakeholders and the public is "The next stages to be delivered under this RLTP involve protecting the future A2B rapid transit corridor, between Auckland Airport and Botany via Manukau, and extending the new AirportLink bus to Botany via Te Irirangi Drive. Extending the AirportLink bus to Botany will be supported by bus interchanges and priority improvements along Te Irirangi Drive, with a move toward a rapid transit corridor in future decades." There is no mention of walking and cycling. Therefore, the stakeholders and public have been misled. Support was gained prior to the inclusion of walking and cycling facilities. The consequences of including improved walking and cycling facilities along both sides of the corridor into the project scope is a significant increase in project costs, an enormous reduction in trees and the urban ngahere canopy coverage across this area, increased flooding risk and climate impacts, an increase in the urban heat and island effect, decreased visual amenity, loss of shade, decreased health and wellbeing to the public and decreased air quality. These impacts are significant and outweigh the benefits of pouring concrete in place of these trees for walking and cycling facilities. There is already footpaths. It is legal for cyclists to ride on the roads. An alternative would be to incorporate a cycling network into the median strip of Ti Irirangi Drive where the RTN busway will go as this will have such few buses, at most, one every 15 minutes I assume and the road is very long and straight so the bus and cyclist will see each other. I don't believe this project has been



transparent with making stakeholders aware of the impacts of including the improved walking and cycling networks into this project. It has been a late addition and one I would deem as misleading after support for the project was gained. I am appalled decision makers have agreed to the destruction of thousands of trees to pour concrete to allow a better footpath / cycling path when this already exists. I don't agree with the statement that that is what public feedback has said. The public would not want improved walking and cycling networks by the destruction of thousands of trees. Should this project proceed unchanged, the inclusion of the walking and cycling aspect no longer adheres to Te-Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan, specifically Action Area N2 and Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy. The specific principals this violates is - Grow our rural and urban ngahere (forest) Action area N2: Grow and protect our rural and urban ngahere (forest) to maximise carbon capture and build resilience to climate change. And • Increase indigenous tree plantings in road corridors, parks and open spaces. Each CCO must work within Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Action Framework. I am not opposed to the RTN along the median strip of Ti Irirangi Drive and would like the project scope and the Notice of Requirement designation reduced to include only the median strip of land.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: Request the project scope be reduced to a rapid transit network - Airport to Botany which includes: a) a dedicated Bus Rapid Transit corridor, centre-running along Te Irirangi Drive b) Bus Rapid Transit stations at Smales Road, Accent Drive, and Ormiston Road – Botany Junction Shopping Centre c) swales and wetlands d) areas for construction related activities including yards, site compounds, and bridge and structure works. Oppose the inclusion of improved walking and cycling facilities along both sides of the corridor due to the destruction of thousands of trees to pour concrete for this. Oppose the removal of trees lining both sides of the corridor along Ti Irirangi Drive creating good canopy coverage and reduced flooding risks to nearby residents. Request the designation of the Notice of Requirement is restricted to the median strip along Ti Irirangi Drive only (and including any areas required for stations) as this is sufficient enough to complete the rapid transit network - Airport to Botany as per the original intent of the project.

Submission date: 11 April 2023

Supporting documents urban-ngahere-forest-strategy_20230411200757.574.pdf howick-canopy-analysis-report-2021_20230411200805.949.pdf

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy



He Mihi

Nau mai e te hā o Tāne, Whakatau mai e te oranga o Tāne.

Tīkina mai te ate rahirahi o te Tāone nui o Tāmaki Makaurau hei whakaniko anō ai i te whenua tapu; ko tō whaea, ko Papatūānuku.

Kia toro ake ōna hua me ōna pai kia tauawhia e tō matua e Rangi-nui e tū iho nei, kia rongohia anō te tīhau a ngā manu, me te kētete a ngā pēpeke.

Kia wawara anō te reo o ngā rākau kua roa e ngū ana ki te wao kōhatu e tāwharau nei i ngā maunga tapu o tō whenua taketake.

Tane-o-te-waiora,

Tāne-whakapiripiri,

Tāne-nui-a-rangi, tukua mai anō tō ihi, tukua mai anō tō mana.

Māu e kitea anō ai he awa para-kore e rere ana, he hau mā e kōrewarewa ana, he taiao hauora e takoto ana.

Kia hipokina anō e tō korowai kākāriki te tāone nui kia whiwhi ko mātou, kia whiwhi te ao katoa.

He whakatupu ngātahi i te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau e matomato ai te hua ā ngā rā e tū mai nei

Together, growing Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #333aurau

Tāne let your breath pervade all, may your life-essence be ever-present.

Reclaim the very heart of Auckland city and adorn once again the hallowed ground; that is your mother, Papatūānuku.

May all that is fruitful and good reach skyward to the embrace of your father Rangi-nui on high so the chorus of birds may be heard again, and the splendid symphony of insects in response.

Bring with you the sounds of rustling trees that have long stood silent to this concrete jungle that bounds the sacred mountains of your primal domain.

Tāne-purveyor of life,

Tāne-provider-of-shelter,

Tāne-source-of-all-knowledge, bestow us again with your wonder, and grace us with your prestige.

By you, we will again realise fresh waterways, pure air, and a healthier environment.

Garb the city with your verdant cloak that we, your heirs might benefit, and so too, the whole world.





Kupu whakataki Foreword

A healthy urban ngahere (forest) enriches our communities, our local economies and our natural environment. Auckland cannot become a world-class city without one.

Whether you are from Takanini or Takapuna, Herne Bay or Henderson, trees and vegetation are valuable to all of us. They clean our air and stormwater, cool and beautify our urban spaces and bring nature to our doorsteps. Developed in partnership with tangata whenua, the strategy gives voice to an important role trees play in the mauri of the land. They provide a wide range of measurable benefits that make our lives healthier, happier and more gratifying.

How can we protect what we value in the face of a growing and urbanising population, rising inequality, and the major impacts of invasive pests and climate change? How do we maintain and enhance the richness that our urban ngahere provides? How do we align our efforts?

This is precisely why we have developed a strategy for Auckland's urban ngahere. It delivers on the vision for our future Auckland, ensuring each one of us – and future Aucklanders - have access to the tangible benefits provided by a vibrant, green city.

The strategy ensures that when Auckland Council, corporate partners, community groups and each one of us plants or maintains a tree, our collective efforts truly add up to something – contributing towards increasing our average canopy cover from 18 to 30 per cent. Likewise, the strategy helps target our efforts to grow the urban ngahere where it's scarce - as in parts of South Auckland - so that all local board areas have at least 15 per cent canopy cover.

This strategy provides an overarching vision and 18 high level actions under three main themes, Knowing, Growing and Protecting but doesn't provide all the answers or deliver the vision. We will need to work with each of you and across all local boards to tailor specific and unique approaches to implementation that respond to the local context, harnessing and building local talents, partnerships and resources along the way.

I invite you to join me. Let's work together to grow, protect and maintain our valuable urban ngahere for a greener and greater Auckland for all of us.

Councillor Penny Hulse Chair, Environment and Community Committee





Kei te puku Contents

1.	A strategic plan for Auckland's urban ngahere (forest)		
	1.1.	What is Auckland's urban ngahere?	10
	1.2.	Benefits of Auckland's urban ngahere	14
	1.3.	Current policy context for our urban ngahere	20
2.	Current status of our urban ngahere		22
	2.1.	Distribution of canopy cover	23
	2.2.	Height distribution	
	2.3.	Level of protection	
3.	Current and future pressures		
	3.1.	A growing population and urban intensification	
	3.2.	Climate change	
	3.3.	Pressure on water infrastructure	
	3.4.	Pests and diseases	
4.	Strategic framework		
	4.1.	Vision	41
	4.2.	Objectives	42
	4.3.	Mechanisms	
	4.4.	Principles	
5.	Strategy outcomes		50
	5.1.	Knowing outcomes	51
	5.2.	Growing outcomes	53
	5.3.	Protecting outcomes	54
	5.4.	Mechanism outcomes	55
6.	Implementation framework		56
	6.1.	Urban ngahere strategy collaboration	57
	6.2.	Funding and partnerships	58
	6.3.	Area specific implementation	58
	6.4.	High level actions	59
7.	Refe	rences	62







He mahere rautaki mō te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau A strategic plan for Auckland's urban ngahere (forest)

When Tāne went to the heavens – so the story goes – he was enraptured by the tūī that lived in his brother Rehua's hair. Tāne desperately wanted to bring the tūī back to earth but he was told he must first plant trees to provide food. So Tāne introduced trees to our world and, three years later when the kahikatea blossomed, Tāne's wish came true. The tūī came to live with him.

When it comes to trees, the message is much the same. If we plant trees now, in time, we create value for our communities. We might even hear the dawn chorus – $e k\bar{o} i te ata$ – once again within urban Auckland.

Auckland is growing and changing rapidly. To accommodate this, Auckland Council has committed to a strategy of urban intensification to increase housing density, deliver the benefits associated with a compact urban form and limit the negative impacts linked with continued outward growth. Successful development requires careful planning; intensification and growth need to complement the protection and planting of trees and vegetation to create liveable neighbourhoods. Trees and vegetation also provide a range of services required for Auckland to function and thrive. These include enhanced stormwater management, air pollution removal, improved water quality, cooling to reduce the urban heat island effect, and ecological corridors to connect habitats and improve biodiversity.

Our urban ngahere faces a number of pressures. Alongside the need for urban development, amendments to the Resource Management Act (RMA) came into effect in 2015, lifting blanket tree protection in urban areas. As a result, the vast majority of trees on private urban properties are no longer protected. Threats from pests and diseases, as well as the impacts of climate change are further challenges. If we want to continue to benefit from the services provided by our urban ngahere it is essential that we better understand its status and value and plan to protect and grow it. Our urban ngahere has the mauri (life force) to care for us but needs our help to be sustainable and healthy.





1.1 He aha te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Mākaurau? What is Auckland's urban ngahere?

Auckland's urban ngahere is the realm of Te Waonui o Tāne (the forest domain of Tāne Mahuta) and consists of the network of all trees, other vegetation and green roofs – both native and introduced – in existing and future urban areas.

It's important to recognise the urban ngahere as more than just trees and vegetation. Urban ngahere captures the interconnected whakapapa (genealogy) of all living things to the wider ecosystem. It consists of a complex network weaving through public and private land, and includes the water, soil, air and sunlight that support it. It also involves people, wildlife and the built environment – all of which impact upon, or are impacted by, the urban ngahere. The urban ngahere has its own mauri (life force) but also depends upon a range of conditions and relationships to support its health, growth and survival.

Auckland's urban ngahere is diverse; it includes trees and vegetation in road corridors, parks and

open spaces, natural stormwater assets, community gardens, living walls, green roofs and trees and vegetation in the gardens of private properties. The urban ngahere, like the pōhutukawa fringing Auckland's coastline, is an important part of Auckland's identity and natural heritage and shapes the fabric of the landscape. Trees also help distinguish our heritage places and areas, such as Albert, Western and Myers Parks, early cemeteries, for example, Symonds Street and Waikumete, and the settings of properties, including Monte Cecilia and Alberton. In addition, Auckland's scheduled character areas often feature memorial plantings and early street plantings.





Examples of Auckland's urban ngahere:

Parks and open space





Potters Park, Mt Eden

Orewa Beach

Street trees and road corridors



Franklin Road, Ponsonby

Federal Street shared space

Private gardens



Island Bay, Birkdale

Blockhouse Bay





Native forest

Natural stormwater assets



Te Auaunga Awa / Oakley Creek

Green roofs and living walls



The University of Auckland green roof

Private residential green roof





Tī Kōuka / Cabbage tree

Kererū / New Zealand pigeon

Rain garden, Wynyard Quarter





Ngā painga o te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau Benefits of Auckland's urban ngahere 1.2

The range of social, environmental, economic and cultural benefits that urban trees deliver is well-documented, with cities increasingly recognising the financial value of the services they provide. The USDA Forest Service estimated that trees in New York City provide US\$5.60 in benefits for every US\$1 spent on tree planting and care.¹ Growing and protecting our urban ngahere is essential to maintain and enhance the broad range of services it provides:



Improve health and wellbeing

Reduce the urban heat island effect

Provide shade

Enhance visual amenity



Enhance biodiversity

Improve air quality

Carbon sequestration

Improve water quality Increase property values

Reduce flood risk

Economic

Reduce energy costs

Reduce healthcare costs

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #33urau



Support education

Local food growing

Sustain and enhance mauri

Cultural heritage

Page 11585



Improve health and wellbeing

Research has shown that access to trees and nature can reduce stress, improve mental health and promote wellbeing² whilst tree lined streets have been shown to encourage walking.



Reduce the urban heat island effect

The cooling effect of trees, as a result of evapotranspiration, reduces the urban heat island effect³ and enhances Auckland's resilience to an increasing number of hot days (>25°C), one of the projected impacts of climate change.



Provide shade

Trees shading school grounds, playgrounds, public spaces, and cycling and walking routes provide relief from the sun and protect people from harmful ultraviolet (UV) radiation, in turn reducing the risk of heat stroke, sunburn and melanoma.



Enhance visual amenity

Trees can visually enhance a street, the character of an area and foster neighbourhood pride. They add beauty, soften harsh urban environments and screen unsightly views.

Environmental



Enhance biodiversity

A healthy urban ngahere enriches biodiversity and provides opportunities for connected habitats that support wildlife.



Improve water quality

Trees intercept rainwater and reduce the amount of pollutants being washed from hard surfaces into the stormwater system and watercourses. Increasing canopy cover will also contribute towards fewer storm water overflows from our combined sewer/stormwater systems and therefore lower levels of water pollution in our harbours and streams.



Carbon sequestration

Trees reduce carbon dioxide (CO₂) in the atmosphere through sequestering carbon in new growth. One tonne of carbon stored in wood is equivalent to removing 3.67 tonnes of CO2 from the atmosphere.



Improve air quality

Trees improve air quality by removing air pollutants, such as particulate matter, and absorb gases harmful to human health. A 2006 study estimated that Auckland's urban trees remove 1320 tonnes of particulates, 1230 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide and 1990 tonnes of ozone.⁴

Economic



healthcare costs

Improving air quality and enhancing health and wellbeing will reduce the need for healthcare and associated costs.



flood risk

An increase in canopy cover would intercept an increased volume of rainwater; reducing and slowing urban runoff and placing less pressure on stormwater systems. International studies show that trees intercept 15 to 27 per cent of the annual rainfall that falls upon their canopy, depending on a tree's species and architecture.⁵



Increase property values

Studies have shown that mature street trees increase residential property values and attract buyers and tenants.



Reduce energy costs

Well-positioned trees provide shade and reduce cooling requirements and associated energy costs in buildings.

Cultural



Tree nurseries and planting projects promote environmental awareness and provide opportunities to encourage and facilitate learning.



The cultural benefits of Auckland's urban ngahere are diverse and priceless. Native forest is important to mātauranga Māori (knowledge and understanding), and trees create a cultural connection to place and history.



Sustain and enhance mauri

Mauri is a life force derived from whakapapa (genealogical connections and links to ecosystems), an essential element sustaining all forms of life. Mauri provides life and energy to all living things, including our urban ngahere, and is the binding force that links the physical to the spiritual worlds.⁶ Mauri can be harmed if the life-supporting capacity and ecosystem health of our urban ngahere is diminished. Protecting and growing our urban ngahere will sustain and enhance its mauri.



Local food growing

Planting fruit trees and establishing community orchards provides people with access to fresh fruit. Maintaining and harvesting fruit trees can connect and strengthen communities.



The cultural significance of Auckland's urban ngahere

The urban ngahere is an important part of Tāmaki Makaurau / Auckland's cultural heritage. Remnants of native forest represent traditional supermarkets (kai o te ngahere), learning centres (wānanga o te ngahere), the medicine cabinet (kapata rongoā), schools (kura o te ngahere) and spiritual domain (wairua o te ngahere).⁷ Trees also represent landing places of waka (canoe) and birth whenua (to Māori, it is customary to bury the whenua or placenta in the earth, returning it to the land).

Many of Auckland's trees provide a visible reference to the city's history and development. European settlers planted London plane trees along streets in the 1860s which have now grown to create grand tree-lined avenues in the city centre and the adjoining suburbs of Ponsonby, Freemans Bay and Grey Lynn. Bishop Selwyn, New Zealand's first Anglican Bishop, is reported to have brought hundreds of Norfolk Island pine seedlings to Auckland in 1858-60. Many of the mature Norfolk Island pines now in Auckland, such as those at Mission Bay, are likely to have been grown from these seedlings.8

A TAKE P LOUP AS





Te horopaki ā-kaupapa here mō ā tātou ngahere ā-tāone ināia tonu nei 1.3 Current policy context for our urban ngahere

Auckland's plans and polices recognise and reference the value of trees and vegetation to varying degrees but do not provide a clear framework for the management of Auckland's urban ngahere. A range of plans and polices influence our urban ngahere (Figure 1) – explicitly and implicitly – yet urban ngahere objectives are only incidental to other considerations, such as green growth, climate change, indigenous biodiversity, and encouraging

sport and recreation. In the past, this contributed to a situation in which Auckland's urban ngahere was managed and maintained through piecemeal initiatives rather than in a strategic and holistic way. This strategy consolidates and builds upon existing directives that support our urban ngahere and sets out a clear framework to protect and grow Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future.



Figure 1 – Key plans, strategies and guidance documents that influence Auckland's urban ngahere

The central city from above - London plane trees on Greys Avenue and Vincent Street (bottom left) and trees in Myers Park (bottom right) and Albert Park (top right).



Figure 2 – Average percentage canopy cover of urban ngahere (3m+ height) in Auckland suburbs – based on analysis of the 2013 LiDAR survey.

Te tūranga a ō tātou ngahere ā-tāone ināia tonu nei Current status of our urban ngahere

2.1 | Te hora o te uhinga rākau Distribution of canopy cover

Analysis of data from the 2013 LiDAR survey found that Auckland's urban area has just over 18 per cent canopy cover, with 10,130 hectares of canopy cover belonging to trees over three metres tall. This varied across different land types, with urban ngahere on 11 per cent of Auckland's road area, 24 per cent of public land, and 18 per cent of private land.

Figure 2 illustrates that Auckland's urban ngahere is distributed unequally throughout the city, with lower levels of canopy cover in southern suburbs, and relatively high canopy cover in northern and western parts of the city. Auckland's three leafiest suburbs are Titirangi, which adjoins the Waitakere Ranges (68 per cent canopy cover), Wade Heads (57 per cent) and Chatswood (55 per cent), where

What is LiDAR?

LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) is used to examine the surface of the Earth through collecting data from a survey aircraft. It measures scattered light to find a range and other information on a distant target. The range to the target is measured using the time delay between transmission of a pulse and detection of a reflected signal. This technology allows for the direct measurement of three-dimensional features and structures and the underlying terrain. The ability to measure the height of features on the ground or above the ground is the principle advantage over conventional optical remote sensing technologies such as aerial imagery.

LiDAR data itself does not provide information on the status of Auckland's urban ngahere, further analysis of the data is required to create a tree canopy layer and quantify the distribution and height of the urban ngahere.

- historically the landform was unsuitable for development. Unequal canopy cover distribution is particularly apparent at a local board area level (see Figure 3). The local boards with the lowest canopy cover are Māngere-Ōtāhuhu (eight per cent) and Ōtara-Papatoetoe (nine per cent). The local board with the highest canopy cover is Kaipātiki with 30 per cent canopy cover, two-thirds of which is in public open spaces.
- The majority of Auckland's urban ngahere 61 per cent – is located on privately-owned land. The remaining 39 per cent is on public land, with seven per cent on Auckland Council parkland, nine per cent on road corridors, and 23 per cent on other public land, such as schools (see Figure 4).



An aerial view of unequal canopy cover



80 70 60 Percentage (%) 50 40 30 20 10 Waitemata Whau Orakei Kaipatiki Puketapapa Albert - Eden

Figure 3 - canopy cover on different land tenures by local board area.



Figure 4 – proportion of canopy cover on different land ownership types (2013 LiDAR survey).







Why the unequal distribution?

There are a number of reasons for the difference in tree cover across the region, including land ownership (public/private), land use (urban/industrial/agricultural), geography and legal protections (eg Significant Ecological Areas and notable trees). Historically, the type of development and street layout also influenced the funding and space available for tree planting. For example, in areas developed for social housing, there was typically a low level of investment in tree planting, resulting in relatively few street trees. The age of a suburb can also be a factor, for example trees planted close to the city centre in the early days of Auckland's development have now matured (eg in Ponsonby). More recently, prior to the amalgamation of the region's councils into Auckland Council, some legacy council areas had active tree planting programmes.





2.2 | Te hora tū teitei Height distribution

The 2013 LiDAR survey reveals that tall trees are rare in our urban ngahere; only six per cent of the urban ngahere is over 20 metres in height, the majority, 64 per cent, is less than 10 metres (see Figure 5). This is partly due to the species that make up the urban ngahere and their height at maturity. In addition,

trees over 20 metres in height need to be in the right place to allow for growth and are likely to be at least 60 years old. Historically, most mature trees were removed as land was cleared for agriculture and Auckland developed.



Figure 5 – Percentage of urban ngahere across different height classes.

When it comes to trees, size does matter!

Benefits are disproportionally greater for larger trees. For example, big trees provide more shade because of their larger, wider canopy spread; their greater leaf areas and more extensive root systems intercept larger amounts of rainfall and stormwater; they absorb more gaseous pollutants, have higher carbon sequestration rates, and typically contribute more to calming and slowing traffic on local streets than small trees. Larger trees also usually have few or no low branches to interfere with activity at ground level, especially if pruned to provide higher canopy clearance over roads, public space and pedestrian footpaths.





2.3 | Te paerewa āraitanga Level of protection

Just 50 per cent of Auckland's urban ngahere has some degree of statutory protection. A high level of protection applies to urban ngahere in Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) which account for 62 per cent of all protected forest (although SEAs capture only about one-third of Auckland's total urban ngahere). A moderate level of protection is provided to urban ngahere in outstanding natural features or landscapes, open space conservation zones, coastal yards, riparian yards and lake protection zones. Some protection is provided to urban ngahere in coastal natural character areas or open space informal recreation zones. A low level of protection is given to urban ngahere in open space active recreation zones and road corridors.

The Notable Trees Schedule in the Unitary Plan is another form of protection. This schedule contains nearly 3000 items (representing some 6000 trees and groups of trees), the majority of which were 'rolled over' from legacy council schedules as part of the Unitary Plan process.

The proportion of protected urban ngahere varies widely from suburb to suburb, much like the level of urban ngahere canopy cover:

- Suburbs with large patches of indigenous ngahere that have been designated as Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) tend to have a high level of urban ngahere canopy cover and a high level of protection (eg Chatswood, Birkenhead and Titirangi).
- Leafy suburbs where the urban ngahere is dominated by exotic and native trees in private backyards (eg Remuera, Epsom and Mt Eden) have moderate to high canopy cover but a low level of protection.
- Some suburbs have a low level of urban ngahere canopy cover, but a relatively high proportion of the canopy cover has some form of protection (eg Māngere, Wiri and Manukau).
- A number of suburbs that have experienced recent urban growth currently have a low level of urban ngahere canopy cover and protection (eg Northpark, Golflands, Howick, New Lynn and New Windsor).







A Pin Oak being lowered into position by a mobile crane and planted at Britomart Place in approximately the 1950's. Credit: Robert Hepple

The Pin Oak pictured above in 2018 – now protected and on the Notable Trees Schedule. This tree is the central feature of a busy intersection, visually contributing to the local streetscape and visible from Quay Street, Beach Road, Anzac Avenue and Fort Street. It is also notable as a solitary specimen of a species that is not well represented in the locality.





Ngā pēhitanga o ināianei, anga atu anō hoki Current and future pressures

Te tupu haere o te tātai tāngata me 3.1 ngā whakakīkītanga āhua tāone A growing population and urban intensification

Auckland is experiencing unprecedented growth and is projected to grow substantially into the future. Around 1.66 million people currently live in Auckland; over the next 30 years this number could grow by another 720,000 people to reach 2.4 million. Auckland will need many more dwellings, possibly another 313,000, in addition to new infrastructure and community



facilities. Development will be focused within existing and future urban areas within the urban boundary (see Figure 6) and this will put significant pressure on the urban ngahere. Much of this growth will occur in existing urban areas through intensification; as land is redeveloped, unprotected trees are at risk of being removed to maximise the developable area of a site.





Figure 6 – Anticipated development in existing and future urban areas as outlined in the Development Strategy (2018).



Without properly recognising the value of trees and understanding the benefits they provide; urban growth is likely to occur at the expense of the urban ngahere. However, urban development and intensification also present opportunities to green our city – to plant and grow our urban ngahere and create new green urban environments in areas set to be urbanised over the next 30 years. Future urban areas are outlined in Auckland's Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (2017) and the Development Strategy (2018). These areas cover around 15,000 hectares, with the potential to accommodate approximately 137,000 dwellings and 1400 hectares of new business land.

3.2 | Te takahurihanga o te huarere Climate change

Climate change threatens our urban ngahere through changing seasonal rainfall patterns, more severe weather events, and increased susceptibility to pests and diseases. Auckland is projected to

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #33urau

Urban regeneration within the existing city limits, such as the implementation of the City Centre Waterfront Refresh Plan and redevelopment plans for suburbs, presents an opportunity to retrofit green spaces and replace lost trees. The benefits of keeping established trees and the opportunities for these to complement and add value to new developments needs to be recognised. Where development occurs around trees, implementing a best practice approach to tree protection significantly increases their survival rate.

experience increased occurrence of drought and reduced soil moisture. This requires us to better understand the threats to our urban ngahere and what can be done to protect it.



Ngā taimahatanga kei runga i ngā whakahaere ā-wai Pressure on water infrastructure 3.3

Auckland's water infrastructure is vital to ensure that Aucklanders have clean water to drink and use, that wastewater is disposed of safely, homes, businesses and infrastructure are protected from flooding, and waterways and harbours are healthy. Population growth is putting all components of Auckland's water infrastructure under pressure. At the same time, this infrastructure is ageing and needs to be managed to ensure its continued performance. Climate change will place additional pressure on water infrastructure as the frequency and intensity of storm events is predicted to increase.

The Auckland Plan 2050 sets a clear direction to use Auckland's growth and development to protect and enhance the environment.⁹ This includes a focus on using green infrastructure to deliver greater resilience, long-term cost savings and quality environmental outcomes.¹⁰ The Auckland Unitary Plan emphasises the use and enhancement of natural hydrological systems and green infrastructure during development to address pressures on stormwater infrastructure.¹¹ This strategic direction and focus on using green infrastructure provides an opportunity to grow Auckland's urban ngahere.

What is green infrastructure?

Green infrastructure is a strategically planned network of natural and semi-natural areas designed and managed to deliver multi-functional benefits such as stormwater management, water purification, filtration of airborne pollutants, space for recreation and climate mitigation and adaptation. Auckland's urban ngahere is an integral part of our green infrastructure network.



3.4 Ngā mate orotā me ngā mate urutā Pests and diseases

Animal pests and weeds threaten the urban ngahere, including the precious native forest remnants that are found in pockets on public and private land. Possums eat leaves, buds, flowers and young shoots, while weeds like climbing asparagus and monkey apple, smother or out-compete valued species.

Plant diseases are a serious threat to the future of our urban ngahere. Kauri dieback is causing localised extinctions, Dutch elm disease has been in Auckland for many years now, myrtle rust has also reached Auckland and is a risk to pohutukawa, bottlebrush, eucalyptus, and willow myrtle, all common street trees in central Auckland. Climate change is expected to create more favourable conditions for plant diseases to establish and spread. Successfully managing the urban ngahere means these threats must be understood and addressed, if we do not take sufficient action to address these threats, we place our urban ngahere at greater risk. Actions include pest and disease control, using a mix of species and, where possible, disease resistant variants of susceptible species in new plantings, and





by responding quickly and effectively to new and emerging threats. To better understand and address kauri dieback and myrtle rust, Auckland Council is working with central government agencies, Crown Research Institutes and academia.



Te tarāwaho rautaki Strategic framework

The strategic framework consists of a vision, three main objectives (Knowing, Growing and Protecting), two key mechanisms for delivering these objectives (Engage and Manage), and a set of nine supporting principles (Figure 7).





Page **35595**7³⁹

A flowering põhutukawa variety.

He whakatupu ngātahi i te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau e matomato ai te hua ā ngā rā e tū mai nei

Together, growing Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future

4.1 | Te tirohanga whānui Vision

Our vision is that Aucklanders are proud of their urban ngahere, that Auckland has a healthy and diverse network of green infrastructure, that it is flourishing across the region and is celebrated, protected, and cared for by all. The urban ngahere is equally distributed across our communities and brings significant benefits to the city. It contributes to our resilience, enhances stormwater management, delivers energy savings, supports biodiversity, and improves health outcomes and quality of life for all Aucklanders. Expanding and improving the urban ngahere is enabled through strong, collaborative partnerships across Auckland. Communities, government, businesses and citizens work together to make our urban ngahere flourish.

We will know we have been successful when we have:

 increased canopy cover across Auckland's urban area



- enhanced the associated social, environmental, economic and cultural benefits
- addressed unequal distribution of canopy cover through increasing canopy cover in neighbourhoods with previously low levels of cover
- increased the network of green infrastructure on public land
- improved linkages between green spaces by establishing ecological corridors
- effectively engaged with private landowners to support a thriving urban ngahere on private land
- planted diverse tree and plant species on public land
- shared knowledge of our urban ngahere
- instilled a sense of pride in Aucklanders for their urban ngahere.



Ngā whāinga Objectives 4.2



Auckland needs to know the status of its urban ngahere, the extent, number and distribution of trees, as well as their size, health and condition. Understanding the social, environmental, economic and cultural value of Auckland's ngahere and quantifying the benefits it provides will support better informed, strategic decisionmaking about its management and growth.

Growing

Auckland needs to grow its urban ngahere to multiply these benefits and address distributional inequity. By expanding and enriching its urban ngahere, Auckland will maximise the social, environmental, economic and cultural benefits that trees, shrubs and other vegetation bring to an urban environment.



Protecting existing ngahere is crucial to safeguarding the added values and benefits mature trees provide. Caring for saplings is critical for ensuring older trees are replenished before the end of their life, our urban ngahere grows over time, and publicly-funded planting is successful.

Ngā tikanga whakahaere Mechanisms 4.3

To achieve these objectives, Auckland Council needs to engage and manage.



Engage with partners and stakeholders – with mana whenua, residents, private landowners, community organisations and the private sector to ensure the urban ngahere is well managed, its benefits are well recognised and that growing and protecting the urban ngahere on public and private land is widely supported.



Manage the city's urban ngahere on public land through coordinated planning, strategic planting, smart and innovative urban design while facilitating best practice standards for work on and around trees through maintenance contracts.



Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #33urau



4.4 Ngā mātāpono Principles

1. Right tree in the right place

It's important to consider growing conditions and their impact on proposed tree species, soil type, drainage, slope, sunlight access, the presence of pests and weeds and the potential current and future impacts of proposed tree species on the nature and function of a place. Growth rate and size of a proposed tree species at maturity should be basic considerations in determining suitability for a specific site. Planting the right tree in the right place is an important factor in minimising future maintenance requirements and costs.



Figure 8 – Consider the context of the site and plant the right tree in the right place

2. Preference for native species

The Auckland Unitary Plan encourages the use of indigenous trees and vegetation for roadside plantings and open spaces to recognise and reflect cultural, amenity, landscape and ecological values. Planting exotic trees may be appropriate in some cases, eg where there is a need for deciduous trees to provide solar access in winter, or fruit trees to establish community orchards. Exotic trees may also be suitable for cultural or heritage reasons in specific locations.





3. Ensure urban forest diversity

Planting a range of species increases the urban ngahere's resilience to the impacts of diseases, pests, and climate change. Planting a diverse range of species will ensure only a portion of the urban ngahere will be affected as diseases and pests tend to be limited to a certain tree species or genus. It is also important to maintain genetic diversity for each species to support better resilience, for example through our seed collection programme. Planting trees with varying lifespans helps to avoid a large-scale decline in numbers as trees with similar lifespans reach the end of their lives.

4. Protect mature, healthy trees

The benefits provided by trees become exponentially greater as they mature. It's also more cost effective to care for mature trees, as this typically costs less than planting and caring for new trees. The only way to replace a 40-year-old tree is to spend 40 years caring for a new tree.

People often have strong emotional connections to landmark, mature trees in their neighbourhoods, and are more likely to mourn the loss of a large tree. Additionally, some native species, such as kākā, and bats, prefer taller trees and their presence can significantly improve the biodiversity value of an area.







5. Create ecological corridors and connections

The urban ngahere is home to a range of ecological groups, such as birds, insects, moths and butterflies. It brings nature into urban environments, a place where the majority of Aucklanders (90 per cent) live and spend most of their time. It can also provide ecological corridors for species migrating through urban environments (see Figure 9). Connecting Auckland's urban ngahere, particularly remnant natural areas, to create ecological corridors and

connections between green spaces is important to enhance biodiversity.

6. Access for all residents

The unequal distribution of canopy cover across Auckland needs to be addressed when new plantings are planned. Considerations include the delivery of urban ngahere benefits, public demand for a higher canopy cover and physical access to the urban ngahere in a local area.



7. Manage urban forest on public and private land

Around 61 per cent of Auckland's urban ngahere canopy is on privately-owned land, with 39 per cent on public land. However, many of the benefits of trees are realised beyond private property boundaries and by many more people than just individual landowners. A loss of urban ngahere on private land is also a loss for the city. While there are opportunities for Auckland Council to grow and protect the urban ngahere on public land, the overall status of the urban ngahere is, to a large degree, dependent on the decisions of private landowners. Managing Auckland's urban ngahere requires private landowners' support and cooperation. Engagement is crucial and is one of two key delivery mechanisms for the proposed strategic framework.



8. Deploy regulatory and non-regulatory tools

Auckland Council has a range of regulatory tools to protect the urban ngahere, such as rules relating to Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs), the schedule of Notable trees, and rules to limit the extent of vegetation removal in sensitive environments, like streams and coastlines. These regulatory tools apply to trees and vegetation on private properties. However, since amendments to the Resource Management Act (RMA) came into effect in 2015, lifting blanket tree protection in urban areas councils depend mainly on non-regulatory tools to control the removal of trees and vegetation on private properties. Examples include landowner advice and assistance with tree care and planting, community education and outreach programmes, and raising awareness of the value and benefits of the urban ngahere.

Page **176051**⁴⁷

9. Manage the whole lifecycle of urban trees

Achieving the long-term vision to grow Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future not only depends on planting more trees and vegetation but also looking after them during their lifecycle. New plantings may not be able to flourish (or even survive) without ongoing aftercare and maintenance. Investing in maintenance and proactive management will yield greater long-term benefits, as well as ensure money is well spent, with less wastage and repeated effort.



Figure 9 - the potential for ecological connections across urban and rural landscapes (adapted from Meurk & Hall, 2006¹²)



48




Ngā hua ā-rautaki Strategy Outcomes

The strategy outcomes are underpinned by an implementation framework and high level actions outlined in the next section.

5.1 | Te mōhio ki ngā mea ka hua Knowing outcomes

To better understand the status and value of Auckland's urban ngahere.

Improved knowledge will assist us to make more informed and strategic decisions on how to manage our urban ngahere.

The knowing outcomes will give us a better understanding of the status and trends of important indicators, such as canopy cover, height and age distribution and species diversity across both public and private land. Understanding these factors will enable us to better evaluate and understand the value of our urban ngahere. i-Tree Eco software¹³ could present an opportunity to do this, however at present additional research is required to fully adapt i-Tree data and analysis to a New Zealand context.

A better understanding of the trends and status of the canopy cover can direct planting efforts to where the most value can be realised. Potential future impacts and pressures on Auckland's urban ngahere, such as climate change and new pests and diseases, can also be better managed and minimised.

Table 1 – Knowing outcomes

Objective	Outcomes
	Better understanding of the status and trends on private and public land over time.
Knowing	Better understanding of the diverse values and benefits of Auckland's urban forest.
	Better understanding of existing and future risks and pressures.





Figure 10 - unequal canopy cover at a local board level (2013 LiDAR survey)



5.2 Te whakatupu i ngā mea ka hua Growing outcomes

To grow Auckland's urban ngahere and grow it more equitably.

Growing our urban ngahere will increase the average canopy cover and also provide a fairer distribution of the urban ngahere and associated benefits across Auckland (see Figure 10).

We can grow our urban ngahere and increase resilience to existing and future pressures, such as pests, diseases and climate change, through the application of the strategic framework's nine principles.

Table 2 – Growing outcomes

Objective	Outcomes
Growing	Increase the average canopy cover to 30 per cent across Auckland's urban area with no local board area having less than 15 per cent canopy cover.
	Increased resilience to existing and future pressures.



5.3 | Te tiaki i ngā mea ka hua Protecting outcomes

To protect and maintain Auckland's existing and future urban ngahere.

Protecting our existing urban ngahere is crucial to realising the values and benefits of mature trees. Caring for new plantings and young trees is essential to ensure that older trees are replaced at the end of their life and our urban ngahere grows over time.

Achieving no net loss ensures that any losses are balanced by a gain elsewhere. At a local board level, any loss will need to be balanced out by a gain in canopy cover elsewhere within the local board area. Table 3 – Protecting outcomes





5.4 Ngā tikanga whakahaere ka hua Mechanism outcomes

Engage and Manage are the two mechanisms Auckland Council will use to achieve the Knowing, Growing and Protecting objectives. For example, increasing the canopy cover and prioritising options for future planting on public and private land will only be possible through engaging and working collaboratively with communities and partners.

Engage

Community support is critical for fulfilling all three main objectives. Auckland Council must engage with relevant partners and stakeholders – mana whenua, private landowners, community groups, and the private sector –to support the growth and protection of Auckland's urban ngahere. The council must also engage with the public more widely about the benefits of urban ngahere to ensure they are understood and recognised.

Table 4 – Engage outcomes



A community engagement programme is needed that addresses Growing and Protecting and is supported by partnerships with relevant stakeholders. The programme must also integrate the aspirations of Māori, in accordance with the principle of partnership enshrined in te Tiriti o Waitangi and recognise the special role of mana whenua as kaitiaki (guardians) whereby ngahere and whenua ora (environmental services) are intimately connected to Māori wellbeing. As the programme evolves, we will develop a better understanding of community aspirations, and knowledge gaps relating to urban ngahere benefits and value.

Manage

Another key mechanism in successfully implementing the vision is the effective management of existing and future urban ngahere on public land through coordinated planning, strategic planting, smart and innovative urban design, and facilitating best practice standards for work on and around trees through maintenance contracts.

Table 5 – Manage outcomes

Mechanism	Outcomes
Manage	Increased survival rate of new plantings and sustainability of Auckland's urban ngahere on public land.

As noted in section 2.2, tree size matters when it comes to the scale of benefits delivered. Central to effective management is the requirement to nurture growing trees and increase the proportion of larger trees.





Tarāwaho whakatinana Implementation framework

The implementation framework consists of high level actions that are central to achieving the strategy outcomes. In addition to the high level actions, collaboration, funding and partnerships and area specific implementation are all fundamental to the strategy's success.

6.1 | Te mahi tahi mō te rautaki ngahere ā-tāone Urban ngahere strategy collaboration

Success will require close collaboration with many partners at various levels across operational boundaries and disciplines, within the municipality and beyond. Some of the key cross boundary groups are:

Cross-council collaboration:

This involves collaboration between internal stakeholders, interdepartmental cooperation and working closely with council controlled organisations. In the urban context, planners should work with foresters and arborists to effectively integrate policy and knowledge management tools to grow and protect the urban ngahere.

Community and council collaboration:

Effective implementation of the strategy requires effective engagement with community groups



and institutions that play a role in growing and protecting the urban ngahere.

Business and council collaboration:

Insight provided by business groups, including developers, is important to support the strategy's successful implementation. The decisions and actions of business groups can have a significant influence on the urban ngahere.

International cooperation:

This strategy draws on the knowledge and experience of many leading cities that have developed their own urban forest strategies. Continued sharing of technical, governance and community know-how will help to achieve better outcomes for Auckland.



6.2 Ngā tahua pūtea me ngā hononga ā-hoa Funding and partnerships

Continuing support from Auckland Council, developers, businesses and the wider community is fundamental to successfully growing and protecting Auckland's urban ngahere. For example, leading developers understand that delivering a successful and sustainable project is not just about building design, but also the surrounding environment and the outcomes this can deliver. Businesses can also contribute to the growth and protection of the urban ngahere through financial support, planting initiatives and effective maintenance of trees on their properties. Most importantly, having financial

support from the council ensures the development of knowledge, growth and protection of urban ngahere on public and private land.

Effective communication on the benefits of urban ngahere, such as better stormwater management, carbon sequestration, lower infrastructure costs, enhanced biodiversity and community health not to mention the city's aesthetic enhancement - is an important tool to justify project costs to stakeholders and partners. It's important to document and disseminate urban ngahere benefits to gain continuous support from all Aucklanders.

6.3 Whakatinanatanga ā-wāhi motuhake Area specific implementation

The strategy must take an area specific approach to implementation. This will require engaging with each local board, partners and stakeholders to discuss needs and drivers for growing and

protecting Auckland's urban ngahere. This will ensure the strategy's high level actions are defined and implemented in a way that matches the needs of each local area.



6.4 Kaupapa mahi matua High level actions

The Engage and Manage mechanisms identified in the strategy framework run through all the high level actions and are central to their successful implementation. Table 6 – Knowing high level actions



- land over time
- urban forest

High level actions

- Incorporate three-yearly LiDAR surveys in council 1 work programmes.
- Create database for existing assets within two year 2
- Integrate scientific knowledge of the urban ngahe 3 mātauranga Māori in partnership with mana wher the urban ngahere.
- Quantify values and benefits (within 12-18 month 4
- 5 Determine survival rates of new council plantings.
- Identify key pressures and risks in partnership with 6 whenua and local boards.

High level actions to support the following outcomes:

• better understanding of the status and trends on private and public

· better understanding of the diverse values and benefits of Auckland's

· better understanding of existing and future risks and pressures.

	Implementation timeframe (years)							
	1-2	3-5	Ongoing					
			•					
ars.	•							
re with nua of			•					
ıs).	•							
			•					
h mana	•							



Table 7 – Growing high level actions

$\langle \cdot \rangle$
Growing

- High level actions to support the following outcomes:
- increase the average canopy cover to 30 per cent across Auckland's urban area with no local board area having less than 15 per cent canopy cover
- increased resilience to existing and future pressures.

		Implementation timeframe (years)				
μıβ	gn level actions		1-2	3-5	Ongoing	
1	Increase canopy cover in road corridors, passes to support an average of 30 per ce across Auckland's urban area with no loca having less than 15 per cent canopy cover	arks and open nt canopy cover l board area			•	
2	Identify and prioritise locations for future on public land in partnership with mana w local boards.	planting ⁄henua and	•			
3	Use science and ongoing engagement wit mana whenua and communities to inform relation to types of planting.	h local boards, n decisions in			•	
4	Increase the capacity of nursery programmers and the supply of eco-sour maraes) to increase the supply of eco-sour	nes (including rced plants.			•	
5	Leverage partnerships established through initiatives (eg the Mayor's Million Trees pr	n existing ogramme).		•		

Table 8 – Protecting high level actions



Raise arboriculture maintenance programme from 6 to five years or until new plantings are well establi (a target survival rate of 70-80 per cent).

guidelines, proper tree care).

7 Establish a labelling programme for protected tree 12 months (eg species, age and benefits).

	Implementation timeframe (years)						
	1-2	3-5	Ongoing				
ion t.	•						
th	•						
mes (eg			•				
s urban			•				
of the anting			•				
n two ished	•						
es within	•						





Ngā tohutoro References

- Pacific Southwest Research Station and Center for Urban Forest Research https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/topics/urban_forestry/products/2/psw_cufr687_NYC_MFRA.pdf
- 2. McDonald, R. et al. 2017. Funding Trees for Health, The Nature Conservancy, www.nature.org/trees4health
- 3. urban environment, Environmental Health 2016 15 (Suppl 1):S36 https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12940-016-0103-6
- Cavanagh, J. E. and Clemons, J. 2006. Do Urban Forests Enhance Air Quality? Australian Journal of 4. Environmental Management, Volume 13, 2006 – Issue 2 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14486563.2006.9725122?needAccess=true
- 5. Ecosyst (2011) 14:755-769
- Harmsworth, G., R. Awatere, S. 2013. Indigenous Māori Knowledge and Perspectives of Ecosystems. 6. Ecosystem services in New Zealand – conditions and trends. Manaaki Whenua Press, Lincoln, New Zealand
- 7. Wilcox, M. D. 2012. Auckland's Remarkable Urban Forest, Auckland Botanical Society
- 8. Manaaki Whenua - Landcare Research, Māori values and native forest (Ngahere) https://www. landcareresearch.co.nz/ data/assets/pdf file/0017/43910/maori values native forest.pdf
- 9. The Auckland Plan 2050, Outcome: Environment and Cultural Heritage, Direction 3: Use Auckland's growth and development to protect and enhance the natural environment https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plansstrategies/auckland-plan/environment-cultural-heritage/Pages/direction-use-growthdevelopment-protect-enhance.aspx
- 10. https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plansstrategies/auckland-plan/environment-cultural-heritage/Pages/focus-area-use-greeninfrastructure-deliver-greater-resilience.aspx
- The Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in part (Updated 13 July 2018), E1 Water quality and 11. integrated management http://unitaryplan.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/Images/Auckland%20Unitary%20Plan%20 Operative/Chapter%20E%20Auckland-wide/1.%20Natural%20Resources/E1%20Water%20 quality%20and%20integrated%20management.pdf
- 12. 30(1): 131-146

https://newzealandecology.org/nzje/2297

13. i-Tree Eco https://www.itreetools.org/eco/index.php

Peper, P. et al. 2007. New York City, New York Municipal Forest Resource Analysis. USDA Forest Service,

Salmond, J. et al. 2016. Health and climate related ecosystem services provided by street trees in the

Xiao, Q. and McPherson, E. G. 2011. Rainfall interception of three trees in Oakland, California, Urban

https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/mcpherson/psw_2011_mcpherson008(xiao).pdf

https://www.landcareresearch.co.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/77047/2_1_Harmsworth.pdf

The Auckland Plan 2050, Outcome: Environment and Cultural Heritage, Focus area 6: Use green infrastructure to deliver greater resilience, long-term cost savings and quality environmental outcomes

Meurk, C.D. Hall, G.M.J. 2006. Options for enhancing forest biodiversity across New Zealand's managed landscapes based on ecosystem modelling and spatial design. New Zealand Journal of Ecology (2006)



© 2019 Auckland Council March 2019 Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department

Auckland Council (2019). Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy

ISBN 978-1-98-856480-7 (Print) ISBN 978-1-98-856481-4 (PDF)

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy was approved by the Auckland Council Environment and Community Committee on 20 February 2018.



Howick Local Board Ngahere Analysis Update 2021 Canopy cover changes with the 2013 to 2016/2018 LiDAR data

Urban Ngahere Strategy 2019 Knowing Programme



A summary of the urban environment in Howick

Approximately **142,700** residents Less than **1%** of canopy cover more than **30 metres** tall

Average canopy cover of

54% of canopy cover with no statutory protection

More than 230 local parks and 55 playgrounds

293 hectares of Significant Ecological Area

Two statistical areas - Shelly Park and Tuscany Heights - with more than **30%** canopy cover

> More than **70%** of total canopy cover on private land

across local board, including canopy cover of: 26% 8% 12% 17% on public parkland reserves on other public land on private

New zoning under Auckland Unitary Plan includes Mixed Housing Urban, Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings

1.8% of original indigenous vegetation cover remaining

Notable Tree records

1,123 hectares of urban forest in 2013, **remaining the same in 2016/2018**



Nearly 7,000 hectares of land



hectares of parks, including:

- Mangemangeroa Reserve
- Point View Reserve
- Murphys Bush

Auckland Council disclaims any liability whatsoever in connection with any action taken in reliance of this document for any error, deficiency, flaw or omission contained in it.

Date: September 2021

ISBN 978-1-99-100252-5 (Print)

ISBN 978-1-99-100253-2 (PDF)

This document is licensed for re-use under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence.

In summary, you are free to copy, distribute and adapt the material, as long as you attribute it to the Auckland Council and abide by the other licence terms.



Contents

1.0 Preface	9	1
2.0 Introd	uction	2
2.1	Howick Local Board	2
2.2	2 Study Background	3
2.3	3 Data Collection	3
3.0 Result	s and Discussion	4
3.1	Urban Canopy Cover Overview	4
3.2	2 Canopy Distribution across Howick Local Board	5
3.3	3 Urban Ngahere Canopy Height	8
3.4	4 Urban Ngahere Tenure	9
3.5	5 Urban Ngahere in Relation to Growth Pressures	10
3.6	6 Recommendations	13
4.0 Ackno	wledgements	14
5.0 Refere	ences	14

1.0 Preface

Tāmaki-Makaurau / Auckland is New Zealand's largest city, and plantings of exotic and native trees have taken place as the region has developed. Early Māori settlers would have planted trees such as karaka, pūriri and tōtara to indicate a special place or to mark a celebration, while European settlers planted trees that were familiar and provided a sense of place. London Plane, English Oak, and European Lime trees were some of the earliest recorded plantings in Auckland. Settlers arriving from around the world commenced the history of Auckland's diverse and unique tree cover.

When European settlers arrived to Tāmaki-Makaurau / Auckland, the gullies of the isthmus were filled with raupō, edged with a varied growth of sedges and other moisture loving plants; and slopes of gullies covered with karamū and cabbage trees. By the late nineteenth century, much of the Auckland area was under cultivation with a large number of introduced plants. Along with residential development commencing in the mid-20th century, these actions have now reduced indigenous forest cover within the Howick Local Board to small fragments, primarily in local reserves.

The Howick Local Board has provided locally driven initiatives funding to Auckland Council's Principal Advisor Urban Ngahere (Forest) in the Parks, Sports and Recreation Department to develop an analysis of the tree cover in its area of responsibility. This update report is the result of a programme of work by Auckland Council involving detailed analysis of urban tree coverages on public and private land, aiming to identify opportunities to nurture, grow and protect urban trees in the local board area. The analysis work is directed by the Auckland Council's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy 2019, which has 18 key objectives to help Council and local boards to deliver a healthy ngahere for a flourishing future.



2.0 Introduction

2.1 Howick Local Board

The Howick Local Board covers approximately (c.) 7,000 hectares (ha) in eastern Auckland, located between the Tāmaki River to the west, the Mangemangeroa Stream to the east and the Redoubt Road ridge to the southeast. The population of the local board is approximately 142,700 residents.

Land-use within the board is very varied, with well-established (pre-1990) residential suburbs dominating the northern half of the board, newer and developing residential suburbs to the east and south, large retail centres at Botany Downs and Pakuranga Plaza, and a swathe of commercial and industrial land to the west, encompassing Highbrook Park and parts of East Tāmaki. Howick's southern and eastern boundaries extend just beyond the recognised rural-urban boundary into the adjacent rural regions around Brookby and Whitford, with the south-eastern spread of development butting up against the physical and regulatory limits imposed by topography and zoning.

Approximately 11% of the local board area is public parkland, with bush reserves containing pockets of remnant native forest. These reserves are predominantly



Urban forest around central Howick

located along Howick's eastern margins at the interface between the suburbs and the rural areas beyond and on the coastal fringe. Examples include Mangemangeroa Reserve, Point View Reserve, and Murphys Bush.

Large reserves for passive or active recreation, or a mixture of both, are distributed throughout Howick and include Barry Curtis Park, Lloyd Elsmore Park, Macleans Park (with substantial areas of native revegetation planting), Tī Rakau Park, Pigeon Mountain, Murvale Reserve (with an outstanding collection of early exotic plantings), and William Green Domain.

Large portions of the local board area are now zoned for development intensification under the Auckland Unitary Plan. The new zoning, including the Mixed Housing Urban Zone and the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone, now allows for smaller sections. Consequently, much of the urban forest is under a range of pressures from development, which could potentially lead to irreversible changes in urban forest cover (Brown et al., 2015).

An information graphic summarising local board details related to urban forest is provided at the beginning of this report.



The 'Rural-Urban Boundary' viewed from Point View Reserve, East Tāmaki Heights

2.2 Study Background

'Urban ngahere' ('urban forest') comprises all the trees within a city – including parks, coastal cliffs, stream corridors, private gardens and streets – both native and naturalised exotic species. For the purposes of this report, 'urban ngahere' is defined as all of the trees and other vegetation three metres or taller in stature within the Howick Local Board, and the soil and water systems that support these trees. This urban ngahere definition encompasses trees and shrubs in streets, parks, private gardens, stream banks, coastal cliffs, rail corridors, and motorway margins and embankments. It also includes both planted and naturally established plants, of both exotic and native provenance.

The scale of the tree and shrub cover across Auckland is sufficiently extensive on both public and private land to make a meaningful contribution to the liveability and sense of place for its residents. Benefits of the urban ngahere include:

Social

- Improve health and wellbeing
- Reduce the urban heat island effect
- Provide shade
- Enhance visual amenity

Environmental

- Enhance biodiversity
- Improve air quality
- Carbon sequestration
- Improve water quality

Economic

- Increase property values
- Reduce flood risk
- Reduce energy costs
- Reduce healthcare costs

Cultural

- Support education
- Local food growing
- Sustain and enhance maur
- Cultural heritage

The Auckland Unitary Plan offers various degrees of protection to urban ngahere and groups of trees meeting specific characteristics (e.g., pre-identified significance, vegetation by coasts or streams); however, other important urban ngahere assets have no statutory protection and can therefore be removed. The completion of a study in urban canopy cover in Howick is important to provide information on baseline tree distribution that future canopy cover measurements can be compared to. This baseline data also provides information on where there are pressures on canopy cover and opportunities for tree planting. Increases in canopy cover are also intended to contribute to other Auckland Council programmes such as Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan (Auckland Council 2019c).

2.3 Data Collection

Urban canopy cover across Auckland was mapped in 2013 (Auckland Council 2019b), and again in 2016/18 by use of LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging). Airborne LiDAR is an optical remote sensing technology that irradiates a target with a beam of light; usually a pulsed laser, to measure an object's variable distances from the earth surface. Two LiDAR data sets are covered in this report, collected in the years 2013 and 2016/2018. The second survey (2016/2018) had to be completed over two years due to unfavourable weather conditions that limited data quality. As these two LiDAR data sets provide a solid baseline for future comparative work, investigations into alternatives to LiDAR for mapping urban ngahere are currently underway.



New native restoration planting

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Urban Canopy Cover Overview

Based on the 2013 data set, urban ngahere covered 16% of the Howick Local Board area, including 6% of roads, 25% of public parks, and 17% of private land. Further information on the 2013 data has been provided in a baseline report (Howick Local Board Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report September 2019; Auckland Council 2019b). There was no net change in overall canopy cover based on the 2016/2018 data set (Table 1).

As an overview, the initial analysis contained in this report (in line with the knowing phase of the Auckland Urban Ngahere Strategy) shows that there are some obvious areas of urban ngahere concentration, while there are also areas that are lacking urban ngahere. The lowest cover (3-6%) tends to be in central/southern areas of the

local board (Botany Central/South, Redcastle, Ormiston North and Donegal Park), while the eastern parts of the local board, Shelly Park and Tuscany Heights, have the highest cover (more than 30%). Although the canopy cover in East Tāmaki is low (5%), the percentage of canopy cover >30 m tall is high compared to other statistical areas in the local board. Other suburbs with a relatively high level of tree cover are the older coastal suburbs of Shelly Park, Mellons Bay and Cockle Bay.

The 2016/18 LiDAR data indicates growth in canopy cover on road reserves and parks across the Howick Local Board, with a combined net increase in canopy cover of c.26 hectares. Conversely, there has been a net reduction in canopy cover of c.8 hectares on privately owned land. An example of this decrease has been observed on private land in Ormiston East, where canopy cover has shown a net reduction of 13 hectares since 2013.

Urban Local Board	Public op	Public open space Private land		Roads		Other public land		Overall coverage		
	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018
Kaipātiki	63	64	25	25	12	14	33	34	30	30
Upper Harbour	50	52	29	30	11	13	10	11	27	28
Hibiscus and Bays	28	29	24	23	15	14	43	42	25	24
Puketāpapa	50	50	17	16	10	12	15	15	20	20
Albert-Eden	33	34	19	18	17	20	19	18	20	20
Ōrākei	25	25	20	19	14	16	20	20	20	19
Waitematā	42	43	16	15	15	17	11	10	19	19
Whau	34	34	17	16	12	13	12	12	17	17
Devonport-Takapuna	24	27	17	17	11	13	13	14	16	16
Howick	25	26	17	17	6	8	11	12	16	16
Henderson-Massey	30	32	14	14	7	8	11	12	15	15
Papakura	16	17	15	15	8	11	8	9	13	14
Manurewa	24	26	11	12	6	9	7	7	12	13
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	21	23	9	9	10	12	11	11	11	12
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	13	14	8	8	7	9	10	10	9	10
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	14	14	7	7	7	9	8	8	8	8

Table 1: Urban ngahere in Auckland's urban local board areas: data includes percentage cover (to nearest whole number) of urban ngahere for different land tenures, and the overall percentage cover of urban ngahere within each board, with a comparison between the 2013 and 2016/2018 data sets.

3.2 Canopy Distribution across Howick Local Board

The urban ngahere is not distributed evenly throughout the local board, as shown in **Figures 1 and 2**, which display variation by statistical area. Urban ngahere covers 16% of the Howick Local Board area as a whole. However, when excluding the rural parts of Howick and considering only the urbanised areas, the level of canopy cover is closer to 11%. This is a low figure for an urban area and well below the level of cover targeted within Auckland's Urban Ngahere Strategy. This strategy has a goal of achieving an average 30% canopy cover across all of urban Auckland, with no local board area having less than 15% cover (Auckland Council, 2019a).

The reliance on the rural fringe of Howick in raising its overall level of tree cover is highlighted by the fact that, despite making up less than a quarter of the board's land area, it contains nearly half of its urban ngahere cover. Small losses of rural land to urbanisation would be likely to have a disproportionate effect on the urban ngahere, both in terms of overall tree cover and by affecting a greater proportion of large trees.

Over half (51%) of the local board is covered in impervious surfaces, which presents an opportunity to plant urban ngahere, particularly in the road corridor, as a direct remedy. Trees are a well-known solution for stormwater management, as their extensive canopies and subsurface root systems are capable of capturing and pumping substantial amounts of water, providing cooling effects (Berland et al. 2017). Establishing trees within impervious surfaces will act to intercept rainfall before it reaches the ground and slows inflow rates. This has follow on benefits for stormwater management systems such as underground pipes and nearby waterways (Dwyer and Miller 1999). Opportunities exist for new tree planting in the road corridor which will assist in stormwater management by capturing stormwater flows via interception and infiltration. Trees and other 'green infrastructure' solutions, including rain gardens, permeable pavements, bioswales, and green roofs, are worth implementing at a greater scale and should be encouraged. There has not been a significant change in urban tree coverage on a local scale, as shown in **Figure 2**. In general, statistical areas of Howick have had only a minor net increase or minor net decrease in canopy cover. The only current concern may be Donegal Park, with already low tree coverage, had a minor net decrease in cover between the two data sets. Upon examination this appears to be attributed to small scale residential tree removal and trimming of larger trees.



Matanginui/Green Mount, East Tāmaki, Auckland



Figure 1: 2016/18 Canopy Cover by Statistical Areas



Figure 2: Spatial distribution of urban ngahere canopy within the statistical areas of Howick Local Board



3.3 Urban Ngahere Canopy Height

LiDAR data includes a height component, and this information was used to split the recorded canopy cover into different height categories: 3-5 metres; 5-10 metres; 10-15 metres; 15-20 metres; 20-30 metres; and taller than 30 metres. This data is representative of canopy cover height, rather than tree height, as each individual tree may be recorded in several categories.

The height class distribution of the urban ngahere canopy within Howick Local Board is displayed in **Figure 3**. In 2013, 26% of the canopy cover was between 3-5 metres tall, 40% 5-10 metres tall, and the remaining 34% was canopy taller than 10 metres. This distribution remained similar in the 2016/2018 data sets, although the percentage of canopy cover over between 3-5 metres tall increased to 32% of the forest canopy. This data shows only low presence of tall canopy cover within the local board area, with all canopy cover taller than 15 metres (including height categories 15-20 metres, 20-30 metres, and 30 metres plus) representing approximately 12% of the total urban ngahere canopy cover assessed and are mainly found in bush remnants and the rural fringes, particularly within East Tāmaki Heights and Flat Bush.

Research has shown that many of the benefits attributed to urban ngahere are disproportionally provided by larger trees (Davies et al. 2011, Moser et al. 2015). Large trees typically create more shade per tree due to a larger and wider canopy spread (Moser et al. 2015); intercept larger amounts of particulate pollutants and rainfall due to significantly larger leaf areas; contain more carbon and have higher carbon sequestration rates (Beets et al. 2012, Schwendenmann and Mitchell 2014, Dahlhausen et al. 2016).

Additionally, trees are often less susceptible to careless or malicious vandalism by the general public once established; can be pruned to provide higher canopy clearance over roadways; carparks and pedestrian footpaths; typically contribute more to calming and slowing traffic on local streets than small trees; and absorb more gaseous pollutants. It is therefore an immediate priority to retain existing large trees across the local board area to ensure the positive benefits of these are not lost, as also emphasised in the Urban Ngahere Strategy (Auckland Council 2019a). The relatively high proportion of shorter canopy cover across the local board (32% 3-5m tall and 39% 5-10m tall) in the 2016/2018 data set, indicates a relatively recent surge of tree planting, assuming the smaller stature canopy corresponds to younger trees, rather than shrubs which are limited at their mature height. When grouped by land use type, it can be seen how the contribution of the trees in rural Howick skews the figures for the board as a whole, with this area containing approximately 50% less canopy cover under five metres tall as a proportion of overall cover than in urban Howick, and has nearly twice the proportion of canopy cover over ten metres tall.



Figure 3: Height class distribution of urban ngahere canopy across all land tenures within Howick Local Board

Ngahe Ragely 7 2021 8

3.4 Urban Ngahere Tenure

The tenure of urban ngahere described in this report relates to the zoning and ownership of different land parcels within the local board. Publicly owned land is described as either 'public parks' or 'other public land' (e.g. schools, Council-owned property), trees in the road corridor/road reserves are described as 'street trees', and privately owned land (residential or commercial) is described as 'private land'.

The tenure distribution of urban ngahere canopy within the Howick Local Board is displayed in **Figure 4**. Nearly three quarters (74%) of the urban ngahere in Howick, much of which is unprotected, is located on private property. Public parks and other publicly owned land (e.g., schools) contain a similar proportion of urban ngahere, being 15% and 11% of the total urban ngahere cover, respectively.

Howick Local Board stands out in the regional data as having a very low degree of tree coverage (8% in 2016/18) within its road reserves (Table 1), which may reflect the relatively recent construction of a large part of the road network and, to some degree, poor planting choices and practices in the newer suburbs. This situation presents an opportunity for enhancing the urban ngahere by infill planting of carefully chosen street trees, that will provide benefits long term to local communities.

Planting may also be considered on rural roads, the canopy within which makes up only 2% of the rural tree coverage. With only 5% canopy cover on other public land



Figure 4: Tenure of urban ngahere canopy within Howick Local Board (2013 data set)

in rural parts of the local board, there may also be an opportunity to encourage planting within this category of land such as schools and colleges, where additional educational benefits may be gained.

In addition to having low levels of canopy cover, roads also exhibit generally small tree size, with only 13% being over ten metres tall, compared to 39% for parks. This reflects the more cramped growing environment within the road corridor (particularly below ground) and the more frequent cycling of tree stock as trees are regularly removed and replaced to allow for infrastructure works.

Public parks have the highest proportion of urban ngahere relative to area out of all the land tenures, as shown in **Figure 5**, followed by private land. There has been a minor net increase in urban ngahere canopy in public parks, as well as road reserves and other public land, between the two survey data sets. The percentage canopy cover of private land has stayed the same.

Public parks are good place to focus additional urban ngahere planting as they comprise approximately 10% of the local board land area and are widely distributed. In addition, public parks offer the best opportunities for long-term sustainable management of the urban ngahere due to the lower chance of conflict with future housing intensification.



Figure 5: Change in urban ngahere cover of different land tenures in Howick Local Board between 2013 and 2016/18



3.5 Urban Ngahere in Relation to Growth Pressures

The Significant Ecological Area overlay (SEA; **Figure 6**) prioritises the areas of urban ngahere in Howick with the highest ecological value, providing a starting point for protection. With future development and urban intensification, however, SEA and other continuous areas of urban ngahere are at risk. Canopy cover in relation to the Auckland Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (Auckland Council 2017) forecasting areas of growth is shown in **Figure 7**.

There is increased pressure on the urban ngahere in Howick through a combination of greenfield development, lack of suitable growing space, and conflicts with infrastructure. An increase in urban ngahere cover in local parks and residential suburbs will provide more universal benefits as a greater number of people are likely to encounter the forest and connect to nature. Urban ngahere on public land provides opportunities to connect with communities, enhanced biodiversity, educational opportunities and helps to develop a sense of place.

The lack of scheduled notable trees in the southern half of Howick is another issue that may warrant investigation, as there may potentially be trees that have so far been overlooked but would meet the necessary standards for inclusion on the schedule. This may particularly be the case in parts of Flat Bush currently under development, where large, high value trees are scattered within former farmland and riparian margins.

Protecting existing and adding to the numbers of trees in the road corridor is an important and ongoing measure to retain and extend urban ngahere cover, as the tree cover in the road corridor is currently low. The importance of trees in the street environment is going to increase, and will, in time, incorporate the only accessible trees for some residents.

To this end, the Howick Local Board is encouraged to work with Auckland Council to readdress the current rules for tree and vegetation protection, especially in relation to highlighting the importance of large trees and the multiple benefits they offer to the local community.



Notable trees, Howick, Auckland

#33



Figure 6: 2016/18 Canopy Height & Significant Ecological Areas





3.6 Recommendations

The assessment of urban tree cover in the Howick Local Board presented in this update report aims to assist in the knowing phase of the Auckland Urban Forest Strategy. The analysis of existing tree cover distribution, structure, tenure, and protection, provides the local board with a basis for determining where to focus efforts in improving urban ngahere cover during the growing phase, to be initiated in the near future.

Recommendations for future urban ngahere management to the Howick Local Board include:

- Prioritise the efforts of the Howick Urban Ngahere Action Plan 2021 to plant new trees in parks and streets
- raise awareness of the current rules for tree and vegetation notable Tree overlay
- strengthen local funding initiatives to engage with, educate, and support private owners of land featuring valuable trees

- set an initial goal of achieving a minimum of 15% urban ngahere cover within the fully urban portion of Howick
- initiate tree planting where possible in unused corners or edges of parks, including the designation of the former Greenmount landfill as a reserve
- identify parks containing playgrounds with low tree shading (e.g., Simon Owen Place Reserve and Monash Park) and obtain funding for large grade specimen trees to plant
- prioritise tree planting in predominantly industrial/ commercial suburbs with low canopy cover, e.g., East Tāmaki, Huntington Park, Clover Park and Highland Park.

The metrics of the canopy analysis will be used to help inform and prioritise the efforts of the Howick Urban Ngahere Action Plan. The action plan highlights the areas to plant new trees and sets out the process to fund, implement, and find ways to protect and nurture existing ngahere on public and private land.



Palm avenue planted along Te Irirangi Drive, East Tāmaki, Auckland



4.0 Acknowledgements

The following parties are acknowledged for their roles in the preparation of this document:

- Content prepared by Carolina Stavert and Jessica Reaburn (Wildland Consultants Ltd).
- Technical advice and peer review completed by Howell Davies (Principal Advisor Urban Ngahere (Forest), Community Services – Parks, Sports & Recreation, Auckland Council).
- Data and GIS-based figures prepared by Grant Lawrence (Research and Evaluation Unit, Auckland Council).
- Photographs supplied by Auckland Council and Wildland Consultants Ltd.
- Graphics and formatting completed by Q Brand Builders.

The authors would also like to thank the Howick Local Board for their support and direction during the development of this report and its content.

5.0 References

Auckland Council (2017). Auckland Future Urban Land Supply Strategy. <u>https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.</u> <u>nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plansstrategies/topic-based-plans-strategies/housing-plans/</u> <u>Documents/future-urban-land-supply-strategy.pdf</u>

Auckland Council (2019a). Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy. Published by Auckland Council's Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department, March 2019. <u>https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/</u> <u>plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plans-</u> <u>strategies/topic-based-plans-strategies/environmental-</u> <u>plans-strategies/Documents/urban-ngahere-forest-</u> <u>strategy.pdf</u>

Auckland Council (2019b), unpublished. Howick Local Board Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report September 2019. Prepared for the Howick Local Board Locally Driven Initiatives – Ngahere Work Programme: Year 1 Knowing Phase.

Auckland Council (2019c). Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan. Developed from Auckland's Climate Action Framework consultation summary published by Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department, June 2019. <u>https://www.aucklandcouncil.</u> govt.nz/environment/Documents/te-taruke-a-tawhiriauckland-climate-plan.pdf

Beets, P. N., M. O. Kimberley, G. R. Oliver, S. H. Pearce, J. D. Graham and A. Brandon (2012). *Allometric Equations for Estimating Carbon Stocks in Natural Forest in New Zealand.* Forests 3: 818-839.

Berland, A., Shiflett, S.A., Shuster, W.D., Garmestani, A.S., Goddard, H.C., Herrmann, D.L. and Hopton, M.E. (2017). *The role of trees in urban stormwater management.* Landscape and Urban Planning 162: 167-177.

Brown, M. A., Simcock, R. and S. Greenhalgh (2015). Protecting the Urban Forest. Landcare Research Manaaki Whenua Policy Brief No. 13 (Issn: 2357-1713).

Dahlhausen, J., P. Biber, T. Rötzer, E. Uhl and H. Pretzsch (2016). *Tree Species and Their Space Requirements in Six Urban Environments Worldwide.* Forests 7: 111-130.

Davies, Z. G., J. L. Edmondson, A. Heinemeyer, J. R. Leake and K. J. Gaston (2011). *Mapping an urban ecosystem service: quantifying above-ground carbon storage at a citywide scale.* Journal of Applied Ecology 48(5): 1125-1134.

Dwyer, M.C. and Miller, R.W. 1999. *Using GIS to assess urban tree canopy benefits and surrounding greenscape distributions.* Journal of Arboriculture 25(2): 102-107.

Moser, A., T. Rötzer, S. Pauleit and H. Pretzsch (2015). Structure and ecosystem services of small-leaved lime (Tilia cordata Mill.) and black locust (Robinia pseudoacacia L.) in urban environments. Urban Forestry and Urban Greening 14: 1110-1121.

Schwendenmann, L. and N. D. Mitchell (2014). *Carbon accumulation by native trees and soils in an urban park, Auckland.* New Zealand Journal of Ecology 38 (2): 213-220.

Wilcox, M., D. (2012). Auckland's Remarkable Urban Forest. Epsom, Auckland, Auckland Botanical Society.





The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Emerson Cheeseman

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: emo.cheeseman@gmail.com

Contact phone number: 0278013992

Postal address:

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Project scope • Walking and cycling networks • Reduction in urban ngahere • Increased flooding risk

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

The project has always been Airport to Botany - rapid transit network (RTN) (the project). The current RLTP highlights delivering a significant increase in rapid transit travel options (fast, frequent, high capacity bus and train services separated from general traffic). Walking and Cycling are not forms of rapid transit. These should not be included in this projects scope. An example of how the project has been described to stakeholders and the public is "The next stages to be delivered under this RLTP involve protecting the future A2B rapid transit corridor, between Auckland Airport and Botany via Manukau, and extending the new AirportLink bus to Botany via Te Irirangi Drive. Extending the AirportLink bus to Botany will be supported by bus interchanges and priority improvements along Te Irirangi Drive, with a move toward a rapid transit corridor in future decades." There is no mention of walking and cycling. Therefore, the stakeholders and public have been misled. Support was gained prior to the inclusion of walking and cycling facilities. The consequences of including improved walking and cycling facilities along both sides of the corridor into the project scope is a significant increase in project costs, an enormous reduction in trees and the urban ngahere canopy coverage across this area, increased flooding risk and climate impacts, an increase in the urban heat and island effect, decreased visual amenity, loss of shade, decreased health and wellbeing to the public and decreased air quality. These impacts are significant and outweigh the benefits of pouring concrete in place of these trees for walking and cycling facilities. There is already footpaths. It is legal for cyclists to ride on the roads. An alternative would be to incorporate a cycling network into the median strip of Ti Irirangi Drive where the RTN busway will go as this will have such few buses, at most, one every 15 minutes I assume and the road is very long and straight so the bus and cyclist will see each other. I don't believe this project has been transparent with making stakeholders aware of the impacts of including the improved walking and



cycling networks into this project. It has been a late addition and one I would deem as misleading after support for the project was gained. I am appalled decision makers have agreed to the destruction of thousands of trees to pour concrete to allow a better footpath / cycling path when this already exists. I don't agree with the statement that that is what public feedback has said. The public would not want improved walking and cycling networks by the destruction of thousands of trees. Should this project proceed unchanged, the inclusion of the walking and cycling aspect no longer adheres to Te-Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan, specifically Action Area N2 and Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy. The specific principals this violates is - Grow our rural and urban ngahere (forest) Action area N2: Grow and protect our rural and urban ngahere (forest) to maximise carbon capture and build resilience to climate change. And • Increase indigenous tree plantings in road corridors, parks and open spaces. Each CCO must work within Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Action Framework. I am not opposed to the RTN along the median strip of Ti Irirangi Drive and would like the project scope and the Notice of Requirement designation reduced to include only the median strip of land.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: Request the project scope be reduced to a rapid transit network - Airport to Botany which includes: a) a dedicated Bus Rapid Transit corridor, centre-running along Te Irirangi Drive b) Bus Rapid Transit stations at Smales Road, Accent Drive, and Ormiston Road – Botany Junction Shopping Centre c) swales and wetlands d) areas for construction related activities including yards, site compounds, and bridge and structure works. Oppose the inclusion of improved walking and cycling facilities along both sides of the corridor due to the destruction of thousands of trees to pour concrete for this. Oppose the removal of trees lining both sides of the corridor along Ti Irirangi Drive creating good canopy coverage and reduced flooding risks to nearby residents. Request the designation of the Notice of Requirement is restricted to the median strip along Ti Irirangi Drive only (and including any areas required for stations) as this is sufficient enough to complete the rapid transit network - Airport to Botany as per the original intent of the project.

Submission date: 11 April 2023

Supporting documents urban-ngahere-forest-strategy_20230411201137.119.pdf howick-canopy-analysis-report-2021_20230411201142.979.pdf

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy



He Mihi

Nau mai e te hā o Tāne, Whakatau mai e te oranga o Tāne.

Tīkina mai te ate rahirahi o te Tāone nui o Tāmaki Makaurau hei whakaniko anō ai i te whenua tapu; ko tō whaea, ko Papatūānuku.

Kia toro ake ōna hua me ōna pai kia tauawhia e tō matua e Rangi-nui e tū iho nei, kia rongohia anō te tīhau a ngā manu, me te kētete a ngā pēpeke.

Kia wawara anō te reo o ngā rākau kua roa e ngū ana ki te wao kōhatu e tāwharau nei i ngā maunga tapu o tō whenua taketake.

Tane-o-te-waiora,

Tāne-whakapiripiri,

Tāne-nui-a-rangi, tukua mai anō tō ihi, tukua mai anō tō mana.

Māu e kitea anō ai he awa para-kore e rere ana, he hau mā e kōrewarewa ana, he taiao hauora e takoto ana.

Kia hipokina anō e tō korowai kākāriki te tāone nui kia whiwhi ko mātou, kia whiwhi te ao katoa.

He whakatupu ngātahi i te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau e matomato ai te hua ā ngā rā e tū mai nei

Together, growing Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #34aurau

Tāne let your breath pervade all, may your life-essence be ever-present.

Reclaim the very heart of Auckland city and adorn once again the hallowed ground; that is your mother, Papatūānuku.

May all that is fruitful and good reach skyward to the embrace of your father Rangi-nui on high so the chorus of birds may be heard again, and the splendid symphony of insects in response.

Bring with you the sounds of rustling trees that have long stood silent to this concrete jungle that bounds the sacred mountains of your primal domain.

Tāne-purveyor of life,

Tāne-provider-of-shelter,

Tāne-source-of-all-knowledge, bestow us again with your wonder, and grace us with your prestige.

By you, we will again realise fresh waterways, pure air, and a healthier environment.

Garb the city with your verdant cloak that we, your heirs might benefit, and so too, the whole world.





Kupu whakataki Foreword

A healthy urban ngahere (forest) enriches our communities, our local economies and our natural environment. Auckland cannot become a world-class city without one.

Whether you are from Takanini or Takapuna, Herne Bay or Henderson, trees and vegetation are valuable to all of us. They clean our air and stormwater, cool and beautify our urban spaces and bring nature to our doorsteps. Developed in partnership with tangata whenua, the strategy gives voice to an important role trees play in the mauri of the land. They provide a wide range of measurable benefits that make our lives healthier, happier and more gratifying.

How can we protect what we value in the face of a growing and urbanising population, rising inequality, and the major impacts of invasive pests and climate change? How do we maintain and enhance the richness that our urban ngahere provides? How do we align our efforts?

This is precisely why we have developed a strategy for Auckland's urban ngahere. It delivers on the vision for our future Auckland, ensuring each one of us – and future Aucklanders - have access to the tangible benefits provided by a vibrant, green city.

The strategy ensures that when Auckland Council, corporate partners, community groups and each one of us plants or maintains a tree, our collective efforts truly add up to something – contributing towards increasing our average canopy cover from 18 to 30 per cent. Likewise, the strategy helps target our efforts to grow the urban ngahere where it's scarce - as in parts of South Auckland - so that all local board areas have at least 15 per cent canopy cover.

This strategy provides an overarching vision and 18 high level actions under three main themes, Knowing, Growing and Protecting but doesn't provide all the answers or deliver the vision. We will need to work with each of you and across all local boards to tailor specific and unique approaches to implementation that respond to the local context, harnessing and building local talents, partnerships and resources along the way.

I invite you to join me. Let's work together to grow, protect and maintain our valuable urban ngahere for a greener and greater Auckland for all of us.

Councillor Penny Hulse Chair, Environment and Community Committee





Kei te puku Contents

1.	A sti	rategic plan for Auckland's urban ngahere (forest)	8
	1.1.	What is Auckland's urban ngahere?	10
	1.2.	Benefits of Auckland's urban ngahere	14
	1.3.	Current policy context for our urban ngahere	20
2.	Curr	ent status of our urban ngahere	22
	2.1.	Distribution of canopy cover	23
	2.2.	Height distribution	28
	2.3.	Level of protection	
3.	Curr	ent and future pressures	
	3.1.	A growing population and urban intensification	
	3.2.	Climate change	
	3.3.	Pressure on water infrastructure	
	3.4.	Pests and diseases	37
4.	Stra	tegic framework	38
	4.1.	Vision	41
	4.2.	Objectives	42
	4.3.	Mechanisms	42
	4.4.	Principles	
5.	Stra	tegy outcomes	50
	5.1.	Knowing outcomes	51
	5.2.	Growing outcomes	53
	5.3.	Protecting outcomes	54
	5.4.	Mechanism outcomes	55
6.	Impl	ementation framework	56
	6.1.	Urban ngahere strategy collaboration	57
	6.2.	Funding and partnerships	58
	6.3.	Area specific implementation	58
	6.4.	High level actions	59
7.	Refe	rences	62







He mahere rautaki mō te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau A strategic plan for Auckland's urban ngahere (forest)

When Tāne went to the heavens – so the story goes – he was enraptured by the tūī that lived in his brother Rehua's hair. Tāne desperately wanted to bring the tūī back to earth but he was told he must first plant trees to provide food. So Tāne introduced trees to our world and, three years later when the kahikatea blossomed, Tāne's wish came true. The tūī came to live with him.

When it comes to trees, the message is much the same. If we plant trees now, in time, we create value for our communities. We might even hear the dawn chorus – $e k\bar{o} i te ata$ – once again within urban Auckland.

Auckland is growing and changing rapidly. To accommodate this, Auckland Council has committed to a strategy of urban intensification to increase housing density, deliver the benefits associated with a compact urban form and limit the negative impacts linked with continued outward growth. Successful development requires careful planning; intensification and growth need to complement the protection and planting of trees and vegetation to create liveable neighbourhoods. Trees and vegetation also provide a range of services required for Auckland to function and thrive. These include enhanced stormwater management, air pollution removal, improved water quality, cooling to reduce the urban heat island effect, and ecological corridors to connect habitats and improve biodiversity.

Our urban ngahere faces a number of pressures. Alongside the need for urban development, amendments to the Resource Management Act (RMA) came into effect in 2015, lifting blanket tree protection in urban areas. As a result, the vast majority of trees on private urban properties are no longer protected. Threats from pests and diseases, as well as the impacts of climate change are further challenges. If we want to continue to benefit from the services provided by our urban ngahere it is essential that we better understand its status and value and plan to protect and grow it. Our urban ngahere has the mauri (life force) to care for us but needs our help to be sustainable and healthy.





1.1 He aha te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Mākaurau? What is Auckland's urban ngahere?

Auckland's urban ngahere is the realm of Te Waonui o Tāne (the forest domain of Tāne Mahuta) and consists of the network of all trees, other vegetation and green roofs – both native and introduced – in existing and future urban areas.

It's important to recognise the urban ngahere as more than just trees and vegetation. Urban ngahere captures the interconnected whakapapa (genealogy) of all living things to the wider ecosystem. It consists of a complex network weaving through public and private land, and includes the water, soil, air and sunlight that support it. It also involves people, wildlife and the built environment – all of which impact upon, or are impacted by, the urban ngahere. The urban ngahere has its own mauri (life force) but also depends upon a range of conditions and relationships to support its health, growth and survival.

Auckland's urban ngahere is diverse; it includes trees and vegetation in road corridors, parks and

open spaces, natural stormwater assets, community gardens, living walls, green roofs and trees and vegetation in the gardens of private properties. The urban ngahere, like the pōhutukawa fringing Auckland's coastline, is an important part of Auckland's identity and natural heritage and shapes the fabric of the landscape. Trees also help distinguish our heritage places and areas, such as Albert, Western and Myers Parks, early cemeteries, for example, Symonds Street and Waikumete, and the settings of properties, including Monte Cecilia and Alberton. In addition, Auckland's scheduled character areas often feature memorial plantings and early street plantings.





Examples of Auckland's urban ngahere:

Parks and open space





Potters Park, Mt Eden

Orewa Beach

Street trees and road corridors



Franklin Road, Ponsonby



Private gardens



Island Bay, Birkdale

Blockhouse Bay

Native forest



Native forest

Natural stormwater assets



Te Auaunga Awa / Oakley Creek

Green roofs and living walls



The University of Auckland green roof

Private residential green roof





Tī Kōuka / Cabbage tree

Kererū / New Zealand pigeon

Rain garden, Wynyard Quarter




Ngā painga o te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau Benefits of Auckland's urban ngahere 1.2

The range of social, environmental, economic and cultural benefits that urban trees deliver is well-documented, with cities increasingly recognising the financial value of the services they provide. The USDA Forest Service estimated that trees in New York City provide US\$5.60 in benefits for every US\$1 spent on tree planting and care.¹ Growing and protecting our urban ngahere is essential to maintain and enhance the broad range of services it provides:



Improve health and wellbeing

Reduce the urban heat island effect

Provide shade

Enhance visual amenity



Enhance biodiversity

Improve air quality

Carbon sequestration

Improve water quality Increase property values

Reduce flood risk

Economic

Reduce energy costs

Reduce healthcare costs

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #34aurau



Support education

Local food growing

Sustain and enhance mauri

Cultural heritage

Page 116359 15



Improve health and wellbeing

Research has shown that access to trees and nature can reduce stress, improve mental health and promote wellbeing² whilst tree lined streets have been shown to encourage walking.



Reduce the urban heat island effect

The cooling effect of trees, as a result of evapotranspiration, reduces the urban heat island effect³ and enhances Auckland's resilience to an increasing number of hot days (>25°C), one of the projected impacts of climate change.



Provide shade

Trees shading school grounds, playgrounds, public spaces, and cycling and walking routes provide relief from the sun and protect people from harmful ultraviolet (UV) radiation, in turn reducing the risk of heat stroke, sunburn and melanoma.



Enhance visual amenity

Trees can visually enhance a street, the character of an area and foster neighbourhood pride. They add beauty, soften harsh urban environments and screen unsightly views.

Environmental



Enhance biodiversity

A healthy urban ngahere enriches biodiversity and provides opportunities for connected habitats that support wildlife.



Improve water quality

Trees intercept rainwater and reduce the amount of pollutants being washed from hard surfaces into the stormwater system and watercourses. Increasing canopy cover will also contribute towards fewer storm water overflows from our combined sewer/stormwater systems and therefore lower levels of water pollution in our harbours and streams.



Carbon sequestration

Trees reduce carbon dioxide (CO₂) in the atmosphere through sequestering carbon in new growth. One tonne of carbon stored in wood is equivalent to removing 3.67 tonnes of CO2 from the atmosphere.



Improve air quality

Trees improve air quality by removing air pollutants, such as particulate matter, and absorb gases harmful to human health. A 2006 study estimated that Auckland's urban trees remove 1320 tonnes of particulates, 1230 tonnes of nitrogen dioxide and 1990 tonnes of ozone.⁴

Economic



healthcare costs

Improving air quality and enhancing health and wellbeing will reduce the need for healthcare and associated costs.



flood risk

An increase in canopy cover would intercept an increased volume of rainwater; reducing and slowing urban runoff and placing less pressure on stormwater systems. International studies show that trees intercept 15 to 27 per cent of the annual rainfall that falls upon their canopy, depending on a tree's species and architecture.⁵



Increase property values

Studies have shown that mature street trees increase residential property values and attract buyers and tenants.



Reduce energy costs

Well-positioned trees provide shade and reduce cooling requirements and associated energy costs in buildings.

Cultural



Tree nurseries and planting projects promote environmental awareness and provide opportunities to encourage and facilitate learning.



The cultural benefits of Auckland's urban ngahere are diverse and priceless. Native forest is important to mātauranga Māori (knowledge and understanding), and trees create a cultural connection to place and history.



Sustain and enhance mauri

Mauri is a life force derived from whakapapa (genealogical connections and links to ecosystems), an essential element sustaining all forms of life. Mauri provides life and energy to all living things, including our urban ngahere, and is the binding force that links the physical to the spiritual worlds.⁶ Mauri can be harmed if the life-supporting capacity and ecosystem health of our urban ngahere is diminished. Protecting and growing our urban ngahere will sustain and enhance its mauri.



Local food growing

Planting fruit trees and establishing community orchards provides people with access to fresh fruit. Maintaining and harvesting fruit trees can connect and strengthen communities.



The cultural significance of Auckland's urban ngahere

The urban ngahere is an important part of Tāmaki Makaurau / Auckland's cultural heritage. Remnants of native forest represent traditional supermarkets (kai o te ngahere), learning centres (wānanga o te ngahere), the medicine cabinet (kapata rongoā), schools (kura o te ngahere) and spiritual domain (wairua o te ngahere).⁷ Trees also represent landing places of waka (canoe) and birth whenua (to Māori, it is customary to bury the whenua or placenta in the earth, returning it to the land).

Many of Auckland's trees provide a visible reference to the city's history and development. European settlers planted London plane trees along streets in the 1860s which have now grown to create grand tree-lined avenues in the city centre and the adjoining suburbs of Ponsonby, Freemans Bay and Grey Lynn. Bishop Selwyn, New Zealand's first Anglican Bishop, is reported to have brought hundreds of Norfolk Island pine seedlings to Auckland in 1858-60. Many of the mature Norfolk Island pines now in Auckland, such as those at Mission Bay, are likely to have been grown from these seedlings.8

A TAKE P LOUP AS



Page **136**454 ¹⁹

Te horopaki ā-kaupapa here mō ā tātou ngahere ā-tāone ināia tonu nei 1.3 Current policy context for our urban ngahere

Auckland's plans and polices recognise and reference the value of trees and vegetation to varying degrees but do not provide a clear framework for the management of Auckland's urban ngahere. A range of plans and polices influence our urban ngahere (Figure 1) – explicitly and implicitly – yet urban ngahere objectives are only incidental to other considerations, such as green growth, climate change, indigenous biodiversity, and encouraging

sport and recreation. In the past, this contributed to a situation in which Auckland's urban ngahere was managed and maintained through piecemeal initiatives rather than in a strategic and holistic way. This strategy consolidates and builds upon existing directives that support our urban ngahere and sets out a clear framework to protect and grow Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future.



Figure 1 – Key plans, strategies and guidance documents that influence Auckland's urban ngahere

The central city from above - London plane trees on Greys Avenue and Vincent Street (bottom left) and trees in Myers Park (bottom right) and Albert Park (top right).



Figure 2 – Average percentage canopy cover of urban ngahere (3m+ height) in Auckland suburbs – based on analysis of the 2013 LiDAR survey.

Te tūranga a ō tātou ngahere ā-tāone ināia tonu nei Current status of our urban ngahere

2.1 | Te hora o te uhinga rākau Distribution of canopy cover

Analysis of data from the 2013 LiDAR survey found that Auckland's urban area has just over 18 per cent canopy cover, with 10,130 hectares of canopy cover belonging to trees over three metres tall. This varied across different land types, with urban ngahere on 11 per cent of Auckland's road area, 24 per cent of public land, and 18 per cent of private land.

Figure 2 illustrates that Auckland's urban ngahere is distributed unequally throughout the city, with lower levels of canopy cover in southern suburbs, and relatively high canopy cover in northern and western parts of the city. Auckland's three leafiest suburbs are Titirangi, which adjoins the Waitakere Ranges (68 per cent canopy cover), Wade Heads (57 per cent) and Chatswood (55 per cent), where

What is LiDAR?

LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) is used to examine the surface of the Earth through collecting data from a survey aircraft. It measures scattered light to find a range and other information on a distant target. The range to the target is measured using the time delay between transmission of a pulse and detection of a reflected signal. This technology allows for the direct measurement of three-dimensional features and structures and the underlying terrain. The ability to measure the height of features on the ground or above the ground is the principle advantage over conventional optical remote sensing technologies such as aerial imagery.

LiDAR data itself does not provide information on the status of Auckland's urban ngahere, further analysis of the data is required to create a tree canopy layer and quantify the distribution and height of the urban ngahere.

- historically the landform was unsuitable for development. Unequal canopy cover distribution is particularly apparent at a local board area level (see Figure 3). The local boards with the lowest canopy cover are Māngere-Ōtāhuhu (eight per cent) and Ōtara-Papatoetoe (nine per cent). The local board with the highest canopy cover is Kaipātiki with 30 per cent canopy cover, two-thirds of which is in public open spaces.
- The majority of Auckland's urban ngahere 61 per cent – is located on privately-owned land. The remaining 39 per cent is on public land, with seven per cent on Auckland Council parkland, nine per cent on road corridors, and 23 per cent on other public land, such as schools (see Figure 4).



An aerial view of unequal canopy cover



80 r 70 60 Percentage (%) 50 40 30 20 10 Waitemata Whau Orakei Kaipatiki Albert - Eden Puketapapa

Figure 3 - canopy cover on different land tenures by local board area.



Figure 4 – proportion of canopy cover on different land ownership types (2013 LiDAR survey).







Why the unequal distribution?

There are a number of reasons for the difference in tree cover across the region, including land ownership (public/private), land use (urban/industrial/agricultural), geography and legal protections (eg Significant Ecological Areas and notable trees). Historically, the type of development and street layout also influenced the funding and space available for tree planting. For example, in areas developed for social housing, there was typically a low level of investment in tree planting, resulting in relatively few street trees. The age of a suburb can also be a factor, for example trees planted close to the city centre in the early days of Auckland's development have now matured (eg in Ponsonby). More recently, prior to the amalgamation of the region's councils into Auckland Council, some legacy council areas had active tree planting programmes.





Trees in private gardens, a significant contribution to our urban ngahere, Ponsonby.



2.2 | Te hora tū teitei Height distribution

The 2013 LiDAR survey reveals that tall trees are rare in our urban ngahere; only six per cent of the urban ngahere is over 20 metres in height, the majority, 64 per cent, is less than 10 metres (see Figure 5). This is partly due to the species that make up the urban ngahere and their height at maturity. In addition,

trees over 20 metres in height need to be in the right place to allow for growth and are likely to be at least 60 years old. Historically, most mature trees were removed as land was cleared for agriculture and Auckland developed.



Figure 5 – Percentage of urban ngahere across different height classes.

When it comes to trees, size does matter!

Benefits are disproportionally greater for larger trees. For example, big trees provide more shade because of their larger, wider canopy spread; their greater leaf areas and more extensive root systems intercept larger amounts of rainfall and stormwater; they absorb more gaseous pollutants, have higher carbon sequestration rates, and typically contribute more to calming and slowing traffic on local streets than small trees. Larger trees also usually have few or no low branches to interfere with activity at ground level, especially if pruned to provide higher canopy clearance over roads, public space and pedestrian footpaths.





2.3 | Te paerewa āraitanga Level of protection

Just 50 per cent of Auckland's urban ngahere has some degree of statutory protection. A high level of protection applies to urban ngahere in Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) which account for 62 per cent of all protected forest (although SEAs capture only about one-third of Auckland's total urban ngahere). A moderate level of protection is provided to urban ngahere in outstanding natural features or landscapes, open space conservation zones, coastal yards, riparian yards and lake protection zones. Some protection is provided to urban ngahere in coastal natural character areas or open space informal recreation zones. A low level of protection is given to urban ngahere in open space active recreation zones and road corridors.

The Notable Trees Schedule in the Unitary Plan is another form of protection. This schedule contains nearly 3000 items (representing some 6000 trees and groups of trees), the majority of which were 'rolled over' from legacy council schedules as part of the Unitary Plan process.

The proportion of protected urban ngahere varies widely from suburb to suburb, much like the level of urban ngahere canopy cover:

- Suburbs with large patches of indigenous ngahere that have been designated as Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) tend to have a high level of urban ngahere canopy cover and a high level of protection (eg Chatswood, Birkenhead and Titirangi).
- Leafy suburbs where the urban ngahere is dominated by exotic and native trees in private backyards (eg Remuera, Epsom and Mt Eden) have moderate to high canopy cover but a low level of protection.
- Some suburbs have a low level of urban ngahere canopy cover, but a relatively high proportion of the canopy cover has some form of protection (eg Māngere, Wiri and Manukau).
- A number of suburbs that have experienced recent urban growth currently have a low level of urban ngahere canopy cover and protection (eg Northpark, Golflands, Howick, New Lynn and New Windsor).







A Pin Oak being lowered into position by a mobile crane and planted at Britomart Place in approximately the 1950's. Credit: Robert Hepple

The Pin Oak pictured above in 2018 – now protected and on the Notable Trees Schedule. This tree is the central feature of a busy intersection, visually contributing to the local streetscape and visible from Quay Street, Beach Road, Anzac Avenue and Fort Street. It is also notable as a solitary specimen of a species that is not well represented in the locality.





Ngā pēhitanga o ināianei, anga atu anō hoki Current and future pressures

Te tupu haere o te tātai tāngata me 3.1 ngā whakakīkītanga āhua tāone A growing population and urban intensification

Auckland is experiencing unprecedented growth and is projected to grow substantially into the future. Around 1.66 million people currently live in Auckland; over the next 30 years this number could grow by another 720,000 people to reach 2.4 million. Auckland will need many more dwellings, possibly another 313,000, in addition to new infrastructure and community



facilities. Development will be focused within existing and future urban areas within the urban boundary (see Figure 6) and this will put significant pressure on the urban ngahere. Much of this growth will occur in existing urban areas through intensification; as land is redeveloped, unprotected trees are at risk of being removed to maximise the developable area of a site.





Figure 6 – Anticipated development in existing and future urban areas as outlined in the Development Strategy (2018).



Without properly recognising the value of trees and understanding the benefits they provide; urban growth is likely to occur at the expense of the urban ngahere. However, urban development and intensification also present opportunities to green our city – to plant and grow our urban ngahere and create new green urban environments in areas set to be urbanised over the next 30 years. Future urban areas are outlined in Auckland's Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (2017) and the Development Strategy (2018). These areas cover around 15,000 hectares, with the potential to accommodate approximately 137,000 dwellings and 1400 hectares of new business land.

3.2 | Te takahurihanga o te huarere Climate change

Climate change threatens our urban ngahere through changing seasonal rainfall patterns, more severe weather events, and increased susceptibility to pests and diseases. Auckland is projected to

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #34aurau

Urban regeneration within the existing city limits, such as the implementation of the City Centre Waterfront Refresh Plan and redevelopment plans for suburbs, presents an opportunity to retrofit green spaces and replace lost trees. The benefits of keeping established trees and the opportunities for these to complement and add value to new developments needs to be recognised. Where development occurs around trees, implementing a best practice approach to tree protection significantly increases their survival rate.

experience increased occurrence of drought and reduced soil moisture. This requires us to better understand the threats to our urban ngahere and what can be done to protect it.



Ngā taimahatanga kei runga i ngā whakahaere ā-wai Pressure on water infrastructure 3.3

Auckland's water infrastructure is vital to ensure that Aucklanders have clean water to drink and use, that wastewater is disposed of safely, homes, businesses and infrastructure are protected from flooding, and waterways and harbours are healthy. Population growth is putting all components of Auckland's water infrastructure under pressure. At the same time, this infrastructure is ageing and needs to be managed to ensure its continued performance. Climate change will place additional pressure on water infrastructure as the frequency and intensity of storm events is predicted to increase.

The Auckland Plan 2050 sets a clear direction to use Auckland's growth and development to protect and enhance the environment.⁹ This includes a focus on using green infrastructure to deliver greater resilience, long-term cost savings and quality environmental outcomes.¹⁰ The Auckland Unitary Plan emphasises the use and enhancement of natural hydrological systems and green infrastructure during development to address pressures on stormwater infrastructure.¹¹ This strategic direction and focus on using green infrastructure provides an opportunity to grow Auckland's urban ngahere.

What is green infrastructure?

Green infrastructure is a strategically planned network of natural and semi-natural areas designed and managed to deliver multi-functional benefits such as stormwater management, water purification, filtration of airborne pollutants, space for recreation and climate mitigation and adaptation. Auckland's urban ngahere is an integral part of our green infrastructure network.



3.4 Ngā mate orotā me ngā mate urutā Pests and diseases

Animal pests and weeds threaten the urban ngahere, including the precious native forest remnants that are found in pockets on public and private land. Possums eat leaves, buds, flowers and young shoots, while weeds like climbing asparagus and monkey apple, smother or out-compete valued species.

Plant diseases are a serious threat to the future of our urban ngahere. Kauri dieback is causing localised extinctions, Dutch elm disease has been in Auckland for many years now, myrtle rust has also reached Auckland and is a risk to pohutukawa, bottlebrush, eucalyptus, and willow myrtle, all common street trees in central Auckland. Climate change is expected to create more favourable conditions for plant diseases to establish and spread. Successfully managing the urban ngahere means these threats must be understood and addressed, if we do not take sufficient action to address these threats, we place our urban ngahere at greater risk. Actions include pest and disease control, using a mix of species and, where possible, disease resistant variants of susceptible species in new plantings, and





by responding quickly and effectively to new and emerging threats. To better understand and address kauri dieback and myrtle rust, Auckland Council is working with central government agencies, Crown Research Institutes and academia.



Te tarāwaho rautaki Strategic framework

The strategic framework consists of a vision, three main objectives (Knowing, Growing and Protecting), two key mechanisms for delivering these objectives (Engage and Manage), and a set of nine supporting principles (Figure 7).







Page **3365**54³⁹

A flowering põhutukawa variety.

He whakatupu ngātahi i te ngahere ā-tāone o Tāmaki Makaurau e matomato ai te hua ā ngā rā e tū mai nei

Together, growing Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future

4.1 | Te tirohanga whānui Vision

Our vision is that Aucklanders are proud of their urban ngahere, that Auckland has a healthy and diverse network of green infrastructure, that it is flourishing across the region and is celebrated, protected, and cared for by all. The urban ngahere is equally distributed across our communities and brings significant benefits to the city. It contributes to our resilience, enhances stormwater management, delivers energy savings, supports biodiversity, and improves health outcomes and quality of life for all Aucklanders. Expanding and improving the urban ngahere is enabled through strong, collaborative partnerships across Auckland. Communities, government, businesses and citizens work together to make our urban ngahere flourish.

We will know we have been successful when we have:

 increased canopy cover across Auckland's urban area



- enhanced the associated social, environmental, economic and cultural benefits
- addressed unequal distribution of canopy cover through increasing canopy cover in neighbourhoods with previously low levels of cover
- increased the network of green infrastructure on public land
- improved linkages between green spaces by establishing ecological corridors
- effectively engaged with private landowners to support a thriving urban ngahere on private land
- planted diverse tree and plant species on public land
- shared knowledge of our urban ngahere
- instilled a sense of pride in Aucklanders for their urban ngahere.



Ngā whāinga Objectives 4.2



Auckland needs to know the status of its urban ngahere, the extent, number and distribution of trees, as well as their size, health and condition. Understanding the social, environmental, economic and cultural value of Auckland's ngahere and quantifying the benefits it provides will support better informed, strategic decisionmaking about its management and growth.

Growing

Auckland needs to grow its urban ngahere to multiply these benefits and address distributional inequity. By expanding and enriching its urban ngahere, Auckland will maximise the social, environmental, economic and cultural benefits that trees, shrubs and other vegetation bring to an urban environment.



Protecting existing ngahere is crucial to safeguarding the added values and benefits mature trees provide. Caring for saplings is critical for ensuring older trees are replenished before the end of their life, our urban ngahere grows over time, and publicly-funded planting is successful.

Ngā tikanga whakahaere Mechanisms 4.3

To achieve these objectives, Auckland Council needs to engage and manage.



Engage with partners and stakeholders – with mana whenua, residents, private landowners, community organisations and the private sector to ensure the urban ngahere is well managed, its benefits are well recognised and that growing and protecting the urban ngahere on public and private land is widely supported.



Manage the city's urban ngahere on public land through coordinated planning, strategic planting, smart and innovative urban design while facilitating best practice standards for work on and around trees through maintenance contracts.



Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy | Te Rautaki Ngahere ā-Tāone o Tāmaki #34



4.4 Ngā mātāpono Principles

1. Right tree in the right place

It's important to consider growing conditions and their impact on proposed tree species, soil type, drainage, slope, sunlight access, the presence of pests and weeds and the potential current and future impacts of proposed tree species on the nature and function of a place. Growth rate and size of a proposed tree species at maturity should be basic considerations in determining suitability for a specific site. Planting the right tree in the right place is an important factor in minimising future maintenance requirements and costs.



Figure 8 – Consider the context of the site and plant the right tree in the right place

2. Preference for native species

The Auckland Unitary Plan encourages the use of indigenous trees and vegetation for roadside plantings and open spaces to recognise and reflect cultural, amenity, landscape and ecological values. Planting exotic trees may be appropriate in some cases, eg where there is a need for deciduous trees to provide solar access in winter, or fruit trees to establish community orchards. Exotic trees may also be suitable for cultural or heritage reasons in specific locations.





3. Ensure urban forest diversity

Planting a range of species increases the urban ngahere's resilience to the impacts of diseases, pests, and climate change. Planting a diverse range of species will ensure only a portion of the urban ngahere will be affected as diseases and pests tend to be limited to a certain tree species or genus. It is also important to maintain genetic diversity for each species to support better resilience, for example through our seed collection programme. Planting trees with varying lifespans helps to avoid a large-scale decline in numbers as trees with similar lifespans reach the end of their lives.

4. Protect mature, healthy trees

The benefits provided by trees become exponentially greater as they mature. It's also more cost effective to care for mature trees, as this typically costs less than planting and caring for new trees. The only way to replace a 40-year-old tree is to spend 40 years caring for a new tree.

People often have strong emotional connections to landmark, mature trees in their neighbourhoods, and are more likely to mourn the loss of a large tree. Additionally, some native species, such as kākā, and bats, prefer taller trees and their presence can significantly improve the biodiversity value of an area.







5. Create ecological corridors and connections

The urban ngahere is home to a range of ecological groups, such as birds , insects, moths and butterflies. It brings nature into urban environments, a place where the majority of Aucklanders (90 per cent) live and spend most of their time. It can also provide ecological corridors for species migrating through urban environments (see Figure 9). Connecting Auckland's urban ngahere, particularly remnant natural areas, to create ecological corridors and connections between green spaces is important to enhance biodiversity.

6. Access for all residents

The unequal distribution of canopy cover across Auckland needs to be addressed when new plantings are planned. Considerations include the delivery of urban ngahere benefits, public demand for a higher canopy cover and physical access to the urban ngahere in a local area.



7. Manage urban forest on public and private land

Around 61 per cent of Auckland's urban ngahere canopy is on privately-owned land, with 39 per cent on public land. However, many of the benefits of trees are realised beyond private property boundaries and by many more people than just individual landowners. A loss of urban ngahere on private land is also a loss for the city. While there are opportunities for Auckland Council to grow and protect the urban ngahere on public land, the overall status of the urban ngahere is, to a large degree, dependent on the decisions of private landowners. Managing Auckland's urban ngahere requires private landowners' support and cooperation. Engagement is crucial and is one of two key delivery mechanisms for the proposed strategic framework.



8. Deploy regulatory and non-regulatory tools

Auckland Council has a range of regulatory tools to protect the urban ngahere, such as rules relating to Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs), the schedule of Notable trees, and rules to limit the extent of vegetation removal in sensitive environments, like streams and coastlines. These regulatory tools apply to trees and vegetation on private properties. However, since amendments to the Resource Management Act (RMA) came into effect in 2015, lifting blanket tree protection in urban areas councils depend mainly on non-regulatory tools to control the removal of trees and vegetation on private properties. Examples include landowner advice and assistance with tree care and planting, community education and outreach programmes, and raising awareness of the value and benefits of the urban ngahere.



9. Manage the whole lifecycle of urban trees

Achieving the long-term vision to grow Auckland's urban ngahere for a flourishing future not only depends on planting more trees and vegetation but also looking after them during their lifecycle. New plantings may not be able to flourish (or even survive) without ongoing aftercare and maintenance. Investing in maintenance and proactive management will yield greater long-term benefits, as well as ensure money is well spent, with less wastage and repeated effort.



Figure 9 - the potential for ecological connections across urban and rural landscapes (adapted from Meurk & Hall, 2006¹²)



48





Ngā hua ā-rautaki Strategy Outcomes

The strategy outcomes are underpinned by an implementation framework and high level actions outlined in the next section.

5.1 | Te mōhio ki ngā mea ka hua Knowing outcomes

To better understand the status and value of Auckland's urban ngahere.

Improved knowledge will assist us to make more informed and strategic decisions on how to manage our urban ngahere.

The knowing outcomes will give us a better understanding of the status and trends of important indicators, such as canopy cover, height and age distribution and species diversity across both public and private land. Understanding these factors will enable us to better evaluate and understand the value of our urban ngahere. i-Tree Eco software¹³ could present an opportunity to do this, however at present additional research is required to fully adapt i-Tree data and analysis to a New Zealand context.

A better understanding of the trends and status of the canopy cover can direct planting efforts to where the most value can be realised. Potential future impacts and pressures on Auckland's urban ngahere, such as climate change and new pests and diseases, can also be better managed and minimised.

Table 1 – Knowing outcomes

Objective	Outcomes
Knowing	Better understanding of the status and trends on private and public land over time.
	Better understanding of the diverse values and benefits of Auckland's urban forest.
	Better understanding of existing and future risks and pressures.





Figure 10 - unequal canopy cover at a local board level (2013 LiDAR survey)



5.2 Te whakatupu i ngā mea ka hua Growing outcomes

To grow Auckland's urban ngahere and grow it more equitably.

Growing our urban ngahere will increase the average canopy cover and also provide a fairer distribution of the urban ngahere and associated benefits across Auckland (see Figure 10).

We can grow our urban ngahere and increase resilience to existing and future pressures, such as pests, diseases and climate change, through the application of the strategic framework's nine principles.

Table 2 – Growing outcomes

Objective	Outcomes
Growing	Increase the average canopy cover to 30 per cent across Auckland's urban area with no local board area having less than 15 per cent canopy cover.
	Increased resilience to existing and future pressures.



5.3 | Te tiaki i ngā mea ka hua Protecting outcomes

To protect and maintain Auckland's existing and future urban ngahere.

Protecting our existing urban ngahere is crucial to realising the values and benefits of mature trees. Caring for new plantings and young trees is essential to ensure that older trees are replaced at the end of their life and our urban ngahere grows over time.

Achieving no net loss ensures that any losses are balanced by a gain elsewhere. At a local board level, any loss will need to be balanced out by a gain in canopy cover elsewhere within the local board area. Table 3 – Protecting outcomes





5.4 Ngā tikanga whakahaere ka hua Mechanism outcomes

Engage and Manage are the two mechanisms Auckland Council will use to achieve the Knowing, Growing and Protecting objectives. For example, increasing the canopy cover and prioritising options for future planting on public and private land will only be possible through engaging and working collaboratively with communities and partners.

Engage

Community support is critical for fulfilling all three main objectives. Auckland Council must engage with relevant partners and stakeholders – mana whenua, private landowners, community groups, and the private sector –to support the growth and protection of Auckland's urban ngahere. The council must also engage with the public more widely about the benefits of urban ngahere to ensure they are understood and recognised.

Table 4 – Engage outcomes



A community engagement programme is needed that addresses Growing and Protecting and is supported by partnerships with relevant stakeholders. The programme must also integrate the aspirations of Māori, in accordance with the principle of partnership enshrined in te Tiriti o Waitangi and recognise the special role of mana whenua as kaitiaki (guardians) whereby ngahere and whenua ora (environmental services) are intimately connected to Māori wellbeing. As the programme evolves, we will develop a better understanding of community aspirations, and knowledge gaps relating to urban ngahere benefits and value.

Manage

Another key mechanism in successfully implementing the vision is the effective management of existing and future urban ngahere on public land through coordinated planning, strategic planting, smart and innovative urban design, and facilitating best practice standards for work on and around trees through maintenance contracts.

Table 5 – Manage outcomes

Mechanism	Outcomes
Manage	Increased survival rate of new plantings and sustainability of Auckland's urban ngahere on public land.

As noted in section 2.2, tree size matters when it comes to the scale of benefits delivered. Central to effective management is the requirement to nurture growing trees and increase the proportion of larger trees.





Tarāwaho whakatinana Implementation framework

The implementation framework consists of high level actions that are central to achieving the strategy outcomes. In addition to the high level actions, collaboration, funding and partnerships and area specific implementation are all fundamental to the strategy's success.

6.1 | Te mahi tahi mō te rautaki ngahere ā-tāone Urban ngahere strategy collaboration

Success will require close collaboration with many partners at various levels across operational boundaries and disciplines, within the municipality and beyond. Some of the key cross boundary groups are:

Cross-council collaboration:

This involves collaboration between internal stakeholders, interdepartmental cooperation and working closely with council controlled organisations. In the urban context, planners should work with foresters and arborists to effectively integrate policy and knowledge management tools to grow and protect the urban ngahere.

Community and council collaboration:

Effective implementation of the strategy requires effective engagement with community groups



and institutions that play a role in growing and protecting the urban ngahere.

Business and council collaboration:

Insight provided by business groups, including developers, is important to support the strategy's successful implementation. The decisions and actions of business groups can have a significant influence on the urban ngahere.

International cooperation:

This strategy draws on the knowledge and experience of many leading cities that have developed their own urban forest strategies. Continued sharing of technical, governance and community know-how will help to achieve better outcomes for Auckland.



6.2 Ngā tahua pūtea me ngā hononga ā-hoa Funding and partnerships

Continuing support from Auckland Council, developers, businesses and the wider community is fundamental to successfully growing and protecting Auckland's urban ngahere. For example, leading developers understand that delivering a successful and sustainable project is not just about building design, but also the surrounding environment and the outcomes this can deliver. Businesses can also contribute to the growth and protection of the urban ngahere through financial support, planting initiatives and effective maintenance of trees on their properties. Most importantly, having financial

support from the council ensures the development of knowledge, growth and protection of urban ngahere on public and private land.

Effective communication on the benefits of urban ngahere, such as better stormwater management, carbon sequestration, lower infrastructure costs, enhanced biodiversity and community health not to mention the city's aesthetic enhancement - is an important tool to justify project costs to stakeholders and partners. It's important to document and disseminate urban ngahere benefits to gain continuous support from all Aucklanders.

6.3 Whakatinanatanga ā-wāhi motuhake Area specific implementation

The strategy must take an area specific approach to implementation. This will require engaging with each local board, partners and stakeholders to discuss needs and drivers for growing and

protecting Auckland's urban ngahere. This will ensure the strategy's high level actions are defined and implemented in a way that matches the needs of each local area.



6.4 Kaupapa mahi matua High level actions

The Engage and Manage mechanisms identified in the strategy framework run through all the high level actions and are central to their successful implementation. Table 6 – Knowing high level actions



- land over time
- urban forest

High level actions

- Incorporate three-yearly LiDAR surveys in council 1 work programmes.
- Create database for existing assets within two year 2
- Integrate scientific knowledge of the urban ngahe 3 mātauranga Māori in partnership with mana wher the urban ngahere.
- Quantify values and benefits (within 12-18 month 4
- 5 Determine survival rates of new council plantings.
- Identify key pressures and risks in partnership with 6 whenua and local boards.

High level actions to support the following outcomes:

• better understanding of the status and trends on private and public

· better understanding of the diverse values and benefits of Auckland's

· better understanding of existing and future risks and pressures.

	Implement	ation timefra	neframe (years)			
	1-2	3-5	Ongoing			
			•			
ars.	•					
re with nua of			•			
ns).	•					
			•			
h mana	•					

Page **3365**459

Table 7 – Growing high level actions

$\langle \cdot \rangle$
Growing

- High level actions to support the following outcomes:
- increase the average canopy cover to 30 per cent across Auckland's urban area with no local board area having less than 15 per cent canopy cover
- increased resilience to existing and future pressures.

Lick level estime		Implementation timeframe (years)				
μıβ	High level actions		1-2	3-5	Ongoing	
1	Increase canopy cover in road corridors, passes to support an average of 30 per ce across Auckland's urban area with no loca having less than 15 per cent canopy cover	arks and open nt canopy cover l board area			•	
2	Identify and prioritise locations for future on public land in partnership with mana w local boards.	planting ⁄henua and	•			
3	Use science and ongoing engagement wit mana whenua and communities to inform relation to types of planting.	h local boards, n decisions in			•	
4	Increase the capacity of nursery programmers and the supply of eco-sour maraes) to increase the supply of eco-sour	nes (including rced plants.			•	
5	Leverage partnerships established through initiatives (eg the Mayor's Million Trees pr	n existing ogramme).		•		

Table 8 – Protecting high level actions



Raise arboriculture maintenance programme from 6 to five years or until new plantings are well establi (a target survival rate of 70-80 per cent).

guidelines, proper tree care).

7 Establish a labelling programme for protected tree 12 months (eg species, age and benefits).

	Implementation timeframe (years)						
	1-2	3-5	Ongoing				
ion t.	•						
th	٠						
mes (eg			•				
s urban			•				
of the anting			•				
n two ished	•						
es within	•						





Ngā tohutoro References

- Pacific Southwest Research Station and Center for Urban Forest Research https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/topics/urban_forestry/products/2/psw_cufr687_NYC_MFRA.pdf
- 2. McDonald, R. et al. 2017. Funding Trees for Health, The Nature Conservancy, www.nature.org/trees4health
- 3. urban environment, Environmental Health 2016 15 (Suppl 1):S36 https://ehjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12940-016-0103-6
- Cavanagh, J. E. and Clemons, J. 2006. Do Urban Forests Enhance Air Quality? Australian Journal of 4. Environmental Management, Volume 13, 2006 – Issue 2 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14486563.2006.9725122?needAccess=true
- 5. Ecosyst (2011) 14:755-769
- Harmsworth, G., R. Awatere, S. 2013. Indigenous Māori Knowledge and Perspectives of Ecosystems. 6. Ecosystem services in New Zealand – conditions and trends. Manaaki Whenua Press, Lincoln, New Zealand
- 7. Wilcox, M. D. 2012. Auckland's Remarkable Urban Forest, Auckland Botanical Society
- 8. Manaaki Whenua - Landcare Research, Māori values and native forest (Ngahere) https://www. landcareresearch.co.nz/ data/assets/pdf file/0017/43910/maori values native forest.pdf
- 9. The Auckland Plan 2050, Outcome: Environment and Cultural Heritage, Direction 3: Use Auckland's growth and development to protect and enhance the natural environment https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plansstrategies/auckland-plan/environment-cultural-heritage/Pages/direction-use-growthdevelopment-protect-enhance.aspx
- 10. https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plansstrategies/auckland-plan/environment-cultural-heritage/Pages/focus-area-use-greeninfrastructure-deliver-greater-resilience.aspx
- The Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in part (Updated 13 July 2018), E1 Water quality and 11. integrated management http://unitaryplan.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/Images/Auckland%20Unitary%20Plan%20 Operative/Chapter%20E%20Auckland-wide/1.%20Natural%20Resources/E1%20Water%20 quality%20and%20integrated%20management.pdf
- 12. 30(1): 131-146

https://newzealandecology.org/nzje/2297

13. i-Tree Eco https://www.itreetools.org/eco/index.php

Peper, P. et al. 2007. New York City, New York Municipal Forest Resource Analysis. USDA Forest Service,

Salmond, J. et al. 2016. Health and climate related ecosystem services provided by street trees in the

Xiao, Q. and McPherson, E. G. 2011. Rainfall interception of three trees in Oakland, California, Urban

https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/mcpherson/psw_2011_mcpherson008(xiao).pdf

https://www.landcareresearch.co.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/77047/2_1_Harmsworth.pdf

The Auckland Plan 2050, Outcome: Environment and Cultural Heritage, Focus area 6: Use green infrastructure to deliver greater resilience, long-term cost savings and quality environmental outcomes

Meurk, C.D. Hall, G.M.J. 2006. Options for enhancing forest biodiversity across New Zealand's managed landscapes based on ecosystem modelling and spatial design. New Zealand Journal of Ecology (2006)



© 2019 Auckland Council March 2019 Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department

Auckland Council (2019). Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy

ISBN 978-1-98-856480-7 (Print) ISBN 978-1-98-856481-4 (PDF)

Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy was approved by the Auckland Council Environment and Community Committee on 20 February 2018.



Howick Local Board Ngahere Analysis Update 2021 Canopy cover changes with the 2013 to 2016/2018 LiDAR data

Urban Ngahere Strategy 2019 Knowing Programme



A summary of the urban environment in Howick

Approximately **142,700** residents Less than **1%** of canopy cover more than **30 metres** tall

Average canopy cover of

54% of canopy cover with no statutory protection

More than 230 local parks and 55 playgrounds

293 hectares of Significant Ecological Area

Two statistical areas - Shelly Park and Tuscany Heights - with more than **30%** canopy cover

> More than **70%** of total canopy cover on private land

across local board, including canopy cover of: 26% on public parkland on road public land on private and on public land on private public land on private land

New zoning under Auckland Unitary Plan includes Mixed Housing Urban, Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Notable Tree records

Nearly 7,000 hectares of land

727

including:

- Mangemangeroa Reserve
- Point View Reserve
- Murphys Bush

1.8% of original indigenous vegetation cover remaining

1,123 hectares of urban forest in 2013, **remaining the same in 2016/2018**



Auckland Council disclaims any liability whatsoever in connection with any action taken in reliance of this document for any error, deficiency, flaw or omission contained in it.

Date: September 2021

ISBN 978-1-99-100252-5 (Print)

ISBN 978-1-99-100253-2 (PDF)

This document is licensed for re-use under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence.

In summary, you are free to copy, distribute and adapt the material, as long as you attribute it to the Auckland Council and abide by the other licence terms.



Contents

1.0 Pr	eface		1			
2.0 In	troducti	on	2			
	2.1	Howick Local Board	2			
	2.2	Study Background	3			
	2.3	Data Collection	3			
3.0 R	esults ar	nd Discussion	4			
	3.1	Urban Canopy Cover Overview	4			
	3.2	Canopy Distribution across Howick Local Board	5			
	3.3	Urban Ngahere Canopy Height	8			
	3.4	Urban Ngahere Tenure	9			
	3.5	Urban Ngahere in Relation to Growth Pressures	10			
	3.6	Recommendations	13			
4.0 A	cknowle	dgements	14			
5.0 R	5.0 References					

1.0 Preface

Tāmaki-Makaurau / Auckland is New Zealand's largest city, and plantings of exotic and native trees have taken place as the region has developed. Early Māori settlers would have planted trees such as karaka, pūriri and tōtara to indicate a special place or to mark a celebration, while European settlers planted trees that were familiar and provided a sense of place. London Plane, English Oak, and European Lime trees were some of the earliest recorded plantings in Auckland. Settlers arriving from around the world commenced the history of Auckland's diverse and unique tree cover.

When European settlers arrived to Tāmaki-Makaurau / Auckland, the gullies of the isthmus were filled with raupō, edged with a varied growth of sedges and other moisture loving plants; and slopes of gullies covered with karamū and cabbage trees. By the late nineteenth century, much of the Auckland area was under cultivation with a large number of introduced plants. Along with residential development commencing in the mid-20th century, these actions have now reduced indigenous forest cover within the Howick Local Board to small fragments, primarily in local reserves.

The Howick Local Board has provided locally driven initiatives funding to Auckland Council's Principal Advisor Urban Ngahere (Forest) in the Parks, Sports and Recreation Department to develop an analysis of the tree cover in its area of responsibility. This update report is the result of a programme of work by Auckland Council involving detailed analysis of urban tree coverages on public and private land, aiming to identify opportunities to nurture, grow and protect urban trees in the local board area. The analysis work is directed by the Auckland Council's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy 2019, which has 18 key objectives to help Council and local boards to deliver a healthy ngahere for a flourishing future.



2.0 Introduction

2.1 Howick Local Board

The Howick Local Board covers approximately (c.) 7,000 hectares (ha) in eastern Auckland, located between the Tāmaki River to the west, the Mangemangeroa Stream to the east and the Redoubt Road ridge to the southeast. The population of the local board is approximately 142,700 residents.

Land-use within the board is very varied, with well-established (pre-1990) residential suburbs dominating the northern half of the board, newer and developing residential suburbs to the east and south, large retail centres at Botany Downs and Pakuranga Plaza, and a swathe of commercial and industrial land to the west, encompassing Highbrook Park and parts of East Tāmaki. Howick's southern and eastern boundaries extend just beyond the recognised rural-urban boundary into the adjacent rural regions around Brookby and Whitford, with the south-eastern spread of development butting up against the physical and regulatory limits imposed by topography and zoning.

Approximately 11% of the local board area is public parkland, with bush reserves containing pockets of remnant native forest. These reserves are predominantly



Urban forest around central Howick

located along Howick's eastern margins at the interface between the suburbs and the rural areas beyond and on the coastal fringe. Examples include Mangemangeroa Reserve, Point View Reserve, and Murphys Bush.

Large reserves for passive or active recreation, or a mixture of both, are distributed throughout Howick and include Barry Curtis Park, Lloyd Elsmore Park, Macleans Park (with substantial areas of native revegetation planting), Tī Rakau Park, Pigeon Mountain, Murvale Reserve (with an outstanding collection of early exotic plantings), and William Green Domain.

Large portions of the local board area are now zoned for development intensification under the Auckland Unitary Plan. The new zoning, including the Mixed Housing Urban Zone and the Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone, now allows for smaller sections. Consequently, much of the urban forest is under a range of pressures from development, which could potentially lead to irreversible changes in urban forest cover (Brown et al., 2015).

An information graphic summarising local board details related to urban forest is provided at the beginning of this report.



The 'Rural-Urban Boundary' viewed from Point View Reserve, East Tāmaki Heights

2.2 Study Background

'Urban ngahere' ('urban forest') comprises all the trees within a city – including parks, coastal cliffs, stream corridors, private gardens and streets – both native and naturalised exotic species. For the purposes of this report, 'urban ngahere' is defined as all of the trees and other vegetation three metres or taller in stature within the Howick Local Board, and the soil and water systems that support these trees. This urban ngahere definition encompasses trees and shrubs in streets, parks, private gardens, stream banks, coastal cliffs, rail corridors, and motorway margins and embankments. It also includes both planted and naturally established plants, of both exotic and native provenance.

The scale of the tree and shrub cover across Auckland is sufficiently extensive on both public and private land to make a meaningful contribution to the liveability and sense of place for its residents. Benefits of the urban ngahere include:

Social

- Improve health and wellbeing
- Reduce the urban heat island effect
- Provide shade
- Enhance visual amenity

Environmental

- Enhance biodiversity
- Improve air quality
- Carbon sequestration
- Improve water quality

Economic

- Increase property values
- Reduce flood risk
- Reduce energy costs
- Reduce healthcare costs

Cultural

- Support education
- Local food growing
- Sustain and enhance maur
- Cultural heritage

The Auckland Unitary Plan offers various degrees of protection to urban ngahere and groups of trees meeting specific characteristics (e.g., pre-identified significance, vegetation by coasts or streams); however, other important urban ngahere assets have no statutory protection and can therefore be removed. The completion of a study in urban canopy cover in Howick is important to provide information on baseline tree distribution that future canopy cover measurements can be compared to. This baseline data also provides information on where there are pressures on canopy cover and opportunities for tree planting. Increases in canopy cover are also intended to contribute to other Auckland Council programmes such as Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan (Auckland Council 2019c).

2.3 Data Collection

Urban canopy cover across Auckland was mapped in 2013 (Auckland Council 2019b), and again in 2016/18 by use of LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging). Airborne LiDAR is an optical remote sensing technology that irradiates a target with a beam of light; usually a pulsed laser, to measure an object's variable distances from the earth surface. Two LiDAR data sets are covered in this report, collected in the years 2013 and 2016/2018. The second survey (2016/2018) had to be completed over two years due to unfavourable weather conditions that limited data quality. As these two LiDAR data sets provide a solid baseline for future comparative work, investigations into alternatives to LiDAR for mapping urban ngahere are currently underway.



New native restoration planting

#34

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Urban Canopy Cover Overview

Based on the 2013 data set, urban ngahere covered 16% of the Howick Local Board area, including 6% of roads, 25% of public parks, and 17% of private land. Further information on the 2013 data has been provided in a baseline report (Howick Local Board Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report September 2019; Auckland Council 2019b). There was no net change in overall canopy cover based on the 2016/2018 data set (Table 1).

As an overview, the initial analysis contained in this report (in line with the knowing phase of the Auckland Urban Ngahere Strategy) shows that there are some obvious areas of urban ngahere concentration, while there are also areas that are lacking urban ngahere. The lowest cover (3-6%) tends to be in central/southern areas of the

local board (Botany Central/South, Redcastle, Ormiston North and Donegal Park), while the eastern parts of the local board, Shelly Park and Tuscany Heights, have the highest cover (more than 30%). Although the canopy cover in East Tāmaki is low (5%), the percentage of canopy cover >30 m tall is high compared to other statistical areas in the local board. Other suburbs with a relatively high level of tree cover are the older coastal suburbs of Shelly Park, Mellons Bay and Cockle Bay.

The 2016/18 LiDAR data indicates growth in canopy cover on road reserves and parks across the Howick Local Board, with a combined net increase in canopy cover of c.26 hectares. Conversely, there has been a net reduction in canopy cover of c.8 hectares on privately owned land. An example of this decrease has been observed on private land in Ormiston East, where canopy cover has shown a net reduction of 13 hectares since 2013.

Urban Local Board	Public open space		Private land		Roads		Other public land		Overall coverage	
	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018	2013	2016/2018
Kaipātiki	63	64	25	25	12	14	33	34	30	30
Upper Harbour	50	52	29	30	11	13	10	11	27	28
Hibiscus and Bays	28	29	24	23	15	14	43	42	25	24
Puketāpapa	50	50	17	16	10	12	15	15	20	20
Albert-Eden	33	34	19	18	17	20	19	18	20	20
Ōrākei	25	25	20	19	14	16	20	20	20	19
Waitematā	42	43	16	15	15	17	11	10	19	19
Whau	34	34	17	16	12	13	12	12	17	17
Devonport-Takapuna	24	27	17	17	11	13	13	14	16	16
Howick	25	26	17	17	6	8	11	12	16	16
Henderson-Massey	30	32	14	14	7	8	11	12	15	15
Papakura	16	17	15	15	8	11	8	9	13	14
Manurewa	24	26	11	12	6	9	7	7	12	13
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki	21	23	9	9	10	12	11	11	11	12
Ōtara-Papatoetoe	13	14	8	8	7	9	10	10	9	10
Māngere-Ōtāhuhu	14	14	7	7	7	9	8	8	8	8

Table 1: Urban ngahere in Auckland's urban local board areas: data includes percentage cover (to nearest whole number) of urban ngahere for different land tenures, and the overall percentage cover of urban ngahere within each board, with a comparison between the 2013 and 2016/2018 data sets.

Te matomatotanga o Te Ngahere-a-Tāone Te Rohe o Howick

3.2 Canopy Distribution across Howick Local Board

The urban ngahere is not distributed evenly throughout the local board, as shown in **Figures 1 and 2**, which display variation by statistical area. Urban ngahere covers 16% of the Howick Local Board area as a whole. However, when excluding the rural parts of Howick and considering only the urbanised areas, the level of canopy cover is closer to 11%. This is a low figure for an urban area and well below the level of cover targeted within Auckland's Urban Ngahere Strategy. This strategy has a goal of achieving an average 30% canopy cover across all of urban Auckland, with no local board area having less than 15% cover (Auckland Council, 2019a).

The reliance on the rural fringe of Howick in raising its overall level of tree cover is highlighted by the fact that, despite making up less than a quarter of the board's land area, it contains nearly half of its urban ngahere cover. Small losses of rural land to urbanisation would be likely to have a disproportionate effect on the urban ngahere, both in terms of overall tree cover and by affecting a greater proportion of large trees.

Over half (51%) of the local board is covered in impervious surfaces, which presents an opportunity to plant urban ngahere, particularly in the road corridor, as a direct remedy. Trees are a well-known solution for stormwater management, as their extensive canopies and subsurface root systems are capable of capturing and pumping substantial amounts of water, providing cooling effects (Berland et al. 2017). Establishing trees within impervious surfaces will act to intercept rainfall before it reaches the ground and slows inflow rates. This has follow on benefits for stormwater management systems such as underground pipes and nearby waterways (Dwyer and Miller 1999). Opportunities exist for new tree planting in the road corridor which will assist in stormwater management by capturing stormwater flows via interception and infiltration. Trees and other 'green infrastructure' solutions, including rain gardens, permeable pavements, bioswales, and green roofs, are worth implementing at a greater scale and should be encouraged. There has not been a significant change in urban tree coverage on a local scale, as shown in **Figure 2**. In general, statistical areas of Howick have had only a minor net increase or minor net decrease in canopy cover. The only current concern may be Donegal Park, with already low tree coverage, had a minor net decrease in cover between the two data sets. Upon examination this appears to be attributed to small scale residential tree removal and trimming of larger trees.



Matanginui/Green Mount, East Tāmaki, Auckland

Te matomatotanga o Te Ngahere-a-Tāone Te Rohe o Howick



Te matomatotanga o Te Ngahere-a-Tāone Te Rohe o Howick



Figure 2: Spatial distribution of urban ngahere canopy within the statistical areas of Howick Local Board

Page **16075**
3.3 Urban Ngahere Canopy Height

LiDAR data includes a height component, and this information was used to split the recorded canopy cover into different height categories: 3-5 metres; 5-10 metres; 10-15 metres; 15-20 metres; 20-30 metres; and taller than 30 metres. This data is representative of canopy cover height, rather than tree height, as each individual tree may be recorded in several categories.

The height class distribution of the urban ngahere canopy within Howick Local Board is displayed in **Figure 3**. In 2013, 26% of the canopy cover was between 3-5 metres tall, 40% 5-10 metres tall, and the remaining 34% was canopy taller than 10 metres. This distribution remained similar in the 2016/2018 data sets, although the percentage of canopy cover over between 3-5 metres tall increased to 32% of the forest canopy. This data shows only low presence of tall canopy cover within the local board area, with all canopy cover taller than 15 metres (including height categories 15-20 metres, 20-30 metres, and 30 metres plus) representing approximately 12% of the total urban ngahere canopy cover assessed and are mainly found in bush remnants and the rural fringes, particularly within East Tāmaki Heights and Flat Bush.

Research has shown that many of the benefits attributed to urban ngahere are disproportionally provided by larger trees (Davies et al. 2011, Moser et al. 2015). Large trees typically create more shade per tree due to a larger and wider canopy spread (Moser et al. 2015); intercept larger amounts of particulate pollutants and rainfall due to significantly larger leaf areas; contain more carbon and have higher carbon sequestration rates (Beets et al. 2012, Schwendenmann and Mitchell 2014, Dahlhausen et al. 2016).

Additionally, trees are often less susceptible to careless or malicious vandalism by the general public once established; can be pruned to provide higher canopy clearance over roadways; carparks and pedestrian footpaths; typically contribute more to calming and slowing traffic on local streets than small trees; and absorb more gaseous pollutants. It is therefore an immediate priority to retain existing large trees across the local board area to ensure the positive benefits of these are not lost, as also emphasised in the Urban Ngahere Strategy (Auckland Council 2019a). The relatively high proportion of shorter canopy cover across the local board (32% 3-5m tall and 39% 5-10m tall) in the 2016/2018 data set, indicates a relatively recent surge of tree planting, assuming the smaller stature canopy corresponds to younger trees, rather than shrubs which are limited at their mature height. When grouped by land use type, it can be seen how the contribution of the trees in rural Howick skews the figures for the board as a whole, with this area containing approximately 50% less canopy cover under five metres tall as a proportion of overall cover than in urban Howick, and has nearly twice the proportion of canopy cover over ten metres tall.



Figure 3: Height class distribution of urban ngahere canopy across all land tenures within Howick Local Board

Ngahe Ragel A Populate 2021 8

3.4 Urban Ngahere Tenure

The tenure of urban ngahere described in this report relates to the zoning and ownership of different land parcels within the local board. Publicly owned land is described as either 'public parks' or 'other public land' (e.g. schools, Council-owned property), trees in the road corridor/road reserves are described as 'street trees', and privately owned land (residential or commercial) is described as 'private land'.

The tenure distribution of urban ngahere canopy within the Howick Local Board is displayed in **Figure 4**. Nearly three quarters (74%) of the urban ngahere in Howick, much of which is unprotected, is located on private property. Public parks and other publicly owned land (e.g., schools) contain a similar proportion of urban ngahere, being 15% and 11% of the total urban ngahere cover, respectively.

Howick Local Board stands out in the regional data as having a very low degree of tree coverage (8% in 2016/18) within its road reserves (Table 1), which may reflect the relatively recent construction of a large part of the road network and, to some degree, poor planting choices and practices in the newer suburbs. This situation presents an opportunity for enhancing the urban ngahere by infill planting of carefully chosen street trees, that will provide benefits long term to local communities.

Planting may also be considered on rural roads, the canopy within which makes up only 2% of the rural tree coverage. With only 5% canopy cover on other public land



Figure 4: Tenure of urban ngahere canopy within Howick Local Board (2013 data set)

■ Other Public Land (47 ha)

in rural parts of the local board, there may also be an opportunity to encourage planting within this category of land such as schools and colleges, where additional educational benefits may be gained.

In addition to having low levels of canopy cover, roads also exhibit generally small tree size, with only 13% being over ten metres tall, compared to 39% for parks. This reflects the more cramped growing environment within the road corridor (particularly below ground) and the more frequent cycling of tree stock as trees are regularly removed and replaced to allow for infrastructure works.

Public parks have the highest proportion of urban ngahere relative to area out of all the land tenures, as shown in **Figure 5**, followed by private land. There has been a minor net increase in urban ngahere canopy in public parks, as well as road reserves and other public land, between the two survey data sets. The percentage canopy cover of private land has stayed the same.

Public parks are good place to focus additional urban ngahere planting as they comprise approximately 10% of the local board land area and are widely distributed. In addition, public parks offer the best opportunities for long-term sustainable management of the urban ngahere due to the lower chance of conflict with future housing intensification.



Figure 5: Change in urban ngahere cover of different land tenures in Howick Local Board between 2013 and 2016/18



3.5 Urban Ngahere in Relation to Growth Pressures

The Significant Ecological Area overlay (SEA; **Figure 6**) prioritises the areas of urban ngahere in Howick with the highest ecological value, providing a starting point for protection. With future development and urban intensification, however, SEA and other continuous areas of urban ngahere are at risk. Canopy cover in relation to the Auckland Future Urban Land Supply Strategy (Auckland Council 2017) forecasting areas of growth is shown in **Figure 7**.

There is increased pressure on the urban ngahere in Howick through a combination of greenfield development, lack of suitable growing space, and conflicts with infrastructure. An increase in urban ngahere cover in local parks and residential suburbs will provide more universal benefits as a greater number of people are likely to encounter the forest and connect to nature. Urban ngahere on public land provides opportunities to connect with communities, enhanced biodiversity, educational opportunities and helps to develop a sense of place.

The lack of scheduled notable trees in the southern half of Howick is another issue that may warrant investigation, as there may potentially be trees that have so far been overlooked but would meet the necessary standards for inclusion on the schedule. This may particularly be the case in parts of Flat Bush currently under development, where large, high value trees are scattered within former farmland and riparian margins.

Protecting existing and adding to the numbers of trees in the road corridor is an important and ongoing measure to retain and extend urban ngahere cover, as the tree cover in the road corridor is currently low. The importance of trees in the street environment is going to increase, and will, in time, incorporate the only accessible trees for some residents.

To this end, the Howick Local Board is encouraged to work with Auckland Council to readdress the current rules for tree and vegetation protection, especially in relation to highlighting the importance of large trees and the multiple benefits they offer to the local community.



Notable trees, Howick, Auckland

#34

Te matomatotanga o Te Ngahere-a-Tāone Te Rohe o Howick



Figure 6: 2016/18 Canopy Height & Significant Ecological Areas

Te matomatotanga o Te Ngahere-a-Tāone Te Rohe o Howick



Figure 7: 2016/18 Canopy & Sequencing and Timing of Growth

Te matomatotanga o Te Ngahere-a-Tāone Te Rohe o Howick

3.6 Recommendations

The assessment of urban tree cover in the Howick Local Board presented in this update report aims to assist in the knowing phase of the Auckland Urban Forest Strategy. The analysis of existing tree cover distribution, structure, tenure, and protection, provides the local board with a basis for determining where to focus efforts in improving urban ngahere cover during the growing phase, to be initiated in the near future.

Recommendations for future urban ngahere management to the Howick Local Board include:

- Prioritise the efforts of the Howick Urban Ngahere Action Plan 2021 to plant new trees in parks and streets
- raise awareness of the current rules for tree and vegetation notable Tree overlay
- strengthen local funding initiatives to engage with, educate, and support private owners of land featuring valuable trees

- set an initial goal of achieving a minimum of 15% urban ngahere cover within the fully urban portion of Howick
- initiate tree planting where possible in unused corners or edges of parks, including the designation of the former Greenmount landfill as a reserve
- identify parks containing playgrounds with low tree shading (e.g., Simon Owen Place Reserve and Monash Park) and obtain funding for large grade specimen trees to plant
- prioritise tree planting in predominantly industrial/ commercial suburbs with low canopy cover, e.g., East Tāmaki, Huntington Park, Clover Park and Highland Park.

The metrics of the canopy analysis will be used to help inform and prioritise the efforts of the Howick Urban Ngahere Action Plan. The action plan highlights the areas to plant new trees and sets out the process to fund, implement, and find ways to protect and nurture existing ngahere on public and private land.



Palm avenue planted along Te Irirangi Drive, East Tāmaki, Auckland



4.0 Acknowledgements

The following parties are acknowledged for their roles in the preparation of this document:

- Content prepared by Carolina Stavert and Jessica Reaburn (Wildland Consultants Ltd).
- Technical advice and peer review completed by Howell Davies (Principal Advisor Urban Ngahere (Forest), Community Services – Parks, Sports & Recreation, Auckland Council).
- Data and GIS-based figures prepared by Grant Lawrence (Research and Evaluation Unit, Auckland Council).
- Photographs supplied by Auckland Council and Wildland Consultants Ltd.
- Graphics and formatting completed by Q Brand Builders.

The authors would also like to thank the Howick Local Board for their support and direction during the development of this report and its content.

5.0 References

Auckland Council (2017). Auckland Future Urban Land Supply Strategy. <u>https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.</u> <u>nz/plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plansstrategies/topic-based-plans-strategies/housing-plans/ Documents/future-urban-land-supply-strategy.pdf</u>

Auckland Council (2019a). Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy. Published by Auckland Council's Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department, March 2019. <u>https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/</u> <u>plans-projects-policies-reports-bylaws/our-plans-</u> <u>strategies/topic-based-plans-strategies/environmental-</u> <u>plans-strategies/Documents/urban-ngahere-forest-</u> <u>strategy.pdf</u>

Auckland Council (2019b), unpublished. Howick Local Board Urban Ngahere (Forest) Analysis Report September 2019. Prepared for the Howick Local Board Locally Driven Initiatives – Ngahere Work Programme: Year 1 Knowing Phase.

Auckland Council (2019c). Te Tāruke-ā-Tāwhiri: Auckland's Climate Plan. Developed from Auckland's Climate Action Framework consultation summary published by Auckland Plan, Strategy and Research Department, June 2019. <u>https://www.aucklandcouncil.</u> govt.nz/environment/Documents/te-taruke-a-tawhiriauckland-climate-plan.pdf

Beets, P. N., M. O. Kimberley, G. R. Oliver, S. H. Pearce, J. D. Graham and A. Brandon (2012). *Allometric Equations for Estimating Carbon Stocks in Natural Forest in New Zealand.* Forests 3: 818-839.

Berland, A., Shiflett, S.A., Shuster, W.D., Garmestani, A.S., Goddard, H.C., Herrmann, D.L. and Hopton, M.E. (2017). *The role of trees in urban stormwater management.* Landscape and Urban Planning 162: 167-177.

Brown, M. A., Simcock, R. and S. Greenhalgh (2015). Protecting the Urban Forest. Landcare Research Manaaki Whenua Policy Brief No. 13 (Issn: 2357-1713).

Dahlhausen, J., P. Biber, T. Rötzer, E. Uhl and H. Pretzsch (2016). *Tree Species and Their Space Requirements in Six Urban Environments Worldwide.* Forests 7: 111-130.

Davies, Z. G., J. L. Edmondson, A. Heinemeyer, J. R. Leake and K. J. Gaston (2011). *Mapping an urban ecosystem service: quantifying above-ground carbon storage at a citywide scale.* Journal of Applied Ecology 48(5): 1125-1134.

Dwyer, M.C. and Miller, R.W. 1999. *Using GIS to assess urban tree canopy benefits and surrounding greenscape distributions.* Journal of Arboriculture 25(2): 102-107.

Moser, A., T. Rötzer, S. Pauleit and H. Pretzsch (2015). Structure and ecosystem services of small-leaved lime (Tilia cordata Mill.) and black locust (Robinia pseudoacacia L.) in urban environments. Urban Forestry and Urban Greening 14: 1110-1121.

Schwendenmann, L. and N. D. Mitchell (2014). *Carbon accumulation by native trees and soils in an urban park, Auckland.* New Zealand Journal of Ecology 38 (2): 213-220.

Wilcox, M., D. (2012). Auckland's Remarkable Urban Forest. Epsom, Auckland, Auckland Botanical Society.





The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Mark and Marta Stevens

Organisation name: Tasman Accounting Trustee LTD

Full name of your agent:

Email address: legacytrust@outlook.co.nz

Contact phone number: 02108223267

Postal address: 54 Te Irirangi Drive Clover park Auckland 2019

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

* IMPORTANT NOTE: We have made a previous submission with the wrong address (business address) for Tasman Accounting Trustee Ltd. This is the new submission and the correct one, as it includes the actual address of the property affected by the proposed Bus Rapid Transit corridor, 54 Te Irirangi Dr, Clover Park. 1- We will be negatively affected by increased traffic and road noise closer to our property at 54 Te Irirangi Dr, Clover Park. Also loosing our land. 2- It will be difficult to get out of our driveway and dangerous to go across bus lane, cycling lane and pedestrian lane and then onto main road. It is already a dangerous road to get in and out of properties and an area of ongoing accidents. 3- Also, we will not be able to turn right to go to Manukau so we will have to go left to turn around to go to work which makes our travel time longer and more difficult, as well as more dangerous with increased traffic and less turning bays. 4- Further concerns are regarding our property getting devalued as we are not longer down a driveway but on a main busy road. Rental returns will also be diminished as it will not be as desirable as it is today. 5- Also, possible changes to the unitary plan zoning and future development potential. This property had previous consent for a minor dwelling which was not carried out as we had intention of doing a higher density development in the near future. 6- Further concern is that the land not used at 56 Te Irirangi Dr (our road side neighbour) could be land banked by AT for future widening of the corridor, further reducing peace and quiet and amenities at our property. 7- We also have concerns about increased noise and pollution as well as safety issues having children and animals at the property.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: We strongly oppose this project and expect that Auckland City Council and AT will not go ahead with this proposed Bus Rapid Transit corridor.

Submission date: 11 April 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.

We're turning your food scraps into clean energy.
2

CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Mark and Marta Stevens

Organisation name: Tasman Accounting trustee LTD

Full name of your agent:

Email address: legacytrust@outlook.co.nz

Contact phone number: 02108223267

Postal address: P.O box 308024 Manly 0952 Auckland 0952

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

1-We will be negatively affected by increased traffic and road noise closer to our house, and loosing our land. 2- It will be difficult to get out of our driveway and dangerous to go across bus lane, cycling lane and pedestrian lane and then onto main road. It is already a dangerous road to get in and out of properties and an area of ongoing accidents. 3- Also, we will not be able to turn right to go to Manukau so we will have to go left to turn around to go to work which makes our travel time longer and more difficult, as well as more dangerous with increased traffic and less turning bays. 4- Further concerns are regarding our property getting devalued as we are not longer down a driveway but on a main busy road. 5- Also, possible changes to the unitary plan zoning and future development potential. This property had previous consent for a minor dwelling which was not carried out as we had intention of doing a higher density development in the near future. 6- Further concern is that the land not used at number 56, Te Irirangi Dr could be land banked by AT for future widening of the corridor, further reducing peace and quiet and amenities at our property. 7- We also have concerns about increased noise and pollution as well as safety issues having children and animals at the property.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: We strongly oppose this project and urged Auckland City Council and AT for its cancelation.

Submission date: 11 April 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission?

Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.

We're turning your food scraps into clean energy.
2

CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Jamie Khang Nguyen

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: j.nguyen@hotmail.co.nz

Contact phone number:

Postal address: 83a Victoria Road Papatoetoe Auckland 2025

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are:

1. Significantly increased safety risk for primary school children walking to and from school from Northern side of puhinui to get to Puhinui Primary school. Puhinui school has a roll of approximately 600 kids, most of which live on the north side of Puhinui Rd and have to cross this road to get to school every day. Significant amendments and consultation with Puhinui Primary school is required to ensure a cohesive solution that improves safety of walking children. Priority should be given to walking pedestrians. 2. Vehicle and Bus-lane congestion very rarely occurs on Puhinui Road east of the Puhinui Train Station. The critical congestion zones causing delays to buses are west of the train line on Puhinui road between the Puhinui Train Station and SH20. Congestion also occurs on Lambie drive however the new bus-lanes are well suited to prioritising buses. 3. Most international and domestic airport arrivals disembark the AIR buses at Puhinui train station to access the train lines. This means the AIR buses running from Puhinui Train Station to Manukau are frequently empty. 4. Most international and domestic airport departures embark the AIR buses at Puhinui Train Station NOT manukau. This means the AIR buses running from Manukau to Puhinui Train Station are frequently empty. Particularly because the competing alternative is a single stop train ride from Manukau to Puhinui Train Station which covers this distance in 4 minutes (1/3 of the travel time of the current AIR bus). This means a dedicated busway between Manukau to Puhinui Train Station will be redundant as even after the proposed upgrades, it will still faster to catch a train... This is poor value for money infrastructure upgrades. 5. Loss of logistics and goods vehicles access from SH20 to Grayson Ave and Norman Spencer road due to no right turn. This will cause increased congestion on Plunket Ave and Cavendish Drive due to all vehicles being re-directed along this road. 5. An alternative is proposed where the benefits would be reduced construction cost, social impact and disruption. Utilising the existing cavendish drive underpass to reduce infrastructure upgrades to the existing puhinui bridge. The proposed bus route reduces the number of affected landowners. A better location to the bus transit station adjacent to the train line. This larger space



may also accomodate a park-n-ride for puhinui train station. 5. As a result the writers opinion is that the benefit to cost for Puhinui Rd, east of the train line is poor value. Funds should be prioritised to reliability and frequency of buses between Airport -> Puhinui Train Station. The proposed BRT on east puhinui road will be a detriment to walking safety of school kids and have negative social impact on the surrounding neighbourhood. The current proposal is significantly spacially constrained by small pieces of land. A better solution would be to acquire larger industrial land that affects 1 owner rather than dozens.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: Decline the current proposal until an alternative through cavendish drive and parallel to the existing train line is investigated.

Submission date: 11 April 2023

Supporting documents 04-rongomai-partk-to-puhinui-station-general-arrangement-plan-JN Submission.pdf

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? No

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.

We're turning your food scraps into clean energy.

CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.





11 April 2023

File ref: AUP NOR 1

Planning Technician Auckland Council Private Bag 92300 Auckland 1142

unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Dear Sir/Madam

SUBMISSION ON A REQUIREMENT FOR DESIGNATION OF LAND UNDER S.168(2) OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991:

NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT FOR BUS RAPID TRANSIT – WIDENING OF THE EXISTING TE IRIRANGI DRIVE BETWEEN BOTANY TOWN CENTRE AND RONGOMAI PARK TO PROVIDE FOR A BUS TRANSIT CORRIDOR AND HIGH QUALITY WALKING AND CYCLING FACILITIES (NOR 1), BY REQUIRING AUTHORITY: AUCKLAND TRANSPORT

To: Auckland Council

Name of submitter: Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

- 1. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) is an autonomous Crown Entity with statutory responsibility under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (HNZPTA) for the identification, protection, preservation, and conservation of New Zealand's historical and cultural heritage. Heritage New Zealand is New Zealand's lead agency for heritage protection.
- 2. HNZPT could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
- 3. HNZPT submission is on the Notice of Requirement for Designation (NoR 1) in the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP) to provide for a Bus Rapid Transit corridor, walking, cycling facilities and associated infrastructure.
- 4. HNZPT acknowledges that the proposed BRT corridor is a significant infrastructure project for Auckland Transport and because it is within a predominantly urban environment there will be changes to the existing environment. It is also understood that there is the need to ensure the city has a transport network that can respond to the "diverse and changing needs" (AEE, page 115) of both the existing communities and future generations. HNZPT supports the purpose of planning for a well-functioning urban environment through the improvement of public transport access and enabling alternative transport facilities such as walking and cycling. HNZPT also supports the protection of the corridor through designation.
- 5. Nevertheless, of focus for HNZPT is for the identification, protection, preservation, and conservation of historic heritage (HNZPTA) and advocate that historic heritage is fully considered in accordance with section 6(f) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). Historic heritage, being specifically identified as a national importance under Section 6(f) the RMA. The definition of historic heritage under Part 2 of the RMA includes archaeology. Therefore, effects on built heritage and archaeology,





in addition to effects on Mana Whenua must be taken into account by Council when assessing the effects of NoR 1.

- 6. While it is stated in the December 2022 report, Assessment of Archaeological Effects that there are no identified archaeological or historic heritage items that will be directly affected there is the possibility for unrecorded sub-surface archaeological sites to exist.
- 7. The Archaeological report recommends the preparation and implementation of a Historic Heritage Management Plan (HHMP) alongside a 'General Archaeological Authority' as the mitigation mechanisms for the protection and management of historic heritage within the designation corridor.

The specific parts of the Notice of Requirement that Heritage New Zealand's submission relates to are:

- 8. No previous engagement with HNZPT.
- 9. Section 11 Engagement of the AEE sets out the overview of the partner, stakeholder and public engagement that has been undertaken in informing and development of the NoR 1 documents. This is of concern to HNZPT because of the extent of potential effect the proposed works within the designation corridor will have on known and potential historic heritage.
- 10. HNZPT does not support the use of the HHMP as it is presently proposed.
- 11. HNZPT is concerned that while there have been both archaeological and built heritage assessment reports completed for the entire length of the Botany to the Auckland Airport (NoR 1 4b) the mitigation of the effect of the designation and future construction of the Bus Rapid Transit corridor, walking and cycling facilities on the known and potential historic heritage will not be managed until the Outline Plan of Works stage.
- 12. The framework of the proposed HHMP conflates matters relating to historic heritage under the RMA and archaeological requirements provided for under the HNZPTA 2014 with respect to archaeological monitoring, investigation, and reporting. This is an unnecessary duplication of HNZPTA archaeological processes, where the archaeological authority will have its own separate Archaeological Works Plan required to be adhered to under that process.
- 13. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga **oppose** the Notice of Requirement (NoR 1).

14. The reasons for Heritage New Zealand's position are as follows:

- 15. The consideration, management and mitigation of effects from the purpose of the designation on known or potential Historic Heritage should be addressed through the NoR process instead of being deferred to the Outline Plan process.
- 16. The HHMP duplicates HNZPTA processes, such as an Archaeological Authority that will be required to be obtained before construction; and that should be included at the Outline Plan stage.
- 17. The protection of historic heritage, and the remedy and mitigation of "any residual" effects are more appropriately addressed through the existing NoR process.





18. Reliance on the Accidental Discovery Protocol with respect to archaeological sites is inappropriate as there is already assessment of the designation corridor that there is the potential for sub-surface archaeology and the need for an Archaeological Authority to be obtained under the HNZPA 2014. Noting that the Accidental Discovery Standards E11.6.1 and E12.6.1 as set out in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) apply where an Archaeological Authority from HNZPT is not otherwise in place.

19. Heritage New Zealand seeks the following decision from Council:

- 20. The objective of the HHMP is rewritten to remove all duplication of processes with the HNZPTA.
- 21. The purpose of the HHMP should be focussed on the provision details such as:
 - Roles, responsibilities and contact details of the project personnel, Requiring Authority's • representative, Mana Whenua and HNZPT while are involved with heritage and archaeological matters.
 - Provision for access for Mana Whenua to carry out tikanga and cultural protocols.
 - Methods for protecting or minimising adverse effects on heritage and archaeological sites • within the designation during works (for example fencing to protect form construction works).
 - Advice that the Accidental Discovery Standards E11.6.1 and E12.6.1 as set out in the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in part) shall apply when an archaeological Authority from HNZPT is not otherwise in place.
 - Methods for interpretation and appropriate public dissemination of knowledge gained from heritage investigations.

22. Heritage New Zealand wishes to be heard in support of our submission.

23. If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

Yours sincerely

BHParslow

pp for Sherry Reynolds **Director Northern Region**

Address for service:

Alice Morris amorris@heritage.org.nz PO Box 105 291 Auckland City 1143

3

a Northern Regional Office, Level 10, SAP Tower, 151 Queen Street a PO Box 105-291, Auckland 1143 wheritage.org.nz p (64 9) 307 9920

The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Mohammad Meraj

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: merajmd13@gmail.com

Contact phone number:

Postal address: 1/132 Wallace road Papatoetoe Auckland 2025

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we support the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are: No comments

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: No comments

Submission date: 11 April 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? No

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

The following customer has submitted a Notice of Requirement online submission.

Contact details

Full name of submitter: Kim Bloom

Organisation name:

Full name of your agent:

Email address: k.bloom183@gmail.com

Contact phone number: 0276393667

Postal address: 183 Puhinui Road Papatoetoe Auckland 2104

Submission details

Name of requiring authority: Auckland Transport

The designation or alteration: Notice of Requirement: Bus Rapid Transit - Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The specific provisions that my submission relates to are:

Do you support or oppose the Notice of Requirement? I or we oppose the Notice of Requirement.

The reason for my or our views are: I do not agree why can't the connection be on Lambie drive where there is more commercial not residential homes.

I or we seek the following recommendation or decision from Auckland Council: The time given is very short for us to make a submission only one month to digest read and make submissions not enough time for our community and families to digest

Submission date: 11 April 2023

Attend a hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? Yes

Would you consider presenting a joint case at a hearing if others have made a similar submission? Yes

Declaration

I accept and agree that:

- by taking part in this public submission process that my submission (including personal details, names and addresses) will be made public,
- I or we must serve a copy of the submission on the person who gave the notice of requirement as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to Auckland Council.



CAUTION: This email message and any attachments contain information that may be confidential and may be LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure or copying of this message or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email message in error please notify us immediately and erase all copies of the message and attachments. We do not accept responsibility for any viruses or similar carried with our email, or any effects our email may have on the recipient computer system or network. Any views expressed in this email may be those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Council.

Form 21

Submission on requirements for designations

То:	Auckland Council
	Private Bag 92300
	Auckland 1142
	unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
Name of submitter:	Aotearoa Towers Group (ATG)
	Private Bag 92161
	Auckland 1142
	Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus)
	PO Box 632
	Wellington
	Connexa Limited (Connexa)
	167 Victoria St West
	Auckland
	One New Zealand (One NZ) (formally Vodafone New Zealand Ltd)
	Private Bag 92161
	Auckland 1142
	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark)
	Private Bag 92028
	Auckland 1010
	Two Degrees Mobile Limited (2degrees)
	PO Box 8355
	Symonds Street
	Auckland 1150

These parties are making a joint submission and for the purposes of this submission are referred to collectively as the *Telecommunications Submitters*.

1

The Proposal:

This is a submission on the following notices of requirement by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport for transport projects from Botany to Auckland International Airport:

- Alteration of Designation 6717 State Highway 20B State Highway 20 to Auckland International Airport;
- Bus Rapid Transit SH20/20B Interchange to Orrs Road (Auckland Transport)
- Bus Rapid Transit Puhinui Station (in the vicinity of Plunket Avenue) to SH20/20B Interchange (Auckland Transport)
- Rongomai Park to Puhunui Station (in the vicinity of Plunket Avenue) (Auckland Transport)
- Bus Rapid Transit Botany to Rongomai Park (Auckland Transport)

The Telecommunications Submitters are not trade competitors for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991.

The specific parts of the notice of requirement that this submission relates to are:

The designations in their entirety, and in particular the conditions of the designations that relate to network utilities.

The Telecommunications Submitters' submission is that:

The Telecommunications Submitters have no position on the overall Botany to Auckland International Airport package of transport projects but seek to ensure that existing and potential future telecommunications infrastructure in the project corridor are adequately addressed. The Telecommunications Submitters oppose the proposed designations unless the matters outlined in this submission are satisfactorily addressed.

The companies collectively deliver and manage the majority of New Zealand's fixed line/fibre and wireless phone and broadband services in New Zealand. The network utility operators in the telecommunications sector deliver critical lifeline utility services (as per Schedule 1 to the Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002) including infrastructure to support emergency services calls. It is also critical for supporting social and economic wellbeing and provides opportunities for work from home/remote work This equipment is often located in road corridors which act as infrastructure corridors as well as just transport corridors. The works enabled by the proposed designations will affect existing infrastructure that will need to be protected and/or relocated as part of the proposed works. Reasonable access for maintenance and access for emergency works at all times will need to be maintained. In addition, the design and construction of the works should take into account any opportunities for new infrastructure to be installed which is preferable to trying to retrofit necessary telecommunications/broadband infrastructure later due to disruptions and/or incompatibility with project design.

Existing Infrastructure

A summary of existing infrastructure located in the project footprints is as follows:

- Chorus fibre and copper lines.
- 8 mobile network sites operated by the various mobile network providers.

Future Infrastructure Requirements

Network utility operators need to integrate necessary services into infrastructure projects such as transport projects. It is most efficient to coordinate any such services with the design and construction of a project, rather than trying to retrofit them at a later date. This process does not always run smoothly. To provide a recent example, Spark has had substantial issues trying to negotiate with the Public Private Partnership (PPP) operator of the Transmission Gully project in the Wellington Region to install services to provide telecommunications coverage along that length of road. This process proved to be very difficult as there was no requirement to consult and work with relevant network utility operators in the designation conditions, and post completion of the project design and PPP contracting it has proved to be very challenging to try to retrofit necessary telecommunications infrastructure into the design of this project.

Spark achieved a more satisfactory outcome through participation as a submitter in the Auckland East West Link and Warkworth to Wellsford (W2W) project designation conditions where there was a specific obligation for the Requiring Authority to consult with network utility operators as part of the detailed design phase of the project to identify opportunities to enable, or to not preclude, the development of new network utility including telecommunications infrastructure where practicable to do so. There was

#40

an associated obligation in that condition to report on opportunities considered and whether or not they had been incorporated into the design in the outline plan(s)¹.

Whilst there is no direct obligation on the requiring authority to accommodate such works/opportunities, a provision to ensure the matter is properly considered during the design phase through consultation with network utility operators, which sets appropriate expectations and ensures these opportunities are properly explored, is reasonable. In the case of telecommunications, this enables proper consideration of making provision for communications that support the function of the road. This should be a consideration distinct from protecting or relocating existing network utilities affected by the project which is the focus of the current proposed conditions.

The Telecommunications Submitters seek an equivalent condition to that included in the W2W designation conditions to address this.

Consultation with Telecommunications Network Utility Operators

Key to the outcomes the Telecommunications Submitters are seeking is to ensure they are adequately consulted by the requiring authorities over effects on their existing infrastructure, as well as being provided the opportunity to discuss any future requirements so this can be considered in the project design. Whilst the notices of requirement have a Network Utility Management Plan (NUMP) condition, this does not specify who the relevant entities are to be consulted on development of that plan. The Assessment of Environmental Effects for each notice sets out the relevant utility providers who have assets within and around the proposed designations. This specifically includes Chorus (in regard to communications lines). However, the other companies party to this submission are not mentioned and therefore there is a concern they will not be consulted as part of the NUMP development for each stage.

Spark, One NZ and 2degrees operate mobile phone/wireless broadband networks which are often include facilities located in roads. In addition, Spark has sold its fixed mobile asset infrastructure (e.g. their poles) to Connexa, and similarly One NZ has sold its fixed mobile assets to ATG (which will rebrand in due course to FortySouth). Accordingly, the operating landscape for telecommunications companies and who may be affected by these projects has become quite complex. Given this complexity, an advice note to the NUMP condition is proposed to provide more clarity on which telecommunications/broadband operators may be affected.

4

¹ East West Link Condition NU2, W2W Condition 24A

The Telecommunications Submitters seeks the following decision from the Requiring Authority:

Amend the NUMP condition by adding an advice note for each notice of requirement as follows:

Network Utility Management Plan (NUMP)

- (a) A NUMP shall be prepared prior to the Start of Construction for a Stage of Work.
- (b) The objective of the NUMP is to set out a framework for protecting, relocating and working in proximity to existing network utilities. The NUMP shall include methods to:
 - (i) provide access for maintenance at all reasonable times, or emergency works at all times during construction activities;
 - (ii) manage the effects of dust and any other material potentially resulting from construction activities and able to cause material damage, beyond normal wear and tear to overhead transmission lines in the Project area; and
 - (iii) demonstrate compliance with relevant standards and Codes of Practice including, where relevant, the NZECP 34:2001 New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 2001; AS/NZS 4853:2012 Electrical Hazards on Metallic Pipelines; and AS/NZS 2885 Pipelines – Gas and Liquid Petroleum.
- (c) The NUMP shall be prepared in consultation with the relevant Network Utility Operator(s) (including Auckland International Airport Limited who have existing assets that are directly affected by the Project.
- (d) The development of the NUMP shall consider opportunities to coordinate future work programmes with other Network Utility Operator(s) where practicable.
- (e) The NUMP shall describe how any comments from the Network Utility Operator (including Auckland International Airport Limited) in relation to its assets have been addressed.
- (f) Any comments received from the Network Utility Operator (including Auckland International Airport Limited) shall be considered when finalising the NUMP.

(g) Any amendments to the NUMP related to the assets of a Network Utility Operator (including Auckland International Airport Limited) shall be prepared in consultation with that asset owner.

Advice Note:

For the purposes of this condition, relevant telecommunications network utility operators include companies operating both fixed line and wireless services. As at the date of designation these include Aotearoa Towers Group, Chorus New Zealand Limited, Connexa Limited, One New Zealand Limited, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited and Two Degrees Mobile Limited (and any subsequent entity for these network utility operators).

Add a new condition to each notice of requirement as follows:

XX: The Requiring Authority shall consult with Network Utility Operators during the detailed design phase to identify opportunities to enable, or not preclude, the development of new network utility facilities including access to power and ducting within the Project, where practicable to do so. The consultation undertaken, opportunities considered, and whether or not they have been incorporated into the detailed design, shall be summarised in the Outline Plan or Plans prepared for the Project.

The Telecommunications Submitters do wish to be heard in support of its submission.

If others make a similar submission, the Telecommunications Submitters will consider making a joint case with them at the hearing.

Signature of submitter (Chris Horne, authorised agent for the Telecommunications Submitters)

Date: 5 April 2023

Address for service of submitter:

Chris Horne Incite PO Box 3082 Auckland **Telephone**: 0274 794 980 **E-mail**: <u>chris@incite.co.nz</u>



SUBMISSION ON AUCKLAND TRANSPORT AND WAKA KOTAHI'S NOTICES OF REQUIREMENT FOR THE AIRPORT TO BOTANY BUS RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT BY KĀINGA ORA HOMES AND COMMUNITIES

TO: Auckland Council
Private Bag 92300
Victoria Street West
Auckland 1010
Submission via email: <u>unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</u>

KĀINGA ORA HOMES AND COMMUNITIES (**Kāinga Ora**) at the address for service set out below makes the following submission on the Notices of Requirement (**NoR**) for the Airport to Botany Bus Rapid Transit Project (**The Project**) (Requiring Authority – Auckland Transport and Waka Kotahi).

Background

- Kāinga Ora was established in 2019 under the Kāinga Ora-Homes and Communities Act 2019. Kāinga Ora consolidates Housing New Zealand Corporation, HLC (2017) Ltd and parts of the KiwiBuild Unit. Under the Crown Entities Act 2004, Kāinga Ora is listed as a Crown entity and is required to give effect to Government policies.
- 2. Kāinga Ora is now the Government's delivery entity for housing and urban development. Kāinga Ora will therefore work across the entire housing spectrum to build complete, diverse communities that enable New Zealanders from all backgrounds to have similar opportunities in life. As a result, Kāinga Ora has two core roles:
 - (a) being a world class public housing landlord; and
 - (b) leading and co-ordinating urban development projects.
- 3. Kāinga Ora's statutory objective requires it to contribute to sustainable, inclusive, and thriving communities that:
 - (a) provide people with good quality, affordable housing choices that meet diverse needs; and

- (b) support good access to jobs, amenities and services; and
- (c) otherwise sustain or enhance the overall economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of current and future generations.
- 4. Kāinga Ora is focused on delivering quality urban developments by accelerating the availability of build-ready land, and building a mix of housing including public housing, affordable housing, homes for first home buyers, and market housing of different types, sizes and tenures. In addition to housing, Kāinga Ora has a key interest in critical infrastructure projects to enable housing supply, build-ready land and well-functioning urban environments. Therefore, its interest is across the urban development spectrum.
- 5. The public housing portfolio managed by Kāinga Ora in Auckland comprises approximately 30,100 dwellings¹. Auckland is a priority to reconfigure and grow Kāinga Ora housing stock to provide efficient and effective public and affordable housing that is aligned with current and future residential demand in the area, and the country as a whole.
- 6. Within Auckland, there are 7,494 applicants on the Ministry of Social Developments housing waitlist as of December 2022², all requiring a range of housing sizes from 1-5+ bedrooms. Of these, 19% are located within the Manukau and Howick Ward's, these being the two wards directly affected by the Project. Combined these comprise approximately 3% of the total area of Auckland, within which there is almost one fifth of the social housing demand. There is high demand for new and existing social housing within the area.
- 7. Kāinga Ora has a shared interest in the community as a key stakeholder, alongside local authorities. Kāinga Ora interests lie in the provision of public housing to persons who are unable to be sustainably housed in private sector accommodation, and in leading and co-ordinating residential and urban development projects. Kāinga Ora works with local authorities to ensure that appropriate services and infrastructure are delivered for its developments.
- 8. In addition to its role as a public housing provider, Kāinga Ora also has a significant role as a landowner, landlord, and developer of residential housing. Strong

2

¹ As of December 2022; https://kaingaora.govt.nz/publications/housing-statistics/

² Ministry of Social Developments Housing Register December 2022

relationships between local authorities and central government are key to delivering government's priorities on increasing housing supply.

- Kāinga Ora owns land within, adjacent and nearby to the proposed designation subject to this submission. Kāinga Ora has identified approximately 269 sites (comprising 483 units) which will be affected, these comprising:
 - a) 41 sites (50 units) of which are proposed to be fully acquired;
 - b) 48 sites (comprising 160 units) of which are proposed to be partially acquired;
 - c) A further 115 sites (comprising 158 units) are located within 50m of the proposed designation boundaries and 65 sites (comprising 115 units) are located within 50-100m of the proposed designation boundaries, being within the 100m assessment extent and considered a *'Protected Premises and Facility'* (**PPF**) within an urban area³; and
 - d) There are approx. 1,230 Kāinga Ora units located within a 1,200m walkable catchment from the 9 proposed rapid transit stops (RTS), representing nearly 10% of the total number of dwellings within these walkable catchments, which will positively support and contribute to the patronage of the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service. In particular, a majority of these Kāinga Ora units (approx. 83.5%) are located between the Ormiston Road and Diorella Drive section of the Project. Kāinga Ora therefore has an interest in ensuring that its tenants' access and connectivity to the RTS are maximised.
- 10. Tenancies within Kāinga Ora's housing portfolio within the Local Board areas impacted by the Project are very stable, with the current occupancy rate sitting at approximately 99.79%, and the average tenancy length being 11 years. Of those properties proposed to be acquired by the Project, the average tenancy length is 13 years. Most households (comprising a mixture of housing compositions and ages) wish to remain in the area because of their existing connections and close-knit community and for their children to stay within the same school and avoid the disruption of being relocated.
- 11. Policy decisions made at both central and local government level have impacts on housing affordability and community wellbeing. The challenge of providing affordable housing will require close collaboration between central and local government to address planning and governance issues to reduce the cost of construction, land

3

³³ NZS6806

supply constraints, infrastructure provisions and capacity as well as an improved urban environment.

12. Kāinga Ora is interested in all issues that may affect the supply and affordability of housing, as well as the well-being of their tenants. This includes the provision of services and infrastructure, and how this may impact on Kāinga Ora existing and planned housing, community development and Community Group Housing (CGH) suppliers.

Wider Context

- 13. In addition to the above, Kāinga Ora will play a greater role in urban development in New Zealand. The legislative functions of Kāinga Ora, as outlined in the Kāinga Ora Act, illustrate this broad mandate and outline two key roles of Kāinga Ora in that regard:
 - a) initiating, facilitating and/or undertaking development not just for itself, but in partnership or on behalf of others; and
 - b) providing a leadership or coordination role more generally.
- 14. Notably, the statutory functions of Kāinga Ora in relation to urban development extend beyond the development of housing (which includes public housing, affordable housing, homes for first time buyers, and market housing) to the development and renewal of urban environments, as well as the development of related commercial, industrial, community, or other amenities, infrastructure, facilities, services or works.

The Government Policy Statement on Housing and Urban Development 2021 ("GPS-HUD")

- 15. The GPS-HUD sets a direction for housing and urban development in New Zealand. Its overarching vision is that everyone in New Zealand lives in a home and a community that meets their needs and aspirations. The four main things it sets out to achieve are:
 - (a) Thriving and resilient communities the places where people live are accessible and connected to employment, education, social and cultural opportunities. They grow and change well within environmental limits, support our culture and heritage and are resilient.

- (b) Wellbeing through housing everyone lives in a home, whether it's rented or owned, that is warm, dry, safe, stable and affordable, with access to the support they need to live healthy, successful lives.
- (c) Māori housing through partnership Māori and the Crown work together in partnership so all whānau have safe, healthy, affordable and stable homes. Māori housing solutions are led by Māori and are delivered locally. Māori can use their own assets and whenua Māori to invest in and support housing solutions.
- (d) **An adaptive and responsive system** Land-use change, infrastructure and housing supply is responsive to demand, well planned and well regulated.

The National Policy Statement on Urban Development ("NPS-UD") and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (the "RMAA 2021")

- 16. The NPS-UD aims to ensure councils better plan for growth and remove overly restrictive barriers to development to allow growth in locations that have good access to services, public transport networks and infrastructure. The NPS-UD's intensification policies require councils to enable greater heights and densities in areas that are well-suited to growth, such as in and around urban centres and (existing and proposed) rapid transit stops. The RMAA 2021 introduced the Intensification Streamlined Planning Process for tier 1 councils to implement the intensification policies and additionally required these councils to introduce the Medium Density Residential Standards.
- 17. Together, the NPS-UD and RMAA 2021 are intended to ensure New Zealand's towns and cities are well-functioning urban environments that support housing supply and affordability, accessibility to jobs and services, and emissions reduction.

Scope of Submission

 The submission relates to the five NoR's for the Airport to Botany Bus Rapid Transit Project in their entirety.

The Submission is:

- 19. Kāinga Ora supports the Project and supports the NoR's for the Project in part, which seeks to undertaken the following works to provide to provide a BRT Corridor and associated walking and cycling facilities⁴:
 - Widen the existing Te Irirangi Drive between Botany Town Centre and Rongomai Park (NoR 1);
 - (b) Widen numerous roads between Rongomai Park and Plunket Avenue (NoR 2);
 - (c) Widen the existing Puhinui Road reserve between Plunket Avenue and the Stage Highway (SH) 20/20B interchange, the provision of a BRT bridge to Puhinui Station, and associated widening of streets around Puhinui Station (NoR 3);
 - (d) Extension of Puhinui Road Reserve between SH20/20B interchange and Orrs Road (NoR 4a); and
 - Widening of SH 20B corridor between SH20/20B and Manukau Memorial Gardens (an alteration to existing designation 6717) (NoR 4b)
- 20. This support is subject to the relief Kāinga Ora seeks being granted and matters raised in its submission being addressed.
- 21. In particular, but without limiting the generality of the above:
 - a) Kāinga Ora supports the outcomes derived from the project particularly as they relate to the delivery of regionally significant transportation infrastructure, enhanced accessibility, and the overall improved rapid transport, walking and cycling provision, however support in part the proposed NoR for the Project. Kāinga Ora considers that the Project will support urban growth and intensification objectives along its alignment, contained within the strategic planning documents, including those within the NPS-UD.

6

^{#41}

⁴ Refer Section 1 of the AEE for specific details.
- Kāinga Ora considers the designation process is appropriate due to the regional significance of the infrastructure proposed and the ability of the designation process to avoid unreasonable delay.
- b) Kāinga Ora generally supports the proposed conditions of the designation and the use of the mechanisms outlined to avoid, remedy, or mitigate potential adverse effects and to regularly communicate with the community, including but not limited to: the submission of an Outline Plan of Works (OPW), the Mana Whenua Partnership Forum (MWPF), Stakeholder Communication and Engagement Management Plan (SCEMP), Development Response Management Plan (DRMP), Urban Landscape Design Management Plan (ULDMP), Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), Cultural Monitoring Plan (CMP), Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP), Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP), Tree Management Plan (TMP), and a Network Utility Management Plan (NUMP).
- 22. Notwithstanding the general support of the Project, Kāinga Ora considers that further information or details about the project are required. Depending on the outcome of these investigations, there may need to be some changes to designation conditions and/or the design of the project to address the concerns expressed in this submission.

Kāinga Ora as a Key Stakeholder

Displacement of Kāinga Ora Tenants and Customers

23. As discussed above, Kāinga Ora has a large land holding and associated high numbers of residents that will be affected by the Project, including four community group housing and a transitional housing facility. Kāinga Ora also has a large number of properties and residents within the wider catchment that would be served by the Project. Demand for housing is high within the Project area, and people wish to stay in the area. Kāinga Ora is concerned that the proposal will result in the displacement of at least 212 tenants from 61 Kāinga Ora dwellings which would be removed as a result of the Project. This equates to approximately 14.6% of Kāinga Ora customers and 12.6% of Kāinga Ora managed stock within 100m of the Project's designation

boundary, exacerbating the already significant issues associated of a lack of social housing, in an environment where demand is so high.

24. A number of the Kāinga Ora properties and the associated communities that will be affected by the Project are also subject to the Auckland Unitary Plan's Moderate Aircraft Noise Area Overlay (MANA). Kāinga Ora has submitted on the constraints of the MANA Overlay in Proposed Plan Change 78 (PPC78). However, the MANA Overlay currently provides for residential development at an average density of one dwelling per 400m² for properties located within the MANA. This presents additional significant challenges to Kāinga Ora when attempting to re-home residents in their communities whose dwellings have been acquired by the Project, and presents a potential increased social effect of displacement of these communities. Given the number of Kāinga Ora landholdings within the designation area, engagement with Kāinga Ora should begin at an early stage to address the effects of displacement on Kāinga Ora tenants as a result of the proposed property acquisition.

Property Acquisition

- 25. Kāinga Ora is concerned that the Requiring Authority is designating more land than they need to for the Project. It is noted that the designation boundaries are based on 'typical offsets' from similar projects. However, given the designation is proposed to be in place for 15 years, and given the boundaries are likely to impact future development along the Project alignment for some time (and may lead to unintended consequences as a result), Kāinga Ora requests that a more refined approach is adopted to determining the designation boundary. This would ensure that only the minimum amount of land required is designated (for both construction and operational needs), so that efficient and effective land use is not compromised. Kāinga Ora requests that they are involved, as a Key Stakeholder, in undertaking this refinement exercise as it relates to their portfolio.
- 26. In addition, Kāinga Ora proposes the incorporation of a periodic review condition where the extent of the designation boundary is reviewed every 12 months following the lodgement of OPW(s) to ensure this is being refined continually, and that any land no longer required for construction and operation as a result of the refinement exercise shall be uplifted from the designation.

Kainga Ora as a Key Stakeholder

27. Kāinga Ora considers that they are a key affected party, and support that they have been identified as a key stakeholder by the Requiring Authority. However, as a key stakeholder, and given the significant potential displacement impacts discussed above, Kāinga Ora requests that they are involved specifically in the preparation of management plans and future OPWs for the Project, and seek amendments to the conditions to reflect this. Notwithstanding this, Kāinga Ora considers that the Requiring Authority should be mitigating the effects of the designation now where possible.

Well-Functioning Urban Environment – Accessibility Improvements

NPS-UD and Proposed Plan Change 78

- 28. The NPS-UD seeks to enable intensification within a walkable catchment of existing and planned RTS⁵, as well as enable building heights, densities and urban form in and town centres that are commensurate with the level of community activity with these centres. As well as this, amendments to the RMA require the incorporation of Medium Density Residential Housing Standards (**MDRS**) across all residential zones, with some exceptions.
- 29. PPC78 implements both the NPS-UD and MDRS. Submissions on PPC78 have closed, and hearings are beginning, however a decision has not yet been made. This has been acknowledged within the Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) for the Project when discussion the receiving environment⁶.
- 30. Irrespective of this, the NPS-UD signifies a clear directive to encourage an increase in building heights, development density and urban form not only within, but also around town centres, and existing and planned RTS such as those proposed by the Project. It is expected that this would require an increase in development capacity, height and form along the alignment of the Project, for both residential and commercial / business activities. Likewise, Kāinga Ora considers that providing for such increases in urban form and density are exactly what transport infrastructure projects such as the proposed NoR are seeking to facilitate.

⁵ NPSUD Policy 3(c)

⁶ Refer section 7.5 of the Assessment of Environmental Effects

31. In light of the above, and while it is acknowledged that the Project makes significant improvements to cycling and bus infrastructure along the Projects alignment, Kāinga Ora considers that greater emphasis should be placed on the importance of quality Urban Design outcomes, including addressing issues of severance, and improving connectivity, levels of services, travel mode priority and amenity for pedestrians, cyclists and micro-mobility options. These issues are discussed below.

Severance

- 32. Kāinga Ora acknowledges that the effects of severance already occur along parts of the proposed BRT corridor, particularly along Te Irirangi Drive due to the number of traffic lanes, number of vehicles, the resulting dominance of vehicles and the lack of mid-block crossing points.
- 33. In addition to this, the block pattern of adjoining land uses, particularly that to the east of Te Irirangi Drive (being made up of numerous cul-de-sacs and dead-end roads) is not very permeable with respects to accessibility for pedestrians or active modes of transport. Consequently, connectivity, particularly at a pedestrian scale, is already restricted in this area.
- 34. However, Kāinga Ora is concerned that the Project will increase this severance effect further and in turn reduce connectivity by increasing the corridor width and making it harder to cross due to the provision of the central bus lanes. Kāinga Ora is concerned that the Project will further extend this severance from Ormiston Road along towards the Manukau Town Centre and through to Puhinui Road.
- 35. This severance effect is acknowledged within the AEE, which states⁷:

"There will be increased community severance as a result of the Project. This is particularly evident on Puhinui Road where the centre running BRT corridor will restrict the ability of pedestrians to cross the road."

36. Kāinga Ora is concerned that adequate mitigation of these severance effects has not been provided and that opportunities for improving the effects of severance have not been fully considered. For example, Kāinga Ora is of the view that there are opportunities for additional safe mid-block crossing facilities along the Projects alignment, as well as the potential for additional stations to be provided. Increasing the

⁷ Refer AEE Section 9.6.3

number of mid-block crossings and stations would facilitate increased patronage of the BRT service.

- 37. As an example, Kāinga Ora has a significant number of tenants between the catchment of Ormiston Road and Dawson Road Stations, where a large residential catchment is serviced and the distance between stations currently proposed is approximately 1,600m. Kāinga Ora considers that a similar opportunity exists at the intersection of Te Irirangi and Hollyford Drives and Boundary Road. Both locations comprise a residential catchment with a high density of Kāinga Ora owned properties that could take advantage of the BRT service. An additional station would be well utilised by these existing and/or future Kainga Ora tenants, which would in turn facilitate the use, and increase patronage of, the proposed BRT service given the density of customers it would serve.
- 38. Kāinga Ora requests that these aspects, are explored further in consultation with Kāinga Ora, with suitable changes made to the NoR.

Travel Mode Priority

- 39. Kāinga Ora acknowledges that the existing context, particularly the car dominated transport routes that currently make up the current road networks along the Protects alignment, provides significant challenges to achieving best practice urban design outcomes such as a high-quality and high-amenity pedestrian and cycling environment. Likewise, Kāinga Ora acknowledges that the proposal will result in improved provision for public transport, pedestrian and cycling accessibility when compared to the existing context.
- 40. However, Kāinga Ora considers that the Project provides a significant opportunity to better address these existing issues, and reconsider the arrangement of, and priority given to the various modes of travel. In particular, Kāinga Ora considers that prioritisation of travel modes for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport should be given over the private vehicle to achieve an efficient public transport route. As a result, Kāinga Ora seeks confirmation that Level of Service (LoS) for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport will be A, and conditions which specify that the safety and accessibility of active modes, micro-mobility and public transport will be prioritised over the private vehicle.

- 41. Kāinga Ora also considers that, given the length of the construction project, a key objective of the CTMP should be to provide these users with safe, direct and appealing routes of access during construction.
- 42. Kāinga Ora acknowledged that the Project proposes the removal of all give-way controlled slip lanes with associated intersection upgrades to *"provide fully signalised vehicle and pedestrian movements, further reducing potential conflict with pedestrians and cyclists"*⁸ and that this has been identified as being one of the reasons where noticeable increases in delay and queue lengths are created. However, Kāinga Ora requests further information regarding how this interface and the treatment of these existing (to be altered) slip roads will be addressed, including how access will be retained while providing for an appropriate LoS for active modes.

Micro-mobility and Active Mode Facilities

43. Kāinga Ora notes that, as a result of the issues discussed above, many residents within the community will be required to walk long distances to / from the proposed bus stops to the neighbouring residential catchments. In order to mitigate this, and maximise accessibility to and from the proposed stations (and therefore patronage of the Project), Kāinga Ora is of the opinion that it will be important to provide for micromobility and active mode facilities at or nearby to the proposed RTS (i.e., cycle or scooter parking or storage etc). Conditions requiring the provision of such facilities when developing OPW are subsequently requested.

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design

44. Kāinga Ora supports the requirement to provide details within the ULDMP of how the Project promotes a sense of personal safety by aligning with best practice guidelines such as Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (**CPTED**) principals.

⁸ Refer Transport Assessment

45. The Assessment of Flooding Effects attached to the AEE lists the following positive effect⁹:

"Raise the existing road levels to preventing flood flows across the road and reducing flood hazard (where this is not limited by existing flooding effects upstream) for road users"

- 46. Kāinga Ora is concerned that this positive effect appears to be achieved at the expense of neighbouring properties. In particular, Kāinga Ora notes that proposed condition 14 'Flood Hazard' would enable an increase in the level of flooding toward adjoining properties. As an example, condition 14 proposes that a 10% reduction in free board for existing habitable floors is permitted, and an increase in flood levels of 50mm is permitted where there is no existing dwelling (among others).
- 47. It is of Kāinga Ora opinion that the Project should be required to manage the flooding effects within its own boundary.
- 48. Kāinga Ora requests that a flood hazard condition is added so that, simply put, the Requiring Authority does not worsen any flooding effects onto neighbouring properties and appropriately avoids, remediates and/or mitigates the effects of their construction activities.

Noise and Vibration

Construction Noise and Vibration

- 49. Kāinga Ora acknowledges that compliance with construction noise and vibration standards are not always practical and supports the management of construction noise and vibration by way of a CNVMP and CNVMS, provided this is in accordance with best practical options and provided the effects of construction noise and vibration are minimised as far as is practical.
- 50. Kainga Ora requests that they are directly consulted as part of the preparation of the CNVMP and CNVMS.

⁹ Section 4.1 of the submitted Assessment of Flooding Effects

Operational Noise and Vibration

- 51. It is acknowledged that transport infrastructure is critical to enabling a well-functioning urban environment, and that a degree of noise and vibration emissions are expected. However, it must be recognised that significant noise emissions have potential adverse effects on surrounding residential environments and the health and well-being of people living nearby. Therefore, Operational Noise and Vibration requires careful consideration to ensure that the effects are appropriately avoided, remediated or mitigated in accordance with Section 16 and 17 of the RMA.
- 52. Kāinga Ora considers that the effect of the Project is a cumulative effect to the noise environment, based on the changes to the roading transport infrastructure since the dwellings within the surrounding environment were built.
- 53. Kāinga Ora is concerned that the Project does not fully assess the health effects associated with traffic noise of the Project. While the Project assesses the traffic noise effects in the context of NZS6806, Kāinga Ora is concerned that the standard does not fully capture the potential health effects of a proposal. This was raised within the Recommendation for the Notices of Requirement sought for the route protection of the Drury Arterial Network (which in turn took reference and guidance from the Board of Inquiry decision for the Waterview Connection)¹⁰ where it was noted that NZS 6806: potentially discounts the adverse cumulative effects of elevated noise on recipients; inadequately addresses those parts of s.5 (2)(c) of the RMA concerned with avoiding, remedying and mitigating adverse effects; does not engage those parts of Section 7 of the RMA concerned with amenities and the quality of the environment likely to be of concern to impacted persons; and inadequately addresses Section 16 of the RMA (among others).
- 54. Consequently, Kāinga Ora requests further information regarding the health and safety effects of the Project (i.e., an assessment of these) including the cumulative effects, prior to the hearing. This does not appear to have been provided within the application documents due to the above, and due to the AEE not identifying this as a potential adverse effect.
- 55. Kāinga Ora notes that Auckland Transport identifies that activities subjected to an operational noise level of 55 dB LAeq require mitigation to address potential adverse

¹⁰¹⁰ Refer paragraph 229 of the Recommendation for the Notices of Requirement sought for the route protection of the Drury Arterial Network dated 20 April 2022

health effects. Kainga Ora requests a condition requiring operational noise levels to not exceed 55 dB LAeq beyond the boundaries of the designation or, where exceeded at a sensitive receiver, mitigation is provided.

56. This operational noise level was the baseline utilised within Auckland Transport's Acoustic Expert Evidence by Claire Drewery for Private Plan Change 51 (PPC51)¹¹, who considered that there are adverse health effects in relation to road traffic, referencing both the World Health Organisation (WHO) Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region (2018) and enHealth's The Health Effects of Environmental Noise (2018). The WHO's guidelines are (in part) copied below:

WHO guidelines for Community Noise 1999 states the following in relation to dwellings

[page xiii]

... The effects of noise in dwellings, typically, are sleep disturbance, annoyance and speech interference. For bedrooms the critical effect is sleep disturbance. Indoor guideline values for bedrooms are 30 dB LAeq for continuous noise and 45 dB LAmax for single sound events. Lower noise levels may be disturbing depending on the nature of the noise source. At night-time, outside sound levels about 1 metre from facades of living spaces should not exceed 45 dB LAeq, so that people may sleep with bedroom windows open. This value was obtained by assuming that the noise reduction from outside to inside with the window open is 15 dB. To enable casual conversation indoors during daytime, the sound level of interfering noise should not exceed 35 dB LAeq. To protect the majority of people from being seriously annoyed during the daytime, the outdoor sound level from steady, continuous noise should not exceed 55 dB LAeg on balconies, terraces and in outdoor living areas. To protect the majority of people from being moderately annoyed during the daytime, the outdoor sound level should not exceed 50 dB LAeq. Where it is practical and feasible, the lower outdoor sound level should be considered the maximum desirable sound level for new development.

¹¹ Paragraphs 6.7 and 6.9 of Statement of Evidence of Claire Drewery on behalf of Auckland Transport – Acoustic, dated 24 August 2021 for Private Plan Change 51 – Drury 2 Precinct.

WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region (2018) states the following

[page xiii]

Environmental noise is an important public health issue, featuring among the top environmental risks to health. It has negative impacts on human health and well-being and is a growing concern among both the general public and policy-makers in Europe.

[page xvi]

For average noise exposure, the Guideline Development Group (GDG) strongly recommends reducing noise levels produced by road traffic below 53 decibels (dB) Lden, as road traffic noise above this level is associated with adverse health effects.

Based on the above, Ms Drewery adopted 55 dB $LAeq_{(24 hour)}$ as the noise level above which potential health effects could occur and made subsequent recommendations for PPC51. Kainga Ora considers that it is appropriate that that any health effects arising from the operation of the road environment should be addressed and that the NOR should include conditions limiting noise beyond the designation boundary to 55 dB $LAeq_{(24 hour)}$ consistent with the levels adopted by Ms Drewery. In circumstances where this can not be achieved then noise mitigation to affected receivers should be provided.

- 57. Kāinga Ora considers that it is appropriate that the Requiring Authority is incentivised to ensure that such measures are undertaken to reduce noise and vibration at source, while at the same time utilising the AUP to manage those effects that cannot be controlled at source, if required.
- 58. Kāinga Ora submits that there would be a number of advantages with minimising noise and vibration at source that should provide benefits to future residents in surrounding urban areas, namely the ability for existing and future occupants to enjoy greater amenity outside their dwellings. While acoustic attenuation could be an appropriate response to address a health or amenity issue, any reduction of noise (or vibration) at source would enable future residents to enjoy their outdoor living areas, rather than being 'locked-up' in their homes.
- 59. At the same time, Kāinga Ora submits that there may be circumstances whereby existing dwellings that experience increased exposure to noise and vibration require

16

further mitigation in the form of building modifications, including but not limited to wall insulation, double glazing, forced ventilation and temperature controls. Kāinga Ora would like to discuss this aspect with the Requiring Authority.

- 60. Kāinga Ora is concerned that the conditions as drafted are not user friendly, are over complicated and would be difficult to understand for adjoining landowners. Kāinga Ora requests that the conditions are simplified for the benefit of adjoining land owners.
- 61. Kāinga Ora supports the application of structural mitigation measures (low noise and vibration road surfaces, acoustic barriers insulation, where appropriate) to all roads within the NoR. However, it is sought that where mitigation is applicable along the alignment of the Project, that this offer for mitigation shall stay in perpetuity (i.e. not be limited to three months), until an offer has been taken up, in the interests of natural justice and mitigating adverse health effects for future occupiers.
- 62. Kāinga Ora requests that condition 28 (Low Noise Road Surface) is amended to require the use of low noise and vibration road surfaces, such as an Asphaltic mix surface, for all road surfaces within this designation, unless further information confirms that this is not warranted from a health and safety perspective.

Other Items

Utilities

63. Kāinga Ora supports the preparation of a NUMP. Kāinga Ora considers that the NUMP should make also provision for potential upgrading and / or future proofing of existing infrastructure and utilities given changing urban environment, uplift in density likely to be facilitated by the Project and preference to avoid disturbance and rework in the future (i.e. post completion).

Validity of Advice Note – Designation Boundary

64. Kāinga Ora has concerns with the validity of the advice note associated with condition 13 (UDLMP) which states that a front yard setback is not required from the designation boundary as the designation is not proposed for road widening purposes. It would appear to Kāinga Ora that the proposal is, at least in part, for road widening to accommodate the Project. A designation cannot modify a rule in the plan, and it is expected that the Council are likely to require the front yard to be taken from the

#41

designated boundary which would potentially result in unintended consequences along the alignment of the Project, and compromise efficient land use and development along the Projects alignment.

Designation Review

65. The proposed designation conditions include a requirement for the Requiring Authority to review the designation within 6 months of completion of construction or as soon as otherwise practicable (proposed condition 3). While Kāinga Ora generally supports this notion and the intent to do this as soon as is practical, Kainga Ora considers that the condition should also include a requirement for the Requiring Authority to provide the land in a suitable state once the land is relinquished from the designation and surrendered, in agreement with the property owner.

Relief Sought

- 66. Kāinga Ora seeks the following further actions regarding the NoR:
 - (a) That the Requiring Authority continues to engage with Kainga Ora, prior to hearing, on the effects of displacement on Kāinga Ora tenants as a result of the proposed property acquisition.
 - (b) That the Requiring Authority adopts a more 'refined' approach in determining the extent the proposed designation boundary and the construction requirements, to ensure that only the minimum amount of land required is designated, and that the designation boundaries are refined accordingly with details provided prior to the hearing.
 - (c) That the Requiring Authority further explores, in consultation with Kainga Ora, opportunities for additional safe mid-block crossing points and stations, including but not limited to between Ormiston and Dawson Roads, and at the intersection of Te Irirangi and Hollyford Drives and Boundary Road, as well as safe mid-block crossing points along the Project's length.
 - (d) That the Requiring Authority provides further information regarding how the interface and treatment of existing (to be altered) slip roads will be addressed, including how access will be retained while providing for an appropriate LoS for active modes.

- (f) That the design of the Project is updated to incorporate the full suite of recommendations contained within (a) to (e) above, or alternatively that appropriate conditions are recommended requiring the recommendations within these assessments to be incorporated.
- 67. Kāinga Ora seeks the following decisions from Auckland Council regarding the NoR:

(e)

prior to the hearing.

- (a) That Kāinga Ora, as a key stakeholder, is explicitly included as partners to be involved in the preparation of management plans and future OPW's for the Project, with associated amendments to the conditions to reflect this.
- (b) The provision of a condition that requires the LoS for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport will be 'A' along the Project's length.
- (c) The provision of a condition that requires the safety and accessibility of active modes, micro-mobility and public transport to be prioritised over the private vehicle.
- (d) That condition 18 (CTMP) be amended to identify a key objective of the CTMP as being to provide active and micro-mobility modal users with safe, direct and appealing routes of access during construction.
- (e) The provision of a condition which requires the provision of facilities for micromobility and active modes at, or nearby to, RTS as part of future OPW's.
- (f) The provision of a condition which requires that, where property access that exists at the time of submitting the OPW is altered by the Project, that the Requiring Authority shall consult with the directly affected land owner regarding the changes requires and the OPW should demonstrate how safe alternative access will be provided.
- (g) That condition 14 is amended to require the Requiring Authority to ensure that the Project does not worsen any flooding effects onto neighbouring properties and appropriately avoids, remediates and/or mitigates the effects of their construction activities.

#41

19

- (h) The provision of a condition requiring operational noise levels to not exceed 55dBA beyond the boundaries of the designation and, where exceeded at a sensitive receiver, mitigation to then be provided by the Requiring Authority.
- (i) That where the operational noise effects require mitigation,that the offer for mitigation is retained in perpetuity, until an offer is taken up.
- (j) A condition requiring that the Requiring Authority undertake monitoring of operational noise be included within the designation.
- (k) That condition 28 (low road noise) is amended to require this to be on all roads within the designation.
- (I) That condition 27 (NUMP) be amended to include a requirement to provide for upgrading and / or future proofing of existing infrastructure and utilities in consultation with key stakeholders, including Kāinga Ora and utility providers.
- (m) That condition 13 (ULDMP) is amended as attached in Attachment A.
- (n) That condition 3 (Designation Review) should be amended to:
 - (i) add a clause requiring the Requiring Authority to, once the land is relinquished from the designation, leave the subject land in a suitable condition in agreement with the property owner/s; and
 - (ii) add a clause requiring the Requiring Authority to assess in conjunction with the land owner, every 12 months following the lodgement of OPW(s), whether any areas of the designation that have been identified as required for construction purposes are still required, and identify any areas that are no longer required, and give notice to the Council in accordance with section 182 for the removal of those parts no longer required.
- (o) Such further or other relief, or other consequential or other amendments, as are considered appropriate and necessary to address the concerns set out herein.
- (p) Any other alternative or consequential relief to give effect to this submission.
- 68. In the absence of the relief sought, Kāinga Ora considers that the NoR:

- (a) is contrary to the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and is otherwise inconsistent with Part 2 of the Act;
- (b) will compromise urban development outcomes;
- (c) will in those circumstances impact on the ability of people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing.
- 69. Kāinga Ora does not consider it can gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
- 70. Kāinga Ora wishes to be heard in support of its submission.
- 71. If others make a similar submission, Kāinga Ora would be willing to consider presenting a joint case with them at hearing.

Dated this 11th day of April 2023

Brendon Liggett Manager – Development Planning Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities

ADDRESSES FOR SERVICE:

Campbell Brown Planning Ltd	Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities
PO Box 147001	PO Box 74598
Auckland	Greenlane, Auckland
Attention: Michael Campbell	Attention: Jennifer Chivers
Email: <u>michael@campbellbrown.co.nz</u>	Email: developmentplanning@kaingaora.govt.nz

(a	a) A ULI	DMP shall be prepared	prior to the Start of
	Cons	truction for a Stage of Work.	
(b	(b) Mana Whenua shall be invited to participate in the development of the ULDMP(s) at lea		
six (6) months prior to the start of detailed design for a Stage of Work to provid			Work to provide input on
	cultur	al landscape and design matters. This shall include (but no	ot be limited to) how
	desire	ed outcomes for the management of potential effects on cu	Iltural sites, landscapes
	and v	alues identified and discussed in accordance with the Hist	oric Heritage
	Mana	gement Plan (Condition) and the Ecological
	Mana	gement Plan (Condition) may be reflected in
	the U	LDMP	
(c) The objective of the ULDMP(s) is to:			
	(i)	enable integration of the Project's permanent works into	the surrounding
		landscape, and urban context;	
	(ii)		
	(iii)		
	<i>(</i> ,)		
	(1V)	ensure that the Project manages potential adverse lands	scape and visual effects
			_ a quality urban
	(,)	environment; and	and have to the Droiget
	(v)	acknowledge and recognise the whakapapa Mana wher	iua nave to the Project
(0		area.	
(U	(i)	Auckland Transport's Lirban Roads and Streets Design (Quide:
	(i) (ii)	Waka Kotabi Urban Design Guidelines: Bridging the Gar	(2013) or any
	(11)	subsequent undated version:	(2013) Of any
	(iii)	Waka Kotabi Landscape Guidelines (2013) or any subse	equent undated version:
	(iv)	Waka Kotabi P39 Standard Specification for Highway La	indscape Treatments
	()	(2013) or any subsequent updated version: and	
	(v)		
	(vi)	Auckland's Urban Ngahere (Forest) Strategy or any subs	sequent updated
		version-	
	(vii)	Auckland Council's Auckland Design Manual; and	
	(viii)	Auckland Council's Transport Emissions Reduction	Pathway
(e	e) To ac	hieve the objective, the ULDMP(s) shall provide details of	how the project:
	(i)	is designed to integrate with the adjacent urban (or prop	osed urban) and
		landscape context, including the surrounding existing or	proposed topography,
		urban environment (i.e. centres and density of built form)),
		natural environment, landscape characte	er and open space zones;



- (ii) provides appropriate ______walking and cycling ______
 ______connectivity to, and interfaces with, existing or proposed adjacent land uses, public transport infrastructure and walking and cycling connections
- (iii) promotes inclusive access (where appropriate); and
- (iv) promotes a sense of personal ______safety by aligning with best practice guidelines, such as:
 - A. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles;
 - B. Safety in Design (SID) requirements; and
 - C. Maintenance in Design (MID) requirements and anti-vandalism/anti-graffiti measures.
- (v) provides opportunities to incorporate Mana Whenua values and cultural narrative through the design. This shall include but not be limited to:
 - A. how to protect and enhance connections to the Māori cultural landscape
 - bow and where accurate historical signage can be provided along the corridor;
 - C. how historical portage routes will be recognised;
 - D. how opportunities for cultural expression through, for example mahi toi, art, sculptures or other public amenity features will be provided;
 - E. how opportunities to utilise flora and fauna with a specific connection to the area are realised where possible by:
 - a. preserving them in the design and maintenance of the Project;
 - b. restoring them in a manner that recognises their historical and cultural significance. For example by clustering planting to represent a lost ngahere; and
 - F. how the historic and cultural significance of the Puhinui Historic Gateway is recognised; and
 - G. how, public access to coastal areas, waterways and open space is enhanced, where appropriate.
- (vi) provides for an integrated stormwater management approach which prioritises in the following order:
 - A. opportunities for ki uta ki tai (a catchment scale approach);
 - B. opportunities for net catchment benefit;
 - C. green infrastructure and nature-based solutions; and
 - D. opportunities for low maintenance design.
- (f) At the discretion of Mana Whenua, the matters listed in (e)(v) (vi) shall either be incorporated into the ULDMP or prepared as a separate plan.
- (g) The ULDMP(s) shall include:
 - a concept plan which depicts the overall landscape and urban design concept, and explain the rationale for the landscape and urban design proposals;

- (ii) developed design concepts, including principles for ______ walking and cycling facilities and public transport; and
- (iii) landscape and urban design details that cover the following:
 - A. road design elements such as intersection form, carriageway gradient and associated earthworks contouring including cut and fill batters and the interface with adjacent land uses, benching, spoil disposal sites, median width and treatment, roadside width and treatment;
 - B. roadside elements such as lighting, fencing, wayfinding and signage;
 - C. architectural and landscape treatment of all major structures, including bridges and retaining walls;
 - D. architectural and landscape treatment of noise barriers;
 - E. landscape treatment of permanent stormwater control wetlands and swales;
 - F. integration of passenger transport;
 - G. _____pedestrian and cycle facilities including _____ paths, road crossings and dedicated pedestrian/ cycle bridges or underpasses;
 - Н._____
 - I. ____
 - J. historic heritage places with reference to the HHMP (Condition 23); and
 - K. re-instatement of construction and site compound areas, driveways, accessways and fences.
- (h) The ULDMP shall also include the following planting details and maintenance requirements:
 - (i) planting design details including:
 - A. identification of existing trees and vegetation that will be retained with reference to the Tree Management Plan (Condition 26). Where practicable, mature trees and native vegetation should be retained;
 - B. street trees, shrubs and ground cover suitable for berms;
 - C. treatment of fill slopes to integrate with adjacent land use, streams, riparian margins and open space zones;
 - D. planting of stormwater wetlands;
 - E. identification of vegetation to be retained and any planting requirements under the Ecological Management Plan (Condition 25) and Tree Management Plan (Condition 26);
 - F. integration of any planting requirements required by conditions of any resource consents for the project; and
 - G. re-instatement planting of construction and site compound areas as appropriate.
 - (ii) a planting programme including the staging of planting in relation to the construction programme which shall, as far as practicable, include provision for

planting within each planting season following completion of works in each Stage of Work; and

- (iii) detailed specifications relating to the following:
 - A. weed control and clearance;
 - B. pest animal management (to support plant establishment);
 - C. ground preparation (top soiling and decompaction);
 - D. mulching; and
 - E. plant sourcing and planting, including hydroseeding and grassing, and use of eco-sourced species.



Watercare Services Limited 73 Remuera Road, Remuera, Auckland 1050, New Zealand Private Bag 92521, Victoria Street West, Auckland 1142, New Zealand Telephone +64 9 442 2222 www.watercare.co.nz

Attn: Planning Technician Auckland Council Level 24, 135 Albert Street Private Bag 92300 Auckland 1142

Notices of Requirement (""") for the Airport to Botany Bus Rapid Transit Project

Watercare Services Limited ("

")

Mark Bishop Regulatory & Policy Manager Watercare Services Ltd Private Bag 92 521 Wellesley Street AUCKLAND 1141 Phone:022 010 6301 Email: Mark.Bishop@water.co.nz

11 April 2023

1

- 1.1 Watercare is pleased to have the opportunity to make a submission on the five NoRs for the Airport to Botany Bus Rapid Transit Project ("") lodged by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency ("") and Auckland Transport as requiring authorities under the Resource Management Act 1991 (""), and in particular:
 - (a) NoR lodged by Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency to alter Designation 6717 State Highway 20B - State Highway 20 to Auckland International Airport;
 - (b) NoR lodged by Auckland Transport for a new designation to widen Puhinui Road between the SH20/SH20B Interchange and Orrs Road to provide for a Bus Rapid Transit corridor and walking and cycling facilities;
 - (c) NoR lodged by Auckland Transport for a new designation to widen the existing Puhinui Road between Plunket Avenue and east of the SH20/SH20B Interchange to provide for a Bus Rapid Transit corridor and walking and cycling facilities;
 - (d) NoR lodged by Auckland Transport for Rongomai Park to Puhinui Station (in the vicinity of Plunket Avenue); and



- (e) NoR lodged by Auckland Transport for a new designation to widen Te Irirangi Drive between Botany and Rongomai Park to provide for a Bus Rapid Transit corridor and walking and cycling facilities.
- 1.2 Watercare recognises the aim of the NoRs is to improve connections between the major centres of Botany, Manukau, Auckland Airport and their employment areas to existing and intensifying residential areas in southern and eastern Auckland.
- 1.3 Watercare neither supports nor opposes the NoRs (ie it is neutral as to whether the NoRs are confirmed or not). Watercare seeks to ensure that any decisions made to confirm the NoRs responds to the issues raised in this submission and avoids, remedies or mitigates potential adverse effects on Watercare's ability to provide water and wastewater services now and in the future.
- 1.4 Watercare could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
- 2.1 Watercare is New Zealand's largest provider of water and wastewater services. We are a substantive council-controlled organisation under the Local Government Act 2002 ("") and are wholly owned by Auckland Council (""). Watercare has a significant role in helping Auckland Council achieve its vision for the city. Our services are vital for life, keep people safe and help communities to flourish.
- 2.2 Watercare provides integrated water and wastewater services to approximately 1.7 million people in the Auckland region. Over the next 30 years, this could increase by another 720,000 people, potentially requiring another 313,000 dwellings along with associated three waters infrastructure. The rate and speed of Auckland's population growth puts pressure on our communities, our environment, and our housing and infrastructure networks. It also means increasing demand for space, infrastructure, and services necessary to support this level of growth.
- 2.3 Under both the LGA and the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009, Watercare has certain obligations. For example, Watercare must achieve its shareholder's objectives as specified in our statement of intent, be a good employer, and exhibit a sense of social and environmental responsibility.¹
- 2.4 Watercare must also give effect to relevant aspects of the Council's Long-Term Plan, and act consistently with other plans and strategies of the Council, including the Auckland Unitary Plan and the Auckland Future Urban Land Supply Strategy.
- 2.5 Watercare is also required to manage our operations efficiently with a view to keeping overall costs of water supply and wastewater services to our customers (collectively) at minimum levels, consistent with effective conduct of the undertakings and maintenance of long-term integrity of our assets.²

LGA, s 59.

² Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009, s 57.

- 3.1 This is a submission on all the NoRs that were publicly notified on 10 March 2023. In particular, this submission relates to the NoRs as they may potentially impact or interact with existing, or potential future, water and wastewater services.
- 3.2 Watercare recognises the aim of the NoRs is to improve connections between the major centres of Botany, Manukau, Auckland Airport and their employment areas to existing and intensifying residential areas in southern and eastern Auckland.
- 3.3 As noted previously, Watercare neither supports or opposes these NoRs (ie it is neutral as to whether the NoRs are confirmed or not). Watercare seeks to ensure that any decisions made on the NoRs responds to the issues raised in this submission and avoids, remedies, or mitigates potential adverse effects on Watercare's ability to provide water and wastewater services now and in the future.
- 3.4 Watercare acknowledges the proactive process to engagement from Waka Kotahi and Auckland Transport during the development of these NoRs including through discussions with the Supporting Growth Alliance, and the project work that preceded the Future Urban Land Use Strategy.
- 3.5 Watercare would like to ensure that in the future there is an active and continual process set up by the requiring authorities to recognise that third party infrastructure providers, including Watercare, have asset management and construction plans that are constantly updating and changing and that these updates and changes should be taken into account by the requiring authorities when the Project is developed further.
- 3.6 To that end, Watercare seeks to be engaged before detailed design and during the ongoing design phases to identify opportunities to enable, or otherwise not preclude, the development of new infrastructure within the Project areas. For example, this could involve the development of an "Infrastructure Integration Plan" prior to detailed design with third party infrastructure providers like Watercare (which can also be updated throughout construction of the Project) to ensure that the Project takes into account and appropriately integrates with potential future infrastructure like wastewater and water services.
- 3.7 It is expected that such an "Infrastructure Integration Plan" could include details of engagement undertaken (including any feedback from infrastructure providers), identify other potential infrastructure that may be developed within the Project areas and how the requiring authorities have enabled or otherwise not precluded the development of such infrastructure within the Project areas.
- 3.8 Watercare supports in depth collaboration and consultation (including information, data sharing and identification of opportunistic works) across infrastructure providers on the development (or redevelopment) of urban environments and wishes to ensure that there is ongoing and timely engagement and collaboration as this Project develops.
- 3.9 As noted, Watercare seeks early engagement from the requiring authorities for future planning and construction works including prior to detailed design and during implementation of construction works. Early and fulsome engagement with Watercare, along with other infrastructure providers, can enable opportunities to plan and future proof the delivery of assets to provide for well-functioning urban environments. For Watercare,

this includes applying for, in a timely manner, "Works Over" Approvals, in compliance with Watercare's "*Water Supply and Wastewater Network Bylaw 2015*" (updated 2021).

- 3.10 In addition, the NoRs interact with existing water and wastewater services. Watercare seeks to ensure the Project does not impact its wastewater and water services in the Project area now and into the future. Watercare wishes to ensure it maintains access to its assets 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for maintenance, safety and efficient operation of its services and that it is consulted on any works undertaken by the requiring authorities that may impact Watercare's services.
- 4.1 Watercare seeks that Auckland Council recommends:
 - (a) amendments to the NoRs, including by way of conditions to ensure any adverse effects on Watercare's assets and operations are avoided, remedied or mitigated and to address the concerns set out above; and
 - (b) such further other relief or other consequential amendments as considered appropriate and necessary to address the concerns set out above.
- 4.2 Watercare wishes to be heard in support of this submission.
- 4.3 If others make a similar submission, consideration would be given to presenting a joint case with them at any hearing.

Mark Bourne



FORM 21

Submission on a requirement for a designation or an alteration to a designation subject to full or limited notification under Section 168A, 169, 181, 189A, 190 and 195A of the Resource Management Act 1991.

То:	Auckland Council
Name of submitter:	Ministry of Education - Te Tāhuhu o te Mātauranga ('the Ministry')
Address for service:	Eden 5, Level 3/12-18 Normanby Road Mount Eden Auckland 1011
Attention:	Gemma Hayes
Phone:	+64 963 80294
Email:	gemma.hayes@education.govt.nz

This is a submission on the Supporting Growth's Notice of Requirement for Airport to Botany Bus Rapid Transit – Notice of Requirement 1 (NoR 1)– Botany to Rongomai Park

This submission relates to the potential road safety effects from heavy construction vehicles on students in Puhinui and Manukau.

Background:

The Ministry is the Government's lead advisor on the New Zealand education system, shaping direction for education agencies and providers and contributing to the Government's goals for education. The Ministry assesses population changes, school roll fluctuations and other trends and challenges impacting on education provision at all levels of the education network to identify changing needs within the network so the Ministry can respond effectively.

The Ministry has responsibility for all education property owned by the Crown. This involves managing the existing property portfolio, upgrading and improving the portfolio, purchasing and constructing new property to meet increased demand, identifying and disposing of surplus State school sector property and managing teacher and caretaker housing.

The Ministry is therefore a considerable stakeholder in terms of activities that may impact on existing and future educational facilities and assets in the Auckland region.

The Ministry of Education's submission is:

Under the Resource Management Act 1991, decision makers must have regard to the health and safety of people and communities. Furthermore, there is a duty to avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment.





Through its delivery partner, Supporting Growth, Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Auckland Transport have lodged five Notice of Requirements (NoRs) between Botany and Auckland Airport. The NoRs will collectively enable the construction of a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridor to allow better transportation between Auckland Airport and Botany. The project will also enable stronger walking and cycling facilities. The project aims to respond to poor mode share, access to employment, and increased pressure on transport networks due to residential intensification in the area.

The Ministry broadly supports the project's aim to enable better public and active modes of transportation in South Auckland. However, there are a number of schools around the project corridor that could be affected by the construction of the BRT corridor, this can be seen in Figure 1. The Ministry seeks for potential heavy construction traffic effects on the safety of schools across the five NoRs to be appropriately addressed and managed. The Ministry's specific concerns are outlined below.



Figure 1: location of schools in relation to NoR 1

Construction traffic effects:

Supporting Growth has outlined that a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be prepared prior to the start of construction, which will include details on how to manage heavy construction traffic near schools. It will include specific non-working or non-movement hours around schools, but no specific details have been provided.



The Ministry appreciates Supporting Growth's willingness to prioritise student safety during construction. There are a number of schools including Rongomai School, East Tamaki School, Willow Bank School and Baverstock Oaks School that are located near the proposed BRT corridor (NoR 1) and there is the potential for these schools to be affected by heavy construction traffic given they are located on a potential construction traffic route. The Ministry requests that these schools be included in the CTMP and all heavy construction vehicles must avoid these schools at peak pick-up and drop-off times to maintain a safe environment for students to walk and cycle to school.

The Ministry requests a designation condition outlining the details to be included in the CTMP on how all heavy construction vehicles must avoid schools during pick-up and drop-off times We have proposed a condition below. There is a diverse road network that surrounds the project corridor, resulting in multiple alternative routes around the schools/roads we have proposed to be avoided. Therefore, we do not see the acceptance of this condition to hinder Supporting Growth's construction programme.

Decision sought

The Ministry is neutral on the Airport to Botany NoRs if Council accepts the following relief and any consequential amendments required to give effect to the matters raised in this submission.

The Ministry requests the following designation conditions:

 The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall include details on how all heavy construction vehicles must avoid the schools at peak school pick up and drop off times (during term time only) outlined in the table below. It is noted that new schools could establish around the project area before construction commences. Any new school on an identified construction route must be added to the table below. Engagement should be undertaken with the Ministry to confirm the information in the table below is still accurate closer to the time of construction.

School Name	Address	Associated no travel route	Times heavy vehicles must avoid the schools (based off each school's individual start and finish times) ¹
NoR 1			
Rongomai School	20 Rongomai Road, Ōtara, Auckland 2023	Preston Road (between Flat Bush Road and Ormiston Road) and East Tamaki Road (between Ormiston Road and Birmingham Road)	8.00am to 8.45am 2.45pm to 3.15pm
East Tamaki School	196 Preston Road, Ōtara, Auckland 2023	Preston Road (between Flat Bush Road and Ormiston Road) and East Tamaki Road (between Ormiston Road and Birmingham Road)	7.45am to 8.30am 2.45pm to 3.15pm

Table 1: Schools that heavy construction vehicles must avoid at peak school pick-up and drop-off times

¹ Typically the morning school drop-off period is longer than the afternoon pick-up period. This is why on average we have requested a 45min window where trucks must avoid the schools in the morning. The afternoon peak pick-up period is typically shorter with students leaving the school grounds as soon as class finishes, which is why we only request a 30min window (on average) for the afternoon peak.



Willow Bank School	56 Middlefield Drive, Dannemora, Auckland 2016	Gracechurch Drive	8.10am to 8.55am 3.00pm to 3.30pm
Baverstock Oaks School	21 Baverstock Road, Flat Bush, Auckland 2016	Baverstock Road	7.45am to 8.30am 3.00pm to 3.30pm
Ormiston Junior and Senior College and Ormiston Primary School	275 Ormiston Road, Manukau City Centre, Auckland 2016	Ormiston Road	Monday, Tuesday Wednesday and Friday: 8.00am to 9.00am 3.00pm to 4.00pm Thursdays: 8.00am to 10.00am 3.00pm to 4.00pm

The Ministry looks forward to working with Supporting Growth to manage construction traffic effects on student safety.

The Ministry wishes to be heard in support of its submission

Gemma Hayes

Principal Planning Advisor Ministry of Education Date: 11 April 2023

2023 April 07

Planning Technicians Plan and Place Auckland Council Private Bag 92300 Auckland 1142

Dear John Duguid

My family is worried about Auckland Council's plan because it may affect the abovementioned decision. If you consider these facts when making your decision, you will realize that my family is totally opposed to it. First of all, we have lived here for 23 years. Second, we feel at home in both our house and the neighborhood. Thirdly, closer proximity to the places where my kids go to school, work, and shop. Fourth, medical facilities and doctors.

My concern is that there aren't enough homes in Auckland to accommodate the city's population. if you knock down all of these residences along Te Irirangi Drive. Where else are we going? Are more homes being built for us that will meet our requirements and cause us less stress?

In order to achieve success, I hope to hear from you soon.

Kind regards

Household Mika Court Hello.

Please accept this as a late submission.

I have been in the South Island for the period 26 February to 6 April, and then away again for the Easter period 6 April to 11 April. On my return I checked the P.O. Box and found the letter from the Auckland Council dated 10 March. I apologise for the late submission but neither myself or my fellow company directors had any knowledge of the letter which was delivered to our company P.O. Box.

This is the submission.

Name of Submitter: Paul Street, on behalf of Street Properties Limited. Address of the property: 11 Reg Savory Place. Address for communication: P.O. Box 24199, Hillcrest, Hamilton, 3251. Contact Phone number; 021-364-943. Contact email: <u>streeto@xtra.co.nz</u> Contact person; Paul Street.

Waka Kotahi NZTA. Rapid transit corridor (NoR S3).

The specific part of the above notice that our submission relates to are: "The widening of Te Irirangi Drive adjacent to our property".

My/our submission is that we **oppose** the notice of requirement.

The reasons for my/our view are:

We wish to register our concern that the proposed boundary infringement set out in the Airport to Botany Rapid Transit Project and subject to a proposed Notice of Requirement to designate land will substantially effect the operational viability and value of our property.

Our property is an industrial warehouse located adjacent to Te Irirangi Drive and accessed from Reg Savory Place. The long side of the warehouse building is aligned parallel to Te Irirangi Drive with two of the three warehouse access roller doors on that facade. There is an office complex on the south eastern corner and a single roller door.

The current site allows for vehicle access around the office complex to the roller doors on the eastern side of the warehouse. We are concerned that the proposed reduction of 800mm and any associated batter will mean that trucks and delivery vehicles will no longer be able to access the eastern side of the building and severely diminish the commercial viability of the facility. I/we seek the following recommendations or decision from the council:

We believe that a potential solution is available through a minor dogleg realignment of the proposed pedestrian path and cycleway towards the dual carriageway along the length of the boundary. This would eliminate the need for any adjustment to the existing boundary.

This proposal would also eliminate the need for the proposed 2 metre contractor access strip within our existing boundary. Our current tenant is a car sales operation with the entire length of the eastern boundary used to display vehicles for sale. The proposed access strip would, for the duration of the construction period, mean that our tenant would be unable to display his stock for sale and possibly result in him abandoning the existing lease on the basis that the building was no longer fit for purpose.

I/we wish to be heard in support of our submission.

From Paul Street, on behalf of Street Properties Limited. Dated; 15 April 2023.

Submission on a requirement for a designation or an alteration to a designation subject to full or limited notification

Sections 168A, 169, 181, 189A, 190, and 195A of the Resource Management Act 1991 FORM 21

Send your submission to <u>unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</u> or post to:

Attn: Planning Technician Auckland Council Level 24, 135 Albert Street Private Bag 92300 Auckland 1142

Submitter details

Organisation Name (if submission is made on behalf of Organisation)

Te Äkitai Waiohua Waka Taua Trust

Address for service of Submitter

PO Box 59 185 Mangere Bridge Auckland, 2151

Telephone: 021500054

Email: karen.a.wilson@xtra.co.nz

Contact Person: Karen Wilson

This is a submission on the following notices of requirement:

Requiring authority	NOR	Description
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport	4b	Alternation to Designation 6717 State Highway 20B – State
Agency		Highway 20 to Auckland International Airport
Auckland Transport	4	Bus Rapid Transit – SH20/20B Interchange to Orrs Road
Auckland Transport	3	Bus Rapid Transit – Puhinui Station (in the vicinity of Plunket Avenue) to SH20/20B Interchange
Auckland Transport	2	Bus Rapid Transit – Rongomai Park to Puhinui Station (in the vicinity of Plunket Avenue)
Auckland Transport	1	Bus Rapid Transit – Botany to Rongomai Park

The specific parts of the above notice of requirement that my submission relates to are:

The proposed conditions for NORs 1 to 4a.

My submission is:

We are neutral on the notices of requirement.

The reasons for my views are:

Te Ākitai Waiohua have lived on these lands since time immemorial. This is our whenua – we have no alternatives. The proposed Bus Rapid Transit will traverse through our rohe and cultural landscape. The scale of the project will have significant adverse effects on the cultural landscape of Te Ākitai Waiohua. As a principal partner to the project, Te Ākitai Waiohua have worked with the project team to develop a set of conditions that will ensure these effects will be appropriate managed as the project is developed.

Te Ākitai Waiohua Waka Taua Trust is neutral on the notices of requirement provided the proposed conditions are retained as requested to ensure ongoing participation in the project.

In particular, condition 5 is supported and must be retained because the project will not commence for many years. Condition 5 provides certainty that Te Äkitai Waiohua is recognised as Mana Whenua and as a partner to this project. Governments and people involved in the project will change over the life of a designation and therefore condition 5 is required to ensure there is no ambiguity in the future. Without condition 5 the hard work of those involved in the project over the past few years and the partnership achieved would be at risk.

I seek the following recommendation or decision from the Council

Retain Condition 5 to ensure certainty is provided that Te Ākitai Waiohua is Mana Whenua and a partner on this project.

I wish to be heard in support of my submission.

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing

Signature of Submitter (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

<u> 06. 04-23</u>

Date



Planning & Resource Management Consultants

11 May 2023

Central/South Planning Team Auckland Council

Attention: Trevor Mackie, Consultant Planner, Planning Central/South By email: *mackiet@xtra.co.nz*

Dear Trevor,

Re: Notices of Requirement: Auckland Transport Airport to Botany Rapid Transit (NoR1)

Our clients, East Tamaki Investments Ltd and the Beale Partnership are both affected parties with regard to the aforenamed Auckland Transport NoR. They have now been notified of the NoR, with their respective property ownerships being:

- 360 Te Irirangi Drive East Tamaki Investments Ltd
- 350 Te Irirangi Drive Beale Partnership

Unfortunately however, both notification letters were sent to the wrong address for service. The address they were sent to (PO Box 62178, Sylvia Park, Auckland 1644) is an old postal address now used by Savory Construction, who were the construction contractors who constructed the commercial development four years ago, which is now occupied by the BMW/Mini Dealership at 360 Te Irirangi Drive. Whilst the parties are in communication, naturally this is not frequent as the construction project has long since been completed.

As a consequence our clients only received the notification letter dated 10 March 2023 and the prior letter dated 3 March 2023 within the last week, being delivered indirectly. Submissions formally closed on 11 April 2023.

Despite attempts by our clients to correct the wrong address for service, it is apparent that the correction has not **been made to Council's data files** and therefore the wrong address for service is still being utilised by Auckland Council.

The correct address for service for both of the following entities/properties is 108 Selwyn Ave, Mission Bay, Auckland 1071:

- 360 Te Irirangi Drive East Tamaki Investments Ltd
- 350 Te Irirangi Drive Beale Partnership

The above said, our clients would prefer to be notified by email, c/o Michael Clark, Talica Management Ltd <u>michael@talica.co.nz</u>.

Our clients intend to lodge a submission on the NoR and will do so as soon as possible, but ensure this will be before the close of business on Friday 18 May 2023, having only just engaged Planning Initiatives Limited to assist them with this process.

The purpose of this letter is advance notice of the above and it is kindly requested that Auckland Council provide relief for the lateness of this submission given the circumstances described, which are not of **our clients'** wrongdoing.

We note that the lateness of the submission will not prejudice any party, given that a date is yet to be set for the hearing.

We also kindly request that this letter is retained with their future submission(s) and provided to the Hearings Commissioners who are tasked with making recommendations on the NoR at the hearings.

A copy of this letter has also been sent to Auckland Transport for their information.

Yours sincerely,

Jonathan Cutler Principal Planner / Director Planning Initiatives Limited

- cc. <u>unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</u>
- cc. Auckland Transport Private Bag 92250 Auckland 1142 Attention: Patrick Buckley



Planning & Resource Management Consultants

Form 21

SUBMISSION ON A NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT

Section 190, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Auckland Council Level 24, 135 Albert Street Private Bag 92300

Auckland 1142

Name of submitter:

East Tamaki Investments Ltd 360 Te Irirangi Drive East Tamaki Auckland 2013

c/o Michael Clark Talica Management Ltd <u>michael@talica.co.nz</u>

Address for Service: C/- Jonathan Cutler Planning Initiatives Ltd PO Box 32153 Devonport AUCKLAND 0744 jcutler@planninginit.co.nz

1. This is a submission on a **Notice Of Requirement (NoR)** lodged by **Auckland Transport** for a designation in the Auckland Unitary Plan for a public work, being the construction, operation and maintenance of an upgrade to Te Irirangi Drive between Leixlep Lane and Rongomai Park to provide for a Bus Rapid Transit corridor, walking and cycling facilities and

E. jcutler@planninginit.co.nz
P. +64 9 489 9125
M. +64 21 216 6751

PO Box 32153 Devonport Auckland, 0744



associated infrastructure.

- 2. The submitter is the owner of 360 Te Irirangi Drive, East Tamaki, which is directly affected by the Notice Of Requirement. Part of the submitter's property is sought by Auckland Transport to be part of the designated land.
- **3.** The submitter is not a trade competitor for the purposes of <u>section 308B</u> of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and as such the submitter could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

4. The specific parts of the Notice Of Requirement(s) that this submission relates to are:

NoR1 – Botany Town Centre to Rongamai Park.

5. The submission summary:

The submitter supports the Bus Rapid Transit Project Objectives for NoR1 but opposes the NoR for the reasons set out below.

6. The reasons for the submission are as follows:

In the absence of the relief sought below being upheld, NoR1 will:

- (i) Not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources;
- (ii) Not amount to and promote the efficient use and development of resources;
- (iii) Not be consistent with the purpose and principles in Part 2 of the RMA;
- (iv) Generate significant adverse effects on the operation and viability of East Auckland BMW; and
- (v) Not warrant being upheld in terms of section 171 of the RMA.

Background: the submitter's property

The property is occupied by East Auckland BMW, being a car sales and showroom for BMW and Mini in the eastern part of the Auckland region. The property was recently redeveloped for this landuse and tenant and all aspects of the improvements to the site are specific to its commercial needs, including building envelope, site layout, design detailing, staff parking,

PO Box 32153 Devonport Auckland, 0744


customer parking, outdoor parking/display of vehicles for sale and all vehicle manoeuvring, including car transporter trucks with Semi Trailers delivering stock to the site.

Support of Rapid Transit Lanes

The submitter supports the objectives and needs of the NoR having regard to dedicated rapid transit lanes and improved public transport choices for residents, workers and visitors. The dedicated bus lanes and stations will improve the public transport experience for passengers and make it more attractive to current private vehicle users. Increased uptake of public transport will also ease congestion and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

However, Te Irirangi Drive is a busy arterial route that will remain predominantly so even after the construction of the improvements sought by the NoR.

The submitter objects to the NoR necessitating the width of the corridor sought along its property's frontage, including requiring a strip of land of the submitter's property, constituting its prime commercial street frontage to Te Irirangi Drive.

Limited Assessment of Alternatives Methods

In its assessment of alternatives, the Requiring Authority has not sufficiently justified the need for the 18 metres to (upto) 57 metres width of legal road corridor¹ necessary to achieve the main purposes of the NoR, being public transit objectives.

Indeed the applicant's AEE, at Part 1.3, in summarising the need for the project and its supporting business case does not once mention active modes or a need for improved walking and cycle facilities on this route.

Similarly in the assessment of alternatives for the project, summarised at Part 4.1 and detailed in Appendix A, the main considerations were the route and mode of rapid transit. There was no assessment of the needs of separate pedestrian and cycle paths, and therefore little consideration of the alternative of a Shared Use Path (SUP) for these active modes. Consideration of SUPs was only outlined for the western sections of the Project to the west of the Southern Motorway, not the section encompassing NoR1.

This is critical to the submitter because the additional width required (of some 4.5m) for separate cycle and pedestrian paths (compared with a SUP) is almost equal to the full width



¹ For the length of the NoR in respect of the submitter's site frontage.

E. jcutler@planninginit.co.nz

P. +64 9 489 9125

M. +64 21 216 6751

PO Box 32153 Devonport Auckland, 0744

of their land proposed to be designated, which tapers from some 5m in the south to 3.5m in the north.

Separate Walking and Cycle Paths

The submitter **opposes** the need for a grade separated walking and cycle paths on this route.

The submitter, from its long-term experience of the area knows that it is not a transport environment that is attractive for these active modes, and this situation will not fundamentally change under the conditions of the completed project. The same also applies for most of the remainder of this package of NoRs through to Orrs Road and the Airport.

The route will remain a busy arterial corridor, albeit with dedicated BRT lanes in its centre. This will do little to remove the noise and fumes of vehicles and whilst buses will be further distanced from pedestrians and cyclists, general traffic, including heavy vehicles carrying freight, will continue to use the general traffic lanes to the detriment of the amenity of pedestrians and cyclists.

This point can be demonstrated by recent counts² of individual pedestrians and cyclists (and electric scooters) passing the submitter's property, which were all very low, as shown in Table 1:

	Pedestrians	Cyclists	Electric Scooters
6.30am - 9.30am	11	3	3
3.30pm - 6.30pm	21	6	2

Table 1: Active Mode Counts: Thursday 18 May 2023

Such low numbers of active modes on an arterial route predominantly servicing commercial landuses does not justify separate pedestrian and cycle paths, which generally require 4.5m more width (two-way) than SUPs.

It is doubtful whether Te Irirangi Drive has the mix of landuse activities described in the Transport Chapter 3 of the Auckland Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision to be classified as a 'Mixed Use Arterial', which shows separate cycle and pedestrian paths.



² As verified by the submitter's tenant's CCTV footage, these figures include both sides of the road on a dry day.

Part 3.5.3.4 of Chapter 3 sets out the conditions where SUPs may be considered instead of separate cycle and pedestrian paths. It states:

"A shared path is not an approved type and may only be used where numbers of cyclists and pedestrians are low enough to avoid frequent conflict.

Where combined cycle usage and pedestrian usage is between 75 and 150 per hour, a Departure from Standard is required, demonstrating that a shared path is safe and appropriate.

Where the function of the path requires a design cycle speed greater than 15 km/h, separation must be provided."

The above data, extrapolated to a daily figure, shows that the combined cycle and pedestrian usage will be significantly less than the lower of the aforesaid range, 75 per hour. This demonstrates what the submitter knows anecdotally that this route does not appeal to either cyclists or pedestrians, and therefore does not justify separate cycle and pedestrian paths. Rather, a shared path would be a safe and more appropriate alternative in this locality.

Operational effects on the submitter's land sought to be designated

With derogating from the generality of above, the NoR, as it significantly affects the submitter is opposed on the following grounds:

The land to be taken at construction stage would require the **removal** of the following capital improvements to the site:

- The most valuable premium frontage parking (with the most commercial street presence) used for the display of vehicles for sale which overlook Te Irirangi Drive, such that all 19 of these parking spaces would be lost. This is particularly problematic as there are only another 5 outdoor display parking spaces on the site;
- A significant number and value of structures along the site's full frontage to Te Irirangi Drive, including but not limited to, extensive retaining walls, pedestrian entrance steps, block and concrete planter boxes, landscaping, security lighting pole and in-ground lighting, 2 x consented freestanding signage boards and 3 x flag poles (which also required a resource consent); and
- Underground services and utilities: private stormwater drainage including 3 x pipes, 2 x manholes and 3 x cesspits, 1 x water connection and 2 x water meters.

E. jcutler@planninginit.co.nz
P. +64 9 489 9125
M. +64 21 216 6751



Furthermore, the Te Irirangi Drive vehicle ingress into the premises is already steep at/near the maximum grade for a commercial access under Table E27.6.4.4.1 of the AUP (OP). This is a critical customer access with the site having a Te Irirangi Drive address and cost significant funds to consent and construct, including legal challenges with AT and Auckland Council. The loss of some 4m of site frontage, including some 50% of the length of this ramped access, would likely render it infeasible to reinstate as it would need a steeper grade even still with less land available between the upper end of the access ramp and the northern-eastern corner of the site's front building.

Therefore under this scenario the entire site would have to be acquired for the works under the Public Works Act 1981 (PWA). This is an unacceptable position for the submitter, notwithstanding the compensation that will be due to the submitter under the PWA. It is also an unnecessary one for the Requiring Authority and an unnecessary additional public cost of the project that will be borne by Auckland ratepayers.

Furthermore, these factors would also result in breaches of the conditions of the submitter's resource consent, LUC60313216, which the submitter obtained as recently as 2018.

Accordingly, due to the above situation, the conditions for avoiding, remedying or mitigating the effects of construction will have no bearing on the submitter as it will not be viable for a high end car dealership to continue to trade from the submitter's site. All of the above features of the site are critical for the viability and success of the submitter's tenant's commercial activities, which would not able to be provided as required by their lease under the circumstances of the designation sought.

6. The following decision is sought from the local authority:

- 6.1 An amendment to the spatial extent of the designation sought under the notice of requirement by removing the designation from the submitter's land, or alternatively;
- 6.2 Any other further or consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.
- 6.3 Notwithstanding the above, if the Council is minded to recommend that the designation be upheld in terms of section 171 of the RMA, as it relates to the land designated on the submitter's property, the submitter reserves its right to comment on the draft designation conditions relating to the construction phase and ongoing operational conditions at the hearing.
- 7. The submitter wishes to be heard in support of this submission.

 E.
 jcutler@planninginit.co.nz
 PO Box 32153

 P.
 +64 9 489 9125
 Devonport

 M.
 +64 21 216 6751
 Auckland, 0744



8. If others make a similar submission, the submitter will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

Signed: For and on behalf of the submitter

Date: 24 May 2023

Jonathan Cutler MPlanPrac(Hons), BSc, BCom, MNZPI, MRTPI **Principal Planner / Director Planning Initiatives Limited**

Phone:	09 489 9125
Mobile:	021 216 6751
Email:	jcutler@planninginit.co.nz
Website	www.planninginit.co.nz





Planning & Resource Management Consultants

Form 21

SUBMISSION ON A NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT

Section 190, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Auckland Council Level 24, 135 Albert Street Private Bag 92300 Auckland 1142

> Name of submitter: Beale Partnership 350 Te Irirangi Drive East Tamaki Auckland 2013 c/o Michael Clark Talica Management Ltd michael@talica.co.nz

- Address for Service: C/- Jonathan Cutler Planning Initiatives Ltd PO Box 32153 Devonport Auckland 0744 jcutler@planninginit.co.nz
- 1. This is a submission on a **Notice Of Requirement (NoR)** lodged by **Auckland Transport** for a designation in the Auckland Unitary Plan for a public work, being the construction, operation and maintenance of an upgrade to Te Irirangi Drive between Leixlep Lane and Rongomai Park to provide for a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridor, walking and cycling facilities and associated infrastructure.

 E.
 jcutler@planninginit.co.nz
 PO Box 32153

 P.
 +64 9 489 9125
 Devonport

 M.
 +64 21 216 6751
 Auckland, 0744

4

- 2. The submitter is the owner of 350 Te Irirangi Drive, East Tamaki, which is directly affected by the Notice Of Requirement. Part of the submitter's property is sought by Auckland Transport to be part of the designated land.
- **3.** The submitter is not a trade competitor for the purposes of <u>section 308B</u> of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and as such the submitter could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

4. The specific parts of the Notice Of Requirement(s) that this submission relates to are:

NoR1 – Botany Town Centre to Rongamai Park.

5. The submission summary:

The submitter supports the Bus Rapid Transit Project Objectives for NoR1 but opposes the NoR for the reasons set out below.

6. The reasons for the submission are as follows:

In the absence of the relief sought below being upheld, NoR1 will:

- (i) Not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources;
- (ii) Not amount to and promote the efficient use and development of resources;
- (iii) Not be consistent with the purpose and principles in Part 2 of the RMA;
- (iv) Generate significant adverse effects on the operation and viability of Andrew Simms Botany; and
- (v) Not warrant being upheld in terms of section 171 of the RMA.

Background: the submitter's property

The property is occupied by Andrew Simms Botany, being car sales and showrooms for Jeep/Chrysler/Ram, Kia and Mitsubishi Motors in the eastern part of the Auckland region. All aspects of the improvements to the site are specific to these tenancy's commercial needs, including building envelope, site layout, design detailing, staff parking, customer parking, outdoor parking/display of vehicles for sale and all vehicle manoeuvring, including car transporter trucks with Semi Trailers delivering stock to the site.



Support of Rapid Transit Lanes

The submitter supports the objectives and needs of the NoR having regard to dedicated BRT lanes and improved public transport choices for residents, workers and visitors. The dedicated bus lanes and stations will improve the public transport experience for passengers and make it more attractive to current private vehicle users. Increased uptake of public transport will also ease congestion and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

However, Te Irirangi Drive is a busy arterial route that will remain predominantly so even after the construction of the improvements sought by the NoR.

The submitter opposes the NoR necessitating the width of the corridor sought along its property's frontage, including requiring a strip of land of the submitter's property, constituting its prime commercial street frontage to Te Irirangi Drive.

Limited Assessment of Alternatives Methods

In its assessment of alternatives, the Requiring Authority has not sufficiently justified the need for the 45 metres to (upto) 75 metres width of legal road corridor¹ necessary to achieve the main purposes of the NoR, being public transit objectives.

Indeed the applicant's AEE, at Part 1.3, in summarising the need for the project and its supporting business case does not once mention active modes or a need for improved walking and cycle facilities on this route.

Similarly in the assessment of alternatives for the project, summarised at Part 4.1 and detailed in Appendix A, the main considerations were the route and mode of rapid transit. There was no assessment of the needs of separate pedestrian and cycle paths, and therefore little consideration of the alternative of a Shared Use Path (SUP) for these active modes. Consideration of SUPs was only outlined for the western sections of the Project to the west of the Southern Motorway, not the section encompassing NoR1.

This is critical to the submitter because the additional width required (of some 4.5m) for separate cycle and pedestrian paths (compared with a SUP) is almost equal to the full width of their land proposed to be designated, which tapers from some 3.5m in the south to 5m in the north.

E. jcutler@planninginit.co.nz

- M. +64 21 216 6751
- PO Box 32153 Devonport Auckland, 0744



¹ For the length of the NoR in respect of the submitter's site frontage.

P. +64 9 489 9125

Separate Walking and Cycle Paths

The submitter **opposes** the need for a grade separated walking and cycle paths on this route.

The submitter, from its long-term experience of the area knows that it is not a transport environment that is attractive for these active modes, and this situation will not fundamentally change under the conditions of the completed project. The same also applies for most of the remainder of this package of NoRs through to Orrs Road and the Airport.

The route will remain a busy arterial corridor, albeit with dedicated BRT lanes in its centre. This will do little to remove the noise and fumes of vehicles and whilst buses will be further distanced from pedestrians and cyclists, general traffic, including heavy vehicles carrying freight, will continue to use the general traffic lanes to the detriment of the amenity of pedestrians and cyclists.

This point can be demonstrated by recent counts² of individual pedestrians and cyclists (and electric scooters) passing the submitter's property, which were all very low, as shown in Table 1:

	Pedestrians	Cyclists	Electric Scooters
6.30am - 9.30am	11	3	3
3.30pm - 6.30pm	21	6	2

Table 1: Active Mode Counts: Thursday 18 May 2023

Such low numbers of active modes on an arterial route predominantly servicing commercial landuses does not justify separate pedestrian and cycle paths, which generally require 4.5m more width (two-way) than SUPs.

It is doubtful whether Te Irirangi Drive has the mix of landuse activities described in the Transport Chapter 3 of the Auckland Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision to be classified as a 'Mixed Use Arterial', which shows separate cycle and pedestrian paths.

Part 3.5.3.4 of Chapter 3 sets out the conditions where SUPs may be considered instead of separate cycle and pedestrian paths. It states:



² As verified by No.360's tenant's CCTV footage, these figures include both sides of the road on a dry day.

E. jcutler@planninginit.co.nz

P. +64 9 489 9125

M. +64 21 216 6751

PO Box 32153 Devonport Auckland, 0744

"A shared path is not an approved type and may only be used where numbers of cyclists and pedestrians are low enough to avoid frequent conflict.

Where combined cycle usage and pedestrian usage is between 75 and 150 per hour, a Departure from Standard is required, demonstrating that a shared path is safe and appropriate.

Where the function of the path requires a design cycle speed greater than 15 km/h, separation must be provided."

The above data, extrapolated to a daily figure, shows that the combined cycle and pedestrian usage will be significantly less than the lower of the aforesaid range, 75 per hour. This demonstrates what the submitter knows anecdotally that this route does not appeal to either cyclists or pedestrians, and therefore does not justify separate cycle and pedestrian paths. Rather, a shared path would be a safe and more appropriate alternative in this locality.

Operational effects on the submitter's land sought to be designated

With derogating from the generality of above, the NoR, as it significantly affects the submitter is opposed on the following grounds:

The land to be taken at construction stage would require the **removal** of the following capital improvements to the site:

- The most valuable premium frontage parking (with the most commercial street presence) used for the display of vehicles for sale which overlook/face Te Irirangi Drive, such that all 30 of these parking spaces would be lost or compromised leaving one row of parking at the site's frontage abutting the building and insufficient space for compliant and practical vehicle manoeuvring and frontage landscaping, signage and banners etc.
- A significant number and value of structures along the site's full frontage to Te Irirangi Drive, including but not limited to, a high retaining wall and its safety fences above (the wall extends to 3m in height at the southern end of the site), 2x security lighting poles, 3 x consented freestanding signage plinths and an entry/exit signage plinth (which also required a resource consent); and
- Underground services and utilities: private stormwater drainage including 2 x pipes and 2 x manholes.



Therefore the entire site may have to be acquired for the works under the Public Works Act 1981 (PWA). This is an unacceptable position for the submitter and an unnecessary one for the Requiring Authority as well as an unnecessary public cost of the project that will be borne by Auckland ratepayers, notwithstanding the compensation that will be due to the submitter under the PWA.

Accordingly, in the above scenario, the conditions for avoiding, remedying or mitigating the effects of construction will have no bearing on the submitter as it will not be viable for a high end car dealership to continue to trade from the submitter's site. All of the above features of the site are critical for the viability and success of the submitter's tenant's commercial activities, which would not be able to be provided as required by their lease under the circumstances of the designation sought.

6. The following decision is sought from the local authority:

- 6.1 An amendment to the spatial extent of the designation sought under the notice of requirement by removing the designation from the submitter's land, or alternatively;
- 6.2 Any other further or consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.
- 6.3 Notwithstanding the above, if the Council is minded to recommend that the designation be upheld in terms of section 171 of the RMA, as it relates to the land designated on the submitter's property, the submitter reserves its right to comment on the draft designation conditions relating to the construction phase and ongoing operational conditions at the hearing.
- **7.** The submitter wishes to be heard in support of this submission.
- **8.** If others make a similar submission, the submitter will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

Signed: For and on behalf of the submitter

Date: 24 May 2023 Jonathan Cutler MPlanPrac(Hons), BSc, BCom, MNZPI, MRTPI **Principal Planner / Director Planning Initiatives Limited**

E. jcutler@planninginit.co.nz
P. +64 9 489 9125
M. +64 21 216 6751



Phone:	09 489 9125
Mobile:	021 216 6751
Email:	jcutler@planninginit.co.nz
Website	www.planninginit.co.nz





Planning & Resource Management Consultants

17 May 2023

Central/South Planning Team Auckland Council

Attention: Trevor Mackie, Consultant Planner, Planning Central/South By email: *mackiet@xtra.co.nz*

Dear Trevor,

Re: Notices of Requirement: Auckland Transport Airport to Botany Rapid Transit (NoR1)

Our client, Howard Property Ltd, being the owners of 4 Beale Place, East Tamaki, is an affected party with regard to the aforenamed Auckland Transport NoR. They have now been notified of the NoR.

Unfortunately however, the notification letter was sent to the **wrong person in the wrong business**. The email address the notification was sent to was for Liam Keatley, a salesperson within Botany Toyota (owned by Howard Trading Limited) rather than the property owner, which is registered as Howard Property Limited. Whilst the parties are in reasonably regular communication, the notice looked very generic and was not passed on in a timely manner.

As a consequence our clients only received the email dated 8 March 2023 **within the last week**. Submissions formally closed on 11 April 2023.

Despite attempts by our clients to correct the wrong address for service, it is apparent that the correction has not been made to Council's data files and therefore the wrong address for service is still being utilised by Auckland Council.

The correct address for service is:

Howard Property Limited Apartment 901 132 Halsey Street Wynyard Quarter **Auckland 1010**

The above said, our clients would prefer to be notified by email, c/o Ali Guise, Howard Group <u>ali@howardgroup.co.nz</u>.

Our clients intend to lodge a submission on the NoR and will do so as soon as possible, but will

endeavour to do so before the close of business on Friday 25 May 2023, having only just engaged Planning Initiatives Limited to assist them with this process.

The purpose of this letter is advance notice of the above and it is kindly requested that Auckland Council provide relief for the lateness of this submission given the circumstances described, which are not of our clients' wrongdoing.

We note that the lateness of the submission will not prejudice any party, given that a date is yet to be set for the hearing.

We also kindly request that this letter is retained with their future submission(s) and provided to the Hearings Commissioners who are tasked with making recommendations on the NoR at the hearings.

A copy of this letter has also been sent to Auckland Transport for their information.

Yours sincerely,

Jonathan Cutler Principal Planner / Director Planning Initiatives Limited

- cc. unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
- cc. Auckland Transport Private Bag 92250 Auckland 1142 Attention: Patrick Buckley



Planning & Resource Management Consultants

Form 21

SUBMISSION ON A NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT

Section 190, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Auckland Council Level 24, 135 Albert Street Private Bag 92300 Auckland 1142

Name of submitter:

Howard Property Ltd Apartment 901 132 Halsey Street

Wynyard Quarter

Auckland 1010

Attention: Ali Guise, Director

ali@howardgroup.co.nz

- Address for Service: C/- Jonathan Cutler Planning Initiatives Ltd PO Box 32153 Devonport Auckland 0744 jcutler@planninginit.co.nz
- 1. This is a submission on a **Notice Of Requirement (NoR)** lodged by **Auckland Transport** for a designation in the Auckland Unitary Plan for a public work, being the construction, operation and maintenance of an upgrade to Te Irirangi Drive between Leixlep Lane and Rongomai Park to provide for a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridor, walking and cycling facilities and associated infrastructure.

E. jcutler@planninginit.co.nz P. +64 9 489 9125 M. +64 21 216 6751



- 2. The submitter is the owner of 4 Beale Place, East Tamaki, which is directly affected by the Notice Of Requirement. Part of the submitter's property is sought by Auckland Transport to be part of the designated land.
- **3.** The submitter is not a trade competitor for the purposes of <u>section 308B</u> of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and as such the submitter could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

4. The specific parts of the Notice Of Requirement(s) that this submission relates to are:

NoR1 – Botany Town Centre to Rongamai Park.

5. The submission summary:

The submitter supports the Bus Rapid Transit Project Objectives for NoR1 but opposes the NoR for the reasons set out below.

6. The reasons for the submission are as follows:

- (a) In the absence of the relief sought below being upheld, NoR1 will:
 - (i) Not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources;
 - (ii) Not amount to and promote the efficient use and development of resources;
 - (iii) Not be consistent with the purpose and principles in Part 2 of the RMA;
 - (iv) Generate significant adverse effects on the operation and viability of Botany Toyota; and
 - (v) Not warrant being upheld in terms of section 171 of the RMA.

Background: the submitter's property

The property is occupied by Botany Toyota, being a car sales and showroom for Toyota in the eastern part of the Auckland region. The property was recently redeveloped for this landuse and tenant and all aspects of the improvements to the site are specific to its commercial needs, including building envelope, site layout, design detailing, staff parking, customer parking, outdoor parking/display of vehicles for sale and all vehicle manoeuvring, including car transporter trucks with Semi Trailers delivering stock to the site.



Support of Bus Rapid Transit

The submitter supports the objectives and needs of the NoR having regard to dedicated BRT lanes and improved public transport choices for residents, workers and visitors. The dedicated bus lanes and stations will improve the public transport experience for passengers and make it more attractive to current private vehicle users. Increased uptake of public transport will also ease congestion and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

However, Te Irirangi Drive is a busy arterial route that will remain predominantly so even after the construction of the improvements sought by the NoR.

The submitter opposes the NoR necessitating the width of the corridor sought along its property's frontage, including requiring a strip of land of the submitter's property, constituting its prime commercial street frontage to Te Irirangi Drive. As currently proposed the designation will adversely affect the operation of Botany Toyota.

Limited Assessment of Alternatives Methods

In its assessment of alternatives, the Requiring Authority has not sufficiently justified the need for the 51 metres to (upto) 72 metres width of legal road corridor¹ necessary to achieve the main purposes of the NoR, being public transit objectives.

Indeed the applicant's AEE, at Part 1.3, in summarising the need for the project and its supporting business case does not once mention active modes or a need for improved walking and cycle facilities on this route.

Similarly in the assessment of alternatives for the project, summarised at Part 4.1 and detailed in Appendix A, the main considerations were the route and mode of rapid transit. There was no assessment of the needs of separate pedestrian and cycle paths, and therefore little consideration of the alternative of a Shared Use Path (SUP) for these active modes. Consideration of SUPs was only outlined for the western sections of the Project to the west of the Southern Motorway, not the section encompassing NoR1.

This is critical to the submitter because the additional width required (of some 4.5m) for separate cycle and pedestrian paths (compared with a SUP) exceeds the full 3.5m width of their land proposed to be designated, albeit tapering at the far northern extent where the boundary turns at the corner of Accent Drive.

M. +64 21 216 6751



¹ For the length of the NoR in respect of the submitter's site Te Irirangi Drive frontage.

E. jcutler@planninginit.co.nz

P. +64 9 489 9125

PO Box 32153 Devonport Auckland, 0744

Separate Walking and Cycle Paths

The submitter **opposes** the need for a grade separated walking and cycle paths on this route.

The submitter, from its long-term experience of the area knows that it is not a transport environment that is attractive for these active modes, and this situation will not fundamentally change under the conditions of the completed project. The same also applies for most of the remainder of this package of NoRs through to Orrs Road and the Airport.

The route will remain a busy arterial corridor, albeit with dedicated BRT lanes in its centre. This will do little to remove the noise and fumes of vehicles and whilst buses will be further distanced from pedestrians and cyclists, general traffic, including heavy vehicles carrying freight, will continue to use the general traffic lanes to the detriment of the amenity of pedestrians and cyclists.

This point can be demonstrated by recent counts² of individual pedestrians and cyclists (and electric scooters) passing the submitter's property, which were all very low, as shown in Table 1:

	Pedestrians	Cyclists	Electric Scooters
6.30am - 9.30am	11	3	3
3.30pm - 6.30pm	21	6	2

Table 1: Active Mode Counts: Thursday 18 May 2023

Such low numbers of active modes on an arterial route predominantly servicing commercial landuses does not justify separate pedestrian and cycle paths, which generally require 4.5m more width (two-way) than SUPs.

It is doubtful whether Te Irirangi Drive has the mix of landuse activities described in the Transport Chapter 3 of the Auckland Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision to be classified as a 'Mixed Use Arterial', which shows separate cycle and pedestrian paths.

Part 3.5.3.4 of Chapter 3 sets out the conditions where SUPs may be considered instead of separate cycle and pedestrian paths. It states:



 $^{^{2}}$ As verified by No.360's tenant's CCTV footage, these figures include both sides of the road on a dry day.

E. jcutler@planninginit.co.nz

P. +64 9 489 9125

M. +64 21 216 6751

PO Box 32153 Devonport Auckland, 0744

"A shared path is not an approved type and may only be used where numbers of cyclists and pedestrians are low enough to avoid frequent conflict.

Where combined cycle usage and pedestrian usage is between 75 and 150 per hour, a Departure from Standard is required, demonstrating that a shared path is safe and appropriate.

Where the function of the path requires a design cycle speed greater than 15 km/h, separation must be provided."

The above data, extrapolated to a daily figure, shows that the combined cycle and pedestrian usage will be significantly less than the lower of the aforesaid range, 75 per hour. This demonstrates what the submitter knows anecdotally that this route does not appeal to either cyclists or pedestrians, and therefore does not justify separate cycle and pedestrian paths. Rather, a shared path would be a safe and more appropriate alternative in this locality.

Operational effects on the submitter's land sought to be designated

With derogating from the generality of above, the NoR, as it significantly affects the submitter is opposed on the following grounds:

The land to be taken at construction stage would require the **removal** of the following capital improvements to the site:

- The most valuable premium frontage parking (with the most commercial street presence) used for the display of vehicles for sale which abut Te Irirangi Drive, such that upto 4 of these parking spaces would be compromised. This is particularly problematic as there are only another 5 outdoor display parking spaces on the site's premium Te Irirangi Drive frontage;
- The taking of approximately 1.5m of width of the vehicle circulation area alongside the southern part of the building and the south-eastern corner of the site, which will compromise the ability of trucks to manoeuvre around this southern part of the site (car transporters with 17.0m Semi Trailers with 12.5m WW Turning Radii);
- Various improvements along the site's full frontage to Te Irirangi Drive, including but not limited to landscaping, security lighting pole and in-ground lighting, 1 x consented freestanding signage plinth; and
- Underground services and utilities: private stormwater drainage including 3 x pipes, 2 x manholes and 2 x cesspits, 1 x water connection, including 2 x water meters and part

E. jcutler@planninginit.co.nz
P. +64 9 489 9125
M. +64 21 216 6751



of a wastewater drainage line including at least 1 x manhole.

Furthermore, if the Te Irirangi Drive vehicle ingress into the adjacent car dealership at 360 Te Irirangi Drive is not able to be reinstated but the business continues to operate from this site, there will be an increase in traffic movements to/from Beale Place and an increase in on-street parking demand. This street is a short no-exit street that is already challenged with the number of businesses taking primary (customer) and secondary (staff and business to business traffic) feeding from it and associated parking and loading demands. Any additional demands on this street will adversely affect the businesses that currently rely on it, including the submitter's tenant, Botany Toyota, to the detriment of its service attractiveness to its customers and its overall commercial viability.

Therefore it is possible, subject to details provided at OPW stage, that the entire site would have to be acquired for the works under the Public Works Act 1981 (PWA). This is an unacceptable position for the submitter, notwithstanding the compensation that will be due to the submitter under the PWA. It is also an unnecessary one for the Requiring Authority and an unnecessary additional public cost of the project that will be borne by Auckland ratepayers.

Furthermore, these factors would also result in breaches of the conditions of the submitter's resource consent, LUC60291720, which the submitter obtained as recently as 2017.

Accordingly, due to the above situation, the conditions for avoiding, remedying or mitigating the effects of construction may not have any bearing on the submitter as it will not be viable for a high end car dealership to continue to trade from the submitter's site. All of the above features of the site are critical for the viability and success of the submitter's tenant's commercial activities, which may not be able to be provided as required by their lease under the circumstances of the designation sought.

Construction effects on the submitter

If it is viable to continue to trade from the site, the submitter is concerned that there will be dust and debris during the construction phase that will adversely affect vehicles displayed for sale, which collectively have a high capital value and are easily prone to engine damage and chips in paintwork, windscreens, windows, greater than typical commercial activities with a 'yard' component. Proposed condition 15 will not be sufficient for protecting this aspect of Botany Toyota's business, notwithstanding the general interruption to business and customers avoiding the area and the impact on staff and customers accessing the site.

It is unclear to what extent the construction of the Accent Drive BRT station will have on the submitter's property, with an enlarged area of the designation sought for the Accent Drive/Te



Irirangi Drive intersection extending approximately 60% of the length of the property's Accent Drive frontage adjacent. This extends close to its vehicle crossing on this road, which serves its primary customer and staff vehicle access.

6. The following decision is sought from the local authority:

- 6.1 An amendment to the spatial extent of the designation sought under the notice of requirement by removing the designation from the submitter's land, or alternatively;
- 6.2 Any other further or consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.
- 6.3 Notwithstanding the above, if the Council is minded to recommend that the designation be upheld in terms of section 171 of the RMA, as it relates to the land designated on the submitter's property, the submitter reserves its right to comment on the draft designation conditions relating to the construction phase and ongoing operational conditions at the hearing.
- **7.** The submitter wishes to be heard in support of this submission.
- **8.** If others make a similar submission, the submitter will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

Signed: For and on behalf of the submitter

Date: 24 May 2023

Jonathan Cutler MPlanPrac(Hons), BSc, BCom, MNZPI, MRTPI **Principal Planner / Director Planning Initiatives Limited**

Phone:	09 489 9125
Mobile:	021 216 6751
Email:	jcutler@planninginit.co.nz
Website	www.planninginit.co.nz



SUBMISSION ON NOTICE OF REQUIREMENT 1 – NOR 1 BOTANY TOWN CENTRE TO RONGOMAI PARK;

Name of Submitter:	Ormiston Centre Ltd
And to:	Auckland Transport and Waka Kotahi
То:	Auckland Council

Introduction

- Ormiston Centre Ltd is the owner of 14.28 hectares of land at 79 Ormiston Road, Flat Bush, at the south-western corner of the Ormiston Road – Te Irirangi Drive intersection.
- 2. The land is subject to NoR 1 comprising part of Botany Town Centre to Rongomai Park.
- 3. Ormiston Centre is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991.
- 4. The Ormiston Centre land has been the subject of successful resource consent applications and a private plan change to enable comprehensive development including:
 - Internal roading connecting to Ormiston Road and Te Irirangi Drive;
 - Specialty retail;
 - Large format retail;
 - Markets;
 - Apartments with lifts;
 - Walk-up apartments;
 - Light industrial.

5. Without significant redesign implementation of the development proposals will be frustrated by the existence of the NoR and the imposition of a designation as presently proposed.

Basis of objection

- Ormiston Centre's concerns relate to the consequences of notification and implementation of NoR 1 as follows:
 - Inability to give effect to existing resource consents;
 - Inability to give effect to zoning opportunities provided by the Private Plan Change;
 - Compromising vehicular access to the land;
 - Creation of 15-year planning blight involving:
 - Uncertainty as to appropriate building design and uses;
 - Uncertainty as to location and design of infrastructure.

Relief sought

- 7. Ormiston Centre requests a rejection of NoR 1 in its entirety.
- 8. In the event of the NoR proceeding conditions are requested as follows:
 - Reduction of extent of land take to the minimum necessary for operation of the widened road;
 - Protection of existing vehicular access points to the land including right hand turns from Ormiston Road and Te Irirangi Drive;
 - The imposition of a 5-year lapse period.
- 9. Ormiston Centre seeks undertakings from the requiring authorities as follows:
 - To negotiate in good faith for the prompt acquisition and purchase of any land to be taken under the designation;
 - To pay full compensation for costs of redesign;

- To pay full compensation for additional building costs, particularly in relation to noise attenuation and maintenance of air quality;
- To undertake proper maintenance of acquired frontage land pending its end use by the requiring authorities;
- To fully fund any necessary relocation of underground services.
- 10. Ormiston Centre wishes to be heard in support of this submission.

R E Bartlett KC *Counsel for Ormiston Centre Ltd*

Address for Service:

R E Bartlett KC Shortland Chambers Level 13, 70 Shortland Street Auckland 1010

PO Box 4338 Auckland 1140

<u>bartlett@shortlandchambers.co.nz</u> 09 307 9827 11 May 2023

Harry Barnes Planning Technician Plans and Places Auckland Council Email: <u>unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</u>

NOR1 BOTANY TOWN CENTRE TO RONGOMAI PARK

Ormiston Centre Limited has lodged submission no. 20 in respect of NoR 2.

It should have been lodged in relation to NoR 1 only.

Please accept for filing an amended submission.

Please advise if any formal application is required.

Yours faithfully

Russell Bartlett KC

encl

Russell Bartlett KC

e bartlett@shortlandchambers.co.nz

p +64 9 307 9827