

From: NotifiedResourceConsentSubmissionOnlineForm@donotreply.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
<NotifiedResourceConsentSubmissionOnlineForm@donotreply.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, 17 December 2018 2:30 p.m.
To: Central RC Submissions <CentralRCSubmissions@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz>
Cc: Haylee Minoprio (AT) <Haylee.Minoprio@at.govt.nz>
Subject: [ID:3399] Submission received on notified resource consent

We have received a submission on the notified resource consent for 85-89 Quay Street, Queens Wharf and water space of the Waitemata Harbour adjacent to the western side of Queens Wharf.

Details of submission

Notified resource consent application details

Property address: 85-89 Quay Street, Queens Wharf and water space of the Waitemata Harbour adjacent to the western side of Queens Wharf

Application number: BUN60327622

Applicant name: Auckland Transport

Applicant email: haylee.minoprio@at.govt.nz

Application description: Auckland Transport has applied for resource consent to construct, operate and maintain six new ferry berths on the western side of Queens Wharf within the Downtown Ferry Basin (Piers A-F), undertake modifications to the existing ferry terminal buildings (located at existing Pier 1 and Pier 2) and historic shelter, and remove existing Piers 3 and 4. The construction, establishment, operation and maintenance of Piers A-F will require the installation of a concrete piled breakwater located immediately adjacent to the west of Queens Wharf, the installation of reverse saw-tooth shaped pontoons, three gangways, three fixed shelter structures, piles, pile guard markers and fenders. Street furniture will be installed along Queens Wharf to demarcate pedestrian-only and vehicle zones between the western edge of Queens Wharf and the Cloud. Modifications to the existing ferry terminal building at Pier 1 include the removal of the East Annexe Building, construction of new façades, removal of the ticket gates, replacement of the upper louvres, and the construction of new retail/food and beverage facilities within the existing terminal building. Modifications to the historic shelter include modification of the northern face and the insertion of skylights in the roof. Modifications to the open spaces to the east and south of the building are also proposed. Modifications to the terminal building at Pier 2 include relocating ancillary office space and repositioning passenger waiting space. Demolition of existing Piers 3 and 4 will involve the removal of gangways, pontoons and piles. The timing of the demolition is dependent on the new berths being fully operational and whether additional layover/decant space may be required for future Stage 2 works. Overall the proposal is a discretionary activity.

Submitter contact details

Full name: Deane Ingram

Organisation name:

Contact phone number: 0210597606

Email address: deaneingram@gmail.com

Postal address:

7 Hamilton Road, Surfdale, Waiheke Island Auckland 1081

Submission details

This submission: opposes the application in whole or in part

Specify the aspects of the application you are submitting on:

Three points concern me: 1: The Southwest Bows in orientation of the sawtooth ferry berths alongside Queens Wharf restricts future vessel size. 2. The constriction placed upon passenger access to those sawtooth ferry berths leaves passengers unnecessarily exposed to the elements creating an environmental health hazard. 3. The loss of Pier 3 finger berths to Public Space at a time when ferry patronage and use of public transport is increasing.

What are the reasons for your submission?

