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### TERMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARPTP:</td>
<td>Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Auckland Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUP:</td>
<td>Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFB:</td>
<td>Downtown Ferry Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFT:</td>
<td>Downtown Ferry Terminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIDP:</td>
<td>Downtown Infrastructure Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA:</td>
<td>Coastal Marine Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNVMP:</td>
<td>Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGMPA:</td>
<td>Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACA:</td>
<td>Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZCPS:</td>
<td>New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMA:</td>
<td>Resource Management Act 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPS:</td>
<td>Regional Policy Statement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Downtown Ferry Terminal (DFT) is the central hub providing ferry services to the wider Auckland region, located in the Downtown Ferry Basin (DFB), between Princes Wharf and Queens Wharf. Around 6 million trips were made on the Auckland ferries network in 2017, approximately 7% of all public transport trips.

Auckland’s DFT currently serves all passenger ferry routes, with around 41% of ferry trips made to Devonport and Waiheke. Future growth predictions indicate that existing infrastructure will only have enough capacity to accommodate growth in services and patronage through to 2022/23, at which point additional berths will be required to accommodate the anticipated growth.

The current ferry facilities at Downtown Auckland are running at full capacity. An increase in the number of berths cannot be accommodated within the current footprint of the DFB, and the existing infrastructure is unlikely to meet requirements of future ferry operations. Piers 1, 2 and 3 are in need of significant upgrade works.

The Auckland Council’s strategic planning documents identify the Ferry Basin as the long-term home for ferry services and includes redevelopment of the Ferry Basin to enable more efficient ferry services to cater for the predicted increase in growth. The redevelopment of the DFB is being advanced through the Downtown Infrastructure Development Programme (DIDP), a programme of public infrastructure projects targeted in the downtown waterfront area to implement the Council’s strategic goals.

Stage 1 of the DFB redevelopment includes the relocation of existing ferry services provided from Piers 3 and 4 to the western edge of Queens Wharf and minor modifications to the existing ferry terminal building to provide improved access and customer amenity to the new berths. These re-development works are proposed to be completed by May 2020 so they are operational in advance of America’s Cup (due to be held over the summer of 2020-21). Further redevelopment of the DFB will take place after 2021.

The proposal includes the construction, establishment, operation and maintenance of new civic infrastructure for six replacement berths in the waterspace adjacent to Queens Wharf West with pontoons arranged in a ‘reverse saw-tooth’ layout. Three hinged gangways will connect the wharf to the pontoons to provide passenger access. The gangways will be covered by overhead, horizontal shelters. A breakwater is proposed to be installed along the length of the pontoons to provide more sheltered and tranquil waterspace. Modifications to the existing ferry terminal building and immediate surrounds are also proposed with the objective of making these facilities more accessible to ferry users and the general public.
This will be achieved through the removal of the East Annexe building, the removal of gates and ticketing barriers and the re-purposing of the historic ferry shelter as a main thoroughfare to the new berths.

The applicant has consulted with mana whenua, existing water users and other key stakeholders prior to the lodgement of this application. Consultation and engagement with these parties will continue throughout the project. In addition to engagement with mana whenua through Auckland Transport’s Mana Whenua engagement framework, applicants for customary title for the Waitemata Harbour under the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011 have been notified of the proposal.

The proposal will occur in the General Coastal Marine Zone and the Central Wharves Precinct and requires various consents under the zone and precinct, in addition to those under the Historic Heritage Overlay and Auckland-wide provisions. Overall, the proposal is a discretionary activity under the Auckland Unitary Plan (Operative in Part) 2016 (AUP).

This Assessment of Effects and the supporting technical reports include a comprehensive assessment of the proposal and in considering the relevant environmental effects, concludes that overall the effects are acceptable within the context of the modified coastal environment of the Ferry Basin.

The proposal has an obvious functional need to be located within the Coastal Marine Area (CMA). The proposed marine structures for ferry services are considered an appropriate use of this part of the coastal marine area as they are contemplated in the relevant planning documents for this locality. The proposal has been developed so that the additional marine structures and breakwater, is minimised as far as is practicable, ensuring that other marine activities, including the cruise industry, are able to operate within the Ferry Basin.

The proposal provides for the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of the community through the provision of enhanced public transport infrastructure serving Downtown Auckland and the wider region. The proposal consolidates ferry services within the DFB, makes efficient use of existing infrastructure and enhances the integration of ferry services with other transport modes located in close proximity including bus and rail services and cycleway networks.
### APPLICANT AND PROPERTY DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Applicant</strong></th>
<th>Auckland Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address for Service</strong></td>
<td>Auckland Transport Private Bag 92250 Auckland 1142 Attention: Haylee Minoprio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address &amp; Legal Descriptions</strong></td>
<td>85-89 Quay Street - Queens Wharf and water space of the Waitemata Harbour adjacent to the western side of Queens Wharf. Title Plan of DP 131568 – being part of Pt Lot 37 DP 131568 (Crown title to part of the bed of the Waitemata Harbour). Lot 15 DP 131565 being 0.0244 ha more or less (CT NA77A/383)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Area</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Road Classification</strong></td>
<td>Quay Street (Arterial Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Designations</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zone</strong></td>
<td>Coastal - General Coastal Marine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Precinct</strong></td>
<td>Central Wharves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Designations</strong></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td>▪ Coastal Inundation 1 per cent AEP Plus 1m Control – 1m sea level rise ▪ Controls: Macroinvertebrate Community Index [rcp/dp] - Urban</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 INTRODUCTION

3.1 BACKGROUND

This report has been prepared in support of an application by Auckland Transport (the “Applicant” or “AT”) for a resource consent for Stage 1 of the Downtown Ferry Basin Redevelopment to upgrade existing ferry services located in the Downtown Ferry Basin. Stage 1 includes the construction, establishment and operation of new infrastructure for six replacement berths adjacent to Queens Wharf West and modifications to the existing ferry terminal buildings and immediate surrounds.

The Waterfront Plan Refresh (2017) and Central Wharves Strategy (2015) sets out the long-term strategic direction for the City Centre waterfront and identifies the Ferry Basin as the long-term home for ferry services. These strategic planning documents acknowledge the role of ferries within the wider public transport network and the role of Auckland’s downtown precinct as a key transport and people hub. To facilitate these outcomes, it is envisaged that the Downtown Ferry Terminal and berths would be progressively redeveloped along the western edge of Queens Wharf to enable the longer-term expansion of the ferry terminal to provide for growth and increase the capacity of ferry services.

Recent ferry growth predictions have indicated that existing infrastructure will only have enough capacity to accommodate growth in services and patronage through to 2022/23, at which point additional berths will be required to accommodate predicted growth. An increase in the number of berths cannot be accommodated within the current footprint of the Downtown Ferry Terminal, and the existing infrastructure is unlikely to meet requirements of future ferry operations. Further to this, Piers 1, 2 and 3 are all in need of significant upgrade works to keep them operating over the long term.

The long-term vision for the downtown precinct includes redevelopment of the Ferry Basin to enable more efficient ferry services to cater for the predicted increase in growth. The Ferry Basin is a key transport hub connecting people to the city centre and is located close to other transport networks, including rail services in Britomart, the northern bus services located in Lower Albert Street and the southern and eastern services located around Britomart.

The current ferry facilities at Downtown Auckland are running at full capacity with no provision to increase services to additional ferries in the peak periods. This restricts AT’s ability to offer a higher frequency service in the future. Redevelopment of the Ferry Basin will allow a greater number of ferries to dock and depart, leading to a higher frequency public transport solution. The existing ferry operation and customer experience at the Downtown Ferry Terminal is below that of similar high-profile transport interchanges. The
The new ferry development will enhance the customer experience and provide for greater patronage. Currently some piers can only be used by a limited number of ferries due to different freeboard heights. The ferry terminal redesign offers the opportunity for a more efficient footprint, delivering infrastructure that allows for future service expansion. The generic design of the pontoons increases the ability to use more than one gate by any ferry. This increases flexibility, efficiency, resilience, reduced waiting times and will result in the ability to service increased patronage.

The long-term plan for the central wharves identifies Captain Cook wharf as the dedicated cruise facility. In the interim, Panuku Development Auckland is applying for a resource consent for mooring dolphins north of Queens Wharf to cater for the berthing of large cruise vessels on the eastern side of the wharf. To enable the relocation of the ferry berths to the western side of Queens Wharf, Auckland Council has advised Ports of Auckland that the third cruise berth currently located on Queens Wharf west will no longer be available after the 2018/2019 cruise season.

In accordance with Section 95A(2)(b) of the RMA, AT requests that this application is publicly notified.

### 3.2 Downtown Infrastructure Development Programme

The Downtown Infrastructure Development Programme is a programme of public infrastructure projects being undertaken in the downtown waterfront area to implement the strategic goals of the City Centre Master Plan 2012 and Waterfront Plan 2012. The programme include a series of projects integrate public transport, tourism and place space outcomes. The public infrastructure projects are planned to be delivered in time for the 36th America's Cup and Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) being held in Auckland in 2021. The programme includes the following specific projects:

- Quay Street Strengthening (works to strengthen the seawall)
- Mooring Dolphin
- Downtown Ferry Basin Redevelopment
- Downtown Public Space
- Quay Street Enhancements
- Downtown Transport Hubs

#### 3.2.1 Mooring Dolphin

A resource consent application (CST60323353) for upgrades to the eastern Queens Wharf cruise ship berth to provide for the mooring of cruise ships up to 362m (Oasis Class Vessels) has been lodged by Panuku Development Auckland. The application was notified on 10 September 2018 and involves the construction
of two new cruise ship mooring dolphins located at distances of 49m and 82m (to the centres of the
dolphins) north of the northern end of Queens Wharf, a gangway connection to Queens Wharf including
hydraulic retractable gangway and security gates, strengthening of the southern end of Queens Wharf,
seven new additional wharf bollards on the eastern side at the southern end of Queens Wharf, and
additional fender clusters on the eastern side at the north end of Queens Wharf.

3.2.2 Quay Street Strengthening

AT propose to undertake an upgrade to the existing seawall from the western side of Lower Hobson Street
to the west of Marsden Wharf to seismically strengthen, repair scour damage to the surface of the seawall
and create resilience to future climate and changing use patterns, particularly the impacts of ship wash from
ferry and cruise ship operations.

The upgrade of the seawall is proposed to be undertaken in four sections: Princess Wharf; Ferry Basin; Ferry
Building; and Queens Wharf to Marsden Wharf, with works planned to be completed prior to the America’s
Cup and APEC in 2021. Resource consent applications have been concurrently lodged by Auckland Transport
for the Princes Wharf (BUN60320273), Ferry Basin (BUN60320266), and Queens Wharf to Marsden Wharf
(BUN60320277) sections. The Queens Wharf to Marsden Wharf application was notified on 20 September
2018 with the close of submission on 14 September 2018. The Ferry Building section of the seawall upgrade
is still in the design phase and the resource consent application will be lodged at a later date.

3.2.3 Downtown Public Space

The Downtown Framework 2014 identified a long-term plan to transform the central wharves and
downtown public realm through the creation of enhanced public space in the area between Princes Wharf
and the Ferry Terminal. This area is being referred to as Downtown Public Space. Design work for this project
has commenced with a resource consent anticipated to be lodged in late 2018, early 2019. To enable the
new public open space to be developed within the ferry basin, Piers 3 and 4 would need to be relocated
from their current location, adjacent to Quay Street.

3.2.4 Quay Street Enhancements

A key component of the Waterfront Masterplan and Downtown Framework is the upgrade of Quay Street
to turn into the main east-west waterfront boulevard, including the proposed enhancement works west of
Commerce Street, including Commercial Bay.
The works include footpath widening and kerb realignment, creation of dedicated bus lanes, the reduction of vehicle traffic on Quay Street to one lane in either direction, dedicated cycle lanes and seats, bins, cycle facilities, lighting, signage and planting.

### 3.2.5 Downtown Transport Hubs

The development of a new bus infrastructure in Lower Albert Street that will accommodate northern and western services and Britomart East that accommodates the southern and eastern services.

### 3.3 Consent History

The area is subject to a number of coastal permits and land use consents establishing a range of uses, activities and development within the CMA. A search of the Council’s property files has identified the following consents in Table 1.

**Table 1: Summary of Existing Consents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Type of Consent</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expiry Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39094 &amp; LUC2011/918</td>
<td>Coastal Permit</td>
<td>Manage and operate the port related commercial undertakings under the Port Companies Act 1988.</td>
<td>30 September 2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39856</td>
<td>Coastal Permit</td>
<td>Establish a service enclosure, temporary Police facilities and the removal of an already modified portion of the Auckland Harbour Board Fence (Red Fence) along the boundary with Quay Street Auckland.</td>
<td>30 September 2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40739 &amp; R/LUC/2012/3423</td>
<td>Coastal Permit</td>
<td>Establish a weekly free ‘Tourist Market’ in The Cloud and on the main Street of Queens Wharf (the wharf).</td>
<td>7 December 2032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39082</td>
<td>Coastal Permit</td>
<td>Establish a Telecommunications Facility comprising of seven antennas and two equipment cabinets.</td>
<td>4 April 2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45385</td>
<td>Coastal Permit</td>
<td>Establishment of a container village for five years comprising 11 containers in total. Four containers approved to be used for food and beverage, four for retail, with the remaining three to be used for storage, rubbish and information kiosk.</td>
<td>28 February 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43267</td>
<td>Coastal Permit</td>
<td>Two external canopies proposed on Shed 10 at the south and south west entrances. The building was</td>
<td>31 August 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refurbished as a hire event centre under resource consent R/LUC/2012/2144.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42485</td>
<td>Coastal Permit</td>
<td>Approval to undertake temporary events, marine and non-marine events, public recreation activities, entertainment facilities and associated ancillary activities and temporary structures, including signage.</td>
<td>31 July 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22484</td>
<td>Coastal Permit</td>
<td>Construction of the extension to the ferry building promenade deck seawards by one metre for three of the five bays. Seaward side of Downtown Ferry Building.</td>
<td>29 November 2034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22486</td>
<td>Coastal Permit</td>
<td>Authorisation of outdoor restaurant dining at the Western Ferry terminal, Downtown Ferry Basin.</td>
<td>29 November 2034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 34727 & 34728 | Coastal Permit | Occupation of the CMA in respect of the works and activities including ferry passenger services and operations and related activities in relation to the Downtown Ferry Terminal including use of:  
- Passenger shelters and associated facilities;  
- Ticketing and entry/exit facilities;  
- Loading ramps, walkways and canopies;  
- Parking and loading facilities for freight and passenger services;  
- Vehicle and pedestrian access onto Pier 1;  
- The pedestrian access in front of the ferry building;  
- Waiheke Island Freight Facilities (Pier 1);  
- Office facilities for ferry related activities;  
- Infrastructure and services including wastewater and stormwater management and vessel pump out connections (already approved through earlier resource consent - not referenced in decision).  
- Canopies at Pier 3, and pontoons, ramps, storage areas and canopies at Pier 4. | 1 August 2038 |
| 34808 | Coastal Permit | Construction works for the Ferry Terminal redevelopment. This coastal permit included the East Annexe building (and electricity transformer). | 1 August 2008 (31 December 2015 for the East Annexe Building) |
| 3170 | Coastal Permit | Permit approved to discharge and divert water into the Waitemata Harbour via an 8 x 100mm diameter outfall. | 31 December 2021 |
| 44541 | Coastal Permit | Permit to install a public artwork (Parakowhai House) at the northern end of Queens Wharf located at 85-89 Quay, Street Auckland | 31 August 2050 |
| 54/1/901-40761 | Coastal Permit | Waiheke Ferry Berth Development —Ferry Tee. Approved on 21 October 1986 under the Harbours Act 1950. | Unknown |
| 27541 | Coastal Permit | Permit provides for activities including ferry passenger | 1 August 2038 |
| R/LUC/2010/4054 | Land Use Consent | Consent provides for alterations and restorative works on the Harbour Board Fence | Unknown |
3.4 CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

To inform Auckland Transport’s decision making process a comprehensive assessment of potential locations for the ferry infrastructure has been undertaken and is detailed in the Project Context and Options Assessment prepared by T&T contained in Attachment B. The report also includes navigation simulation testing undertaken as part of the options consideration. The options development was progressed in consultation with existing water users in the DFB through a series of workshops.

Initial concept options for the redevelopment of Piers 3 and 4 on Queen Wharf West were advanced on the basis of the third cruise ship berth on Queens Wharf West remaining. Four initial options were developed with a combination of berth arrangements. The options did not result in a safe and efficient arrangement within the context of maintaining other existing uses within the ferry basin. To enable the project to progress a decision was made by Auckland Council to remove the cruise ship berth from Queens Wharf West from April 2019 onwards to provide more space for ferry redevelopment.

Following this, five further options along Queens Wharf West were developed in consultation with key stakeholders, considering the requirements for six new berths as part of Stage 1 and the future state for the Ferry Basin, catering for up to 12 operational berths. All of the options were located along Queens Wharf West and included the following berth arrangement options:

A. Perpendicular finger berths.
B. 30 degree towards north finger berths.
C. 45 degree towards north finger berths.
D. 30 degree towards south finger berths.
E. Saw-tooth berth arrangement.

A series of navigation simulations were undertaken at the New Zealand Maritime School to test the five berthing arrangements safety and efficiency, with the most constrained scenarios tested. The existing layout of Piers 3 and 4 was also tested to provide a baseline for the proceeding navigation simulations. The testing indicated that for all of the finger pontoon options (Options A - D), although it was possible to navigate in and out of the berth, safety and efficiency was comprised. In addition none of the finger arrangements allowed for the anti-clockwise circulation and queuing of vessels to continue whilst a vessel was berthing or exiting a finger berth, decreasing the efficiency of the entire basin not just at the berth.

The saw-tooth arrangement (Option E) extending along the side of Queens Wharf West provided increased safety and efficiency when entering and exiting the berths. The arrangement is similar to existing berths at
Pier 1 and 2. It allows for the anti-clockwise circulation and queuing of vessels within the basin to continue with the berthing and departure of vessels even when the cruise liner and bunker barge are at Princes Wharf.

To ensure the saw-tooth arrangement provided a workable and efficient solution another round of simulations was undertaken. A reverse saw-tooth was simulated by going in a clockwise circulation and entering the saw-tooth’s bow in instead of stern in. It was found in the prior simulations that the overall time to enter and exit berths was 40 seconds quicker with bow-in entry. Therefore, the proposed design is a bow in saw-tooth design, as this provides increased safety when vessels manoeuvre in and out of the berth and improved efficiency when compared to the standard, stern in, saw-tooth.

Of the various layouts considered, the “reverse saw-tooth” layout has been assessed as having the lowest maritime safety risk while allowing a simple movement pattern (compatible with the existing anticlockwise movement pattern of the ferry basin) that minimises congestion potential. The reverse saw-tooth arrangement also has the ability to operate under a wide range of weather conditions and can cater for existing ferry traffic with cruise ships on Princes Wharf East (including fuel bunkering operations).

4 SITE DESCRIPTION AND SURROUNDING LOCALITY

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Auckland’s City Centre occupies a series of valleys and ridges with Queen Street occupying the central valley and Hobson Street and Princes Street occupying the ridges to the west and east respectively. The initial colonial settlement of Auckland was clustered around the original shoreline. The early city grew from a trading port and advances in transport technology saw the expansion of the town to the area now occupied by the central business district.

Auckland has grown beyond its natural coastline through successive reclamations and the construction of wharf structures over the harbour. Initial reclamation prior to 1900 occurred along the shoreline and at the head of the Waihorotiu Stream (Queen Street River). This area is now occupied by much of the commercial heart of Downtown Auckland. The construction of central wharf structures in the Downtown Waterfront included the Ferry Pier (Pier 2) in 1906, Queen Wharf between 1906-1913 and Princes Wharf between 1922-1924.
The Central Wharves are located within a highly modified coastal environment with a mixture of commercial, residential, maritime, port, transport, tourist and public uses. The dominant activities on Princes Wharf include food and beverage, entertainment, residential and hotel accommodation, cruise ship berthing and public promenades. Activities on Queens Wharf include event, cruise ship berthing, passenger transport, tourism, food and beverage, entertainment and public open space.
4.2 Downtown Ferry Basin

The DFB is located to the north of Quay Street between Princes Wharf and Queens Wharf with the water space used for port and maritime vessels, ferries, charter and tourist vessels and the berthing of cruise ships. Quay Street is located to the south of the central wharves and is the main east-west road connecting the Viaduct Harbour to Tamaki Drive. It is located on land reclaimed from the Waitemata Harbour between 1879 and 1925, with the harbour edge of the reclamation defined by seawall. The seawall supporting land adjacent to the DFB was built between 1923-1925 and proposed to be seismically strengthened as part of the Downtown programme of works.

![Downtown Ferry Basin](Source: Google Maps)

Ferry services operate from the Downtown Ferry Terminal located to the north of the historic Ferry Building on the south-western corner of Queens Wharf. The terminal and surrounding piers provide a central hub for the passenger ferry network which connects Auckland’s Central City with parts of suburban Auckland as well as islands in the Haurakai Gulf. The terminal and piers also provide tourist and charter boat services for recreational activities on the Waitemata Harbour and destinations in the Hauraki Gulf. These combined services are provided by a number of operators including Fullers, Sealink, Belaire, Explore Group, Adventure Jet and 360 Discovery Cruises.
4.3 **Ferry Terminal Buildings**

The Ferry Terminal buildings located adjacent to Pier 1 and on Pier 2 were constructed in the mid-2000s. They are pavilion type buildings designed to resemble a ship berthed at port. The main terminal building houses the historic ferry shelter and provides ticketing, passenger facilities and amenities, a small cafe and direct access to boats leaving from Pier 1. It also provides office space and staff breakroom for Fullers and the Auckland Transport Operations Centre (ATOC). The terminal is not publicly accessible and has ticketing gates located at the entrance to the building. An annexe building (the East Annexe) is located between the main terminal and the historic Ferry Building. It houses an information centre and transformer that provides power to the Ferry Building. The terminal building located on Pier 2 is of a similar architectural style, although smaller in size and provides passenger facilities and amenities.

4.4 **Ferry Piers**

The DFB includes a number of existing ferry piers and cruise ship berths. These are illustrated in the Figure 3 and described below.

![Figure 3: Existing Piers and Cruise Ship Berths (source: Navigatus)](image-url)
Pier 1 is located on the western side of the Ferry Terminal and contains three berths which are predominantly used for the following services:

- Pier 1A Bayswater, Birkenhead and Stanley Bay (Fullers)
- Pier 1B Devonport and Stanley Bay (Fullers)
- Pier 1C Halfmoon Bay (Fullers) and occasionally Waiheke (Fullers).

Pier 2 is located perpendicular to the western side of the Ferry Building and contains five berths which are predominantly used for the following services:

- Pier 2A Layover
- Pier 2B Waiheke (Fullers)
- Pier 2C Waiheke (Explore Group Ltd)
- Pier 2D Layover, sullage and light maintenance
- Pier 2E Not in use.

Piers 3 and 4 are located to the north of Quay Street perpendicular to the breastworks between Pier 2 and Princes Wharf. Pier 3 has four berths which are predominantly used for the following services:

- Pier 3A Jet boat tours (Adventure Jet), occasional use by drop-off services (Department of Conservation, Maritime Police, Coastguard etc.)
- Pier 3B West Harbour (Belaire Ferries Ltd)
- Pier 3C Charters (to Department of Conservation managed islands), occasional use by drop-off services (Department of Conservation, Maritime Police, Coastguard etc.)
- Pier 3D Pine Harbour (Sea Link Pine Harbour Ltd).

Pier 4 has two berths which are predominantly used to service:

- Pier 4E Gulf Harbour (360 Discovery Cruises) and scheduled commercial tourist services by 360 Discovery Cruises and Fullers (to Rangitoto, Coromandel, Harbour Cruise, Hauraki Gulf Islands)
- Pier 4W1 Hobsonville (360 Discovery Cruises) and scheduled commercial tourist services by 360 Discovery Cruises and Fullers (to Rangitoto, Coromandel, Harbour Cruise, Hauraki Gulf Islands)
- Pier 4W2 Layover (360 Discovery Cruises and Fullers).
4.5 Ferry Basin Operations

Ferries using the DFB follow an anticlockwise circulation in and out of the basin (with the exception of the Kea, the double ended Devonport Ferry). Ferries queue along the western side of the basin until there is clear water access to the inner end of the basin where they either navigate bow in the berth, or turn in the open water space seaward of the berth and approach the berth stern in. In general, during peak commuter periods, three or four ferries can be queued along the western side of the DFB, while waiting their turn to manoeuvre into the appropriate berth.

Operations in the Ferry Terminal are governed by an Access Agreement. The agreement includes the ability to undertake scheduled maintenance to the terminal (planned repairs, maintenance, renewals and inspections) and unscheduled maintenance (any maintenance, repairs, renewals or inspection required as a result of a Force Majeure event, incident or an accident).

The agreement restricts operators undertaking ‘Hot Work’ operations as defined in the Navigation Safety Bylaw 2014 and no on-board maintenance of vessels may be undertaken at the terminals without the prior consent of AT

In terms of vessel maintenance, only light/minor maintenance is permitted to be undertaken on vessels within the confines of the DFT. These works include emergency repairs to allow vessels to continue to operations or to return to an alternative maintenance site for further works. In addition to this, light maintenance is permitted on-board vessels which do not require, or result in, excessive noise or environmental impact to users of the facility.

4.6 Ferry Building and Shelters

The historic Ferry Building was built in 1912 and housed a variety of marine and port industry tenants. Access to the main ferry terminal building and Pier 1 is via the eastern arch or the eastern side of the building. The building was refurbished in 1985 and an additional level was added. The building contains restaurants, cafes and food outlets and offices.

An area of public open space is located between Quay Street and the edge of the Ferry Basin, adjacent to Piers 3 and 4. This split-level area of public space is predominantly located on a wharf deck that extends to the seaward side of the seawall. This area is paved and occupied by public seats and two original ferry shelters that are used for tourist activities and operated by Fullers. A pontoon stand is located adjacent to Piers 3 and 4 and is occupied by Adventure Jet. The area is delineated by the blue historic Auckland Harbour
4.7 **Cruise Ships**

The cruise industry has continued to grow with an increase in the number and size of cruise ships visiting Auckland. Auckland is the key hub port for the cruise industry in New Zealand, and its role as an exchange port benefits the Auckland economy and other port cities around New Zealand. Cruise ships currently berth at Queens Wharf East and West and Princes Wharf East. The primary cruise ship berth is Queens Wharf East with secondary berthing located on Princes Wharf East. The facilities at Queens Wharf are currently limited in capacity to be able to safely berth ships of a maximum length of 294m on the eastern side and 205m on the western side of the wharf. In addition to these berths, cruise ships of up to 320m (or up to 330m in weather conditions permitting) can be berthed on the eastern side of Princes Wharf.

Growth in the cruise industry has resulted in cruise operators utilising larger cruise ships with visits to New Zealand by the 348m Quantum Class Ovation of the Seas in the 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 cruise seasons. There is currently no capacity in Auckland to berth cruise ships longer than 330m. Ships longer than 330m such as the Ovation of the Seas, are currently required to locate in the Waitemata Harbour with passengers "tendered" to shore. Panuku Development Auckland has lodged a resource consent application to install mooring dolphins to the north of Queens Wharf to enable larger ships to berth on Queens Wharf East.

Schedules from POAL indicate that 150 cruise ships are expected to dock in the 2018 - 2019 season, with approximately 2,000 passengers aboard each ship. It is estimated that 70 % will dock at Queens Wharf with the remaining 30 % docking at Princes Wharf East during the 12 month season. Growth in cruise ship visits is anticipated by POAL to increase at the same current rate of approximately 15%.

4.8 **Princes Wharf**

Princes Wharf is dominated by a multi-level mixed-use building of up to 36m above wharf level. The building is occupied the Hilton Hotel, residential apartment accommodation, restaurants and bars, retail outlets, offices and an elevated public outlook area at the northern face of the building. Carparking is provided within the building and at ground level in-between the two building structures. Cruise ships berth on the eastern side of the wharf and passengers are processed through a customs clearance facility. When a cruise ship is berthed at the wharf, coaches and vehicles service the passengers and provide provisions for the ship via the central accessway located between the buildings. Unrestricted public access is provided along the western and northern sides of the wharf and along the eastern side when a cruise ship is not berthed.
4.9 Queens Wharf

Queens Wharf is located at the foot of Queen Street and has particular significance given it connects the central city to the Waitemata Harbour along the main north-south axis of the city. Queens Wharf was purchased by Auckland Council and the Crown in 2009 from POAL to provide a high-quality cruise terminal, expansion of ferry services, a major event space and improved public open space.

Current uses include the main cruise ship terminal (Shed 10) which receives passengers from cruise ships berthed on the eastern side of the wharf and is used for events. The Cloud is located on the western side of the wharf and is used for functions and events throughout the year. The Lighthouse artwork is located on the northern end of the wharf.

The majority of Queens Wharf is accessible to the public with public seating and amenities provided at various points around the wharf. A Container Village is located at the southern end of the wharf, near Quay Street, and provides food and beverage activities established following the closure of the Downtown Shopping Centre. Public access to parts of the wharf is restricted during cruise visits. Customs New Zealand designates parts of Queens Wharf and Shed 10 as customs-controlled areas on days that a cruise ship is berthed on Queens Wharf East. Occasionally a cruise ship berths on the western side of Queens Wharf with The Cloud utilised for customs bonding and passenger processing.

4.9.1 Perimeter Strip Licence

As part of the sale of Queens Wharf to Auckland Council/Crown, a Perimeter Strip Licence was granted back to POAL for a 7 metre wide strip along the eastern and western edges of Queens Wharf. The purpose of the Perimeter Strip Licence is to enable POAL to operate the berthing and servicing of cruise ships (and other passenger, naval, ferry and research boats).

The Perimeter Strip Licence includes a mechanism that allows Auckland Council and the Crown to give notice to POAL that it requires part of the western boundary of Queens Wharf for the purpose of expanding the Ferry Terminal. Once notice is given, the Perimeter Strip Licence is surrendered partially as it relates to the area of the western edge required for the Ferry Terminal from the date that construction works related to the expansion commence. Auckland Council has advised POAL of its intention to give for notice that it requires part of the western side of the wharf for ferry expansion. This formal notice is being drafted and will be issued shortly.
4.9.2 Cruise Ship Licence

At the same time, POAL was also granted a licence to use other parts of Queens Wharf (primarily parts of Shed 10 on the eastern side) for operating the overseas passenger terminal for certain time periods when required – based on arrival and departure schedules for vessels (Cruise Ship Licence).

The licenced areas are changeable and Auckland Council and the Crown have discretion as to how much of the surface of Queens Wharf is made available for use by POAL, subject to consultation with POAL. AT has been consulting POAL in relation to the use of areas of the wharf for construction access, staging and storage areas.

4.10 Coastal Occupation Permits and Licences

In 1991, POAL was granted a section 384A deemed coastal occupation permit (RMA) for the waterspace previously managed by the Auckland Harbour Board (under the previous Harbour Board Act). The extent of the permit is illustrated by red shading in Figure 4 below. This permit expires in 2026.

Figure 4: Original POAL S384A Deemed Coastal Permit – Expires 30 September 2026
Since 1991, additional permits have been granted over parts of this waterspace for specific management purposes as the waterfront has developed for additional uses. This includes a coastal occupation permit granted to the former Auckland Regional Transport Authority (ARTA) for the Ferry Basin. This is illustrated in Figure 5 below. The coastal permit expires in 2038. The occupation permit provides for the structures, uses and activities associated with ferry services.

![Figure 5: Existing Coastal Permits/Licences (Source: T&T Engineering Plans)](image)

4.11 **Waterspace Management Agreement**

Although POAL holds a S384A a statutory coastal permit relating to Waitemata Harbour, it granted the right for Auckland Council and the Crown to have exclusive management and control of the waterspace beneath Queens Wharf, until 30 September 2026 (the expiry of the POAL permit) by exercising POAL's rights on its behalf under that statutory permit through a Waterspace Management Agreement.

The definition of ‘Waterspace Management Area’ in the Waterspace Management Agreement includes the waterspace on the western side of Queens Wharf which is occupied by any additional structure relating to the extension of the Ferry Terminal. Following partial surrender of the Perimeter Strip Licence to allow the expansion of the Ferry Terminal, the Waterspace Management Agreement will cover the waterspace on the western side of Queens Wharf until the expiry of the s384A deemed coastal permit in 2026.
4.12 **East Annexe Building**

The East Annexe Building is located between the Ferry Building and the entrance to the Ferry Terminal Building. It is currently occupied by tourism activities and houses a transformer that provides power to the Ferry Building. The Coastal Permits 34728 & 34727 relate to the redevelopment of the ferry terminal. Coastal Permit 34728 expires on 1 August 2038. The purpose of this permit was the redevelopment of the ferry terminal and the design of the pedestrian canopy and passenger waiting area. Coastal Permit 34808, which relates to construction works for the Ferry Terminal redevelopment, has a general expiry of 1 August 2008 but a later expiry of 31 December 2015 for the East Annex. The consent for the Annex has expired and it appears that it (and the electricity transformer) were required to be removed in the first half of 2016. These matters are being addressed in this application.

4.13 **Central Wharves and Port**

To the east of Queens Wharf is the commercial port. The other central wharves include Captain Cook Wharf and Marsden Wharf which are used for berthing and loading/unloading of goods associated with the port. These wharves are under the operation of the POAL and form part of the customs controlled bonded area of the port. As such, they are not accessible by the general public. Further east is main port area including Bledisloe Terminal, Jellicoe Wharf, Fryberg Wharf and the Fergusson Container Terminal.

4.14 **Quay Street**

To the south of the waterfront is Quay Street and the Auckland City Centre. Quay Street is currently the main east-west transport connection along the waterfront serving both private vehicles and public transport. It is classed as an arterial road in the AUP. It is the primary access to Queens Wharf and the Ferry Terminal. A dedicated cycleway is located on the northern side of Quay Street, providing multi-directional cycle access connecting to the wider cycle network in the Central City and beyond. Pedestrian activity in this part of the central city is high. Quay Street, Queen Street and Albert Street are main pedestrian thoroughfares used by commuters, tourists and visitors and residents. Pedestrian volumes increase significantly during the summer months and when cruise ships are in port.

4.15 **Downtown Auckland**

Downtown Auckland is the most intensively developed commercial centre in New Zealand. It features high rise commercial and residential towers. On the southern side of Quay Street, in the vicinity of the Ferry Terminal, is the Endean’s Building, Britomart Transport Interchange, HSBC and PWC office buildings and M Social Hotel. Commercial Bay, an office and retail development is currently under construction. The mixed
use nature of the City Centre enables all types of activities to be provided for within the underlying sloping ridge and valley landform.

4.16 Heritage

The area contains a number of historic heritage buildings, features and places that are scheduled items under the AUP including the Auckland Harbour Board Fence, the Former Public Shelters the Ferry Building and Queens Wharf. The scheduled items are listed and illustrated below.

![Figure 6: Built Heritage and Character: Historic Heritage Overlay Extent of Place, Auckland Harbour Board Fence (Item 1915)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Primary Feature</th>
<th>Extent of Place</th>
<th>Exclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quay Street, between Hobson Street and Britomart Place, Auckland Central</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Entire Fence including panels, pylons, handrails and gates.</td>
<td>Shown above in Red</td>
<td>No Exclusions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7: Built Heritage and Character: Historic Heritage Overlay Extent of Place, Public Shelters (Former) (Item 2018)

Figure 8: Built Heritage and Character: Historic Heritage Overlay Extent of Place, Public Shelters (Former) (Item 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Primary Feature</th>
<th>Extent of Place</th>
<th>Exclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>109-11 Quay Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>Shown above in Red</td>
<td>No Exclusions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 9: Built Heritage and Character: Historic Overlay Extent of Place, Ferry Building (Item 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verified Location</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Primary Feature</th>
<th>Extent of Place</th>
<th>Exclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99 Quay Street, Auckland Central</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ferry Building</td>
<td>Shown in red above</td>
<td>No exclusions apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10: Historic Heritage Extent of Place Overlay, Queens Wharf (Item 2735).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Primary Feature</th>
<th>Extent of Place</th>
<th>Exclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Quay Street, Auckland Central  | B        | Substructure and deck including shed platforms; Shed G (also known as Shed 10); ferry shelter, electricity substation building, railway tracks, crane rails and weighbridge | Shown above in red                   | 1. Fendering.  
2. Cast iron bollards.  
3. Any works associated with repair and maintenance to ensure the integrity of the wharf structure for port purposes. The repair and maintenance methodology for piles includes the removal of defective concrete either by mechanical means or by hydromolition replacement of corroded reinforcement, coating of reinforcement and reinstatement with new concrete either by spraying or recasting with concrete or mortar. |
5 PROPOSAL

5.1 OVERVIEW

The Downtown Ferry Terminal is proposed to be redeveloped to consolidate ferry services along the western edge of Queens Wharf with passengers accessing all berths through a single terminal building. The redevelopment is proposed to be undertaken in two main stages:

- Stage 1, which is the subject of this resource consent application, includes the relocation of existing ferry services provided from Piers 3 and 4 to the western edge of Queens Wharf and minor modifications to the existing ferry terminal buildings (located on Piers 1 and 2) to provide improved access and customer amenity to the new berths. This stage is part of a wider package of Downtown Infrastructure Development works to be completed in advance of America’s Cup 36 (due to be held over the summer of 2020-21), and is proposed to be completed by December 2019.
- Stage 2 includes the redevelopment of Piers 1 and 2 and a new ferry terminal building to service all of the ferry berths. Stage 2 is not anticipated until after 2021 and will be the subject of a separate resource consent application.

The redevelopment of the Ferry Basin is being staged, with provision for the relocation of current Piers 3 and 4 services being undertaken as part of the first phase of redevelopment as Pier 3 is nearing the end of life and is in need of redevelopment within the next 2-3 years. In addition, use of the existing Ferry Basin configuration is nearing capacity and the provision of new ferry berth infrastructure, as part of Stage 1, will allow improved efficiencies to be delivered which will allow for expected service growth over the next 5 to 7 years, pending completion of Stage 2 of the redevelopment.

The relocation of services away from their current location along Quay Street also enables the development of new public open space on the Auckland waterfront.

5.2 DESIGN REQUIREMENTS AND CONSTRAINTS

In order to successfully relocate the existing ferry services operating from Piers 3 and 4, a number of design requirements need to be provided within the constraints of the existing ferry basin between Princes Wharf and Queens Wharf. The key design requirements include:

- The provision of six berths (five to replace the five operational berths on Piers 3 and 4 and one to provide layover).
- Multi-purpose berths for a range of vessels with different loading and unloading configurations.
• The provision of two berths for 35 m (L) x 10 m (B) vessels and four berths for 24 m (L) x 8.5 m (B) vessels.
• Passenger access to the berths provided through the existing ferry terminal.
• The provision of calm water for the safety and comfort of the loading and unloading of passengers from the pontoons and ferries.

The constraints of the existing ferry basin influencing the proposed redevelopment include:

• The existing facilities at Pier 1 and 2 to remain operational during and after construction.
• Clear navigation to and from Pier 1 and 2 is to be maintained.
• Cruise liners moored on eastern side of Princes Wharf require a safe distance from the ferry vessels to take into consideration mooring lines, security, safety and navigation.
• Bunkering operations of cruise liners on Princes Wharf East needs to be accommodated during off-peak times.
• Local and international navigational rules are met, including maintaining the anti-clockwise circulation of vessel movements in the ferry basin.

5.3 Stage 1 Works

Stage 1 of the proposed ferry basin redevelopment includes the construction, establishment and operation of new infrastructure for six replacement berths adjacent to Queens Wharf West and modifications to the existing ferry terminal building and immediate surrounds. The new piers are labelled Piers A-F, with Pier A located closest to the ferry terminal building and Pier F located towards the northern end of Queens Wharf. The proposal also includes the demolition of the existing Piers 3 and 4, although the timing of this is dependent on the new berths being fully operational and whether additional layover/decant space may be required for the Stage 2 works.

5.3.1 Coastal Marine Structures

The construction, establishment and operation of new infrastructure to provide for the new ferry berths includes piles, pile guard markers, pontoons, gangways, shelters, fenders and a breakwater is proposed. The berths are proposed to be arranged in a ‘reverse saw-tooth’ layout at approximately 17-20 degrees to Queens Wharf to enable ferries to circulate in an anticlockwise movement around the ferry basin and enter the berths bow first. A new breakwater is also proposed adjacent to Queens Wharf to provide more tranquil water space for the ferry berths. The proposal is illustrated in Figure 11 below.
5.3.2 **Floating Pontoons**

Six floating pontoon berths approximately 210m long with a total area of approximately 2,400sqm. The pontoons will provide for two 35m (L) x 10m (B) vessels and four 24m (L) x 8.5m (B) vessels. The larger vessel are proposed to be located on Piers A and B, closer to the ferry terminal building.
The pontoons will be secured by approximately 24 pontoon mooring piles to the back face (Queens Wharf side) of the pontoon. These mooring piles are proposed to be located some 11.5m from the face of Queens Wharf. Recessed mooring piles are also proposed to the outside corners of each pontoon. The piles will be approximately 600-800mm in diameter and sleeved in black polyethylene and capped. The pontoons will float approximately 1.0m ‘free-board’ above the water level for the 24m vessels and 1.6m for the 35m vessels. The inside edges and ends of the pontoons will have balustrading consisting of frameless glass and stainless steel stanchions. The mooring edges are to be open and fitted with integrated fenders. It is anticipated that the design of the floating pontoons will be carried out by specialist suppliers, in accordance with detailed design specifications to ensure structures achieve the required performance standard for the conditions in which they are located.

Six dolphin piles and five fender dolphins are proposed to be constructed at each berth and arch fenders attached to the face of the pontoon. It is proposed to cap the dolphin piles with ‘markers’ approximately 6.025m high and 3.302m wide to assist with wayfinding.

The pontoons will include a range of ancillary fittings and fixtures such as fire hoses, wash-down hoses, power, utilities, life buoys, sullage connections, passenger information boards, signage, lighting, CCTV and PA equipment.

A summary of the location, diameter, type and number of piles included within the proposal is included in the table below.

**Table 2: Pile Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pile Location</th>
<th>Pile Diameter (mm)</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gangway (slab)</td>
<td>600 – 800</td>
<td>Steel tube with reinforced concrete core</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontoon gangway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontoons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontoon Mooring</td>
<td>700 – 1100</td>
<td>Steel tube with reinforced concrete core</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fender Dolphin</td>
<td>≤550</td>
<td>Timber</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakwater</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Steel UC, HDPE sleeved with concrete infill</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.3.3 Gangways**

Three hinged gangways will connect the wharf to the pontoons to provide passenger access to ferries. The gangways will run parallel to Queens Wharf, will rise and fall with the tide and be connected to the wharf by loading platforms that are approximately 16m by 8m.
The gangways will be approximately 6m wide and approximately 33m long to provide three passenger lanes and enable a gradient of 1 in 12 or less for 80% of the tidal range. The three passenger lanes will provide for both embarking and disembarking passengers to facilitate efficient boarding of ferries. Sufficient space is provided on the gangways to accommodate the full passenger capacity of ferries using the berths.

It is proposed to cover the gangways with a fixed shelter 60m in length sitting 6.0m above Queens Wharf, with the roof extending over Queens Wharf to approximately 2.7m. The structures will be fixed and supported by piles and thinner supports fixed to the breakwater – i.e. the structures will be independent of the tidal rise and fall of the gangways and pontoons. This avoids the need for separate canopies over gangways and the landings. The structure is proposed to be glazed with a flat roof and horizontal proportions which relate visually to Queen Wharf. The gangways are illustrated in Figure 12 below.

![Figure 12: Gangway enclosures (Source: Isthmus Landscape Report)](image)

Aligning the glazed wall of the structures with the breakwater along the western edge of the wharf avoids the need for balustrading except in the gaps between the gangway shelter structures. In those locations the balustrading will be frameless glass on stainless steel stanchions. Such balustrading will not extend beyond the northern-most structure so that the northern end of Queens Wharf will remain in its current open condition.

Lighting, wayfinding and identification signage is to be provided for the new piers and detailed in the Urban Design Report at Diagrams 2.26 and 2.27 (pages 42 &43). The strategy has been developed to ensure that there is an adequate level of lighting and signage to assist with wayfinding and provide for a safe and functional ferry service. Lighting is proposed to be installed along the western side of Queens Wharf, inside the gangway structures and on the pontoons. Lighting and signage will be designed and installed to
complement that provided for the existing ferry facilities and services and in accordance with AT Metro standards.

5.3.4 Breakwater

A new concrete piled and capped breakwater is proposed to ensure sheltered berthing conditions for each ferry berth. The breakwater is designed to protect the proposed berths from the predominant north-east/east wind direction, which generates waves over 1m that pass under Queens Wharf.

The breakwater (wave screen) is approximately 210m long and is proposed to be constructed adjacent to Queens Wharf. It will comprise a continuous wall of 402 piles capped with a concrete beam. The piles are proposed to be sleeved in black polyethylene. The capping beam is proposed to be 800mm wide, situated approximately 100mm from the edge of Queens Wharf, with the top of the breakwater sitting approximately 50mm below the level of Queens Wharf.

5.3.5 Ferry Terminal

It is proposed to reconfigure the main Ferry