1. With regards to the orientation of the sawtooth ferry berths alongside Queens Wharf: The consultation documents (in particular Navigatus Consulting documents) highlight the issues facing vessel movements well and logically lay out the reasons for their proposal. However, missing from these documents is reference to trialling the use of Bow Spring Lines during berthing on a Northwest facing Bows out sawtooth configuration when simulator trialling the berthing options. The current Southwest orientation with Bows in berthing effectively limits the size of ferries that can berth there in the future particularly as all of the current fleet has passenger loading access aft. This restricts the vessel size of vessels and restricts the potential for future passenger volume growth. Already today's fleet model of smaller vessels making more trips is struggling to keep pace with the increasing volume of passenger traffic. This is particularly relevant to the Waiheke run which experiences high passenger numbers and already is regularly forced to leave some passengers behind due to ferries reaching capacity. A Northwest sawtooth berth orientation with a strong pile at the outer corner that ferries can lean their forward starboard shoulder on and "spring" into the berth using a forward Spring Line would facilitate a bows out orientation to the northerly weather; whilst keeping aft passengers loading access (sheltered from the NW wind), enable a range of vessel sizes to operate as the bow could overhang the berth and also facilitate easy departure. Keeping vessel size open also means that ratepayers won't be forced into buying a fleet of smaller vessels due to berth size limitations. It is interesting to note that the consultation document do reference using stern lines for departure from the Southwest Bows in proposal, therefore it should be possible to trial the Northwest Bows out orientation if not already done so. Furthermore, the consultation documents highlight the challenge of skipper visibility during berthing. The current stern spring proposal will exacerbate this as the bridge to stern distance is greater than the bridge to bow distance. i.e. skippers visibility of the spring line movements is key as "springing a vessel places high stress on the line" as it combines the vessel putting power on to pull against the spring line to swing the vessel: this poses increased risk to line handlers and persons in the vicinity should the spring line surge or snap. A bow spring keeps this risk confined to an area where the skipper has full visibility and also increased passenger protection from the cabin superstructure. A stern spring is distant from the skippers line of visibility, therefore poor line handling may result in injury to the line handler or a spring line snap could recall into passengers loitering on the stern. This poses considerable unnecessary increased risk to crew and passengers; risk that can be avoided by the use of bow spring and a northwest bows out sawtooth berth orientation. 2. All documentation and pictures show a long covered walkway on a floating pontoon to access sawtooth berths. There is some access to Queens Wharf but that seaside edge of Queens Wharf is uncovered and left exposed to the elements. Ferry patronage is increasing and passengers often have many bags and are forced to wait long periods in queues. Having no shelter covering the queueing area leaves passengers exposed to wet weather or hot sun creating an environmental health hazard, increasing the likelihood of passenger chaos and discontent. It is important to note that the proposed dimension of the current floating pontoon walkways are not that wide and half of it would have to be reserved for disembarking passengers, or alternatively closed for embarking passengers until all disembarking passengers have left; the impact of this is that what little shelter there is, will be halved in utility as a cleared walkway must be retained in order to allow passengers to leave the ferry. Recommend putting a covered walkway along the edge of Queens Wharf as well. 3. Ferry Patronage and use of Public Transport is increasing and will continue to do so especially once Auckland Council initiatives to reduce cars in the CBD come into effect. All the consultation documents highlight the challenges of operating ferries from the confines of the ferry basin, therefore any small vessel berths

should be considered as highly valuable from an overall public transport perspective. They should not be sacrificed for a public park as it limits future options for utilisation of those ferry berths. A Public Park has the flexibility of being relatively easy to set up on any existing land or wharf structure (e.g. Queens Wharf). However small ferry berths once lost are extremely hard to reinstitute particularly when dredging or removal of piled wharf structures is needed. In short, once a vessel berth is lost in this confined basin, it is highly unlikely to be cost effective to reinstate. Looking to the future, the decision to turn Pier 3 into public space is shortsighted and detrimental to keeping future public transport options open.

What decisions and amendments would you like the council to make?

1. With regards to the orientation of the sawtooth ferry berths alongside Queens Wharf: Change the Southwest Bows in orientation to a Northwest Bows out sawtooth berth orientation with a strong pile at the outer corner that ferries can lean their forward starboard shoulder on and "spring" into the berth using a forward Spring Line. This would facilitate a bows out orientation to the northerly weather; whilst keeping aft passengers loading access (sheltered from the NW wind), enable a range of vessel sizes to operate without limitation on vessel length and facilitate easy departure. It would also improve the skippers visibility of the spring line movements and keep the risk to line handlers and persons in the vicinity away from passengers. 2. Recommend putting a covered walkway along the western edge of Queens Wharf as well as the vessel berthing pontoons so that all access from ferry terminal to vessel is covered providing protection to passengers from the elements. 3. Ferry Patronage and use of Public Transport is increasing and will continue to do so therefore any small vessel berths should be considered as highly valuable from an overall public transport perspective. Recommend moving the location of the proposed public park space to another location away from the ferry basin and retain the Pier 3 finger wharves for public transport use.

Are you a trade competitor of the applicant? I am not a trade competitor of the applicant.

Do you want to attend a hearing and speak in support of your submission? No

If other people make a similar submission I will consider making a joint case with them at the hearing: Yes

Supporting information: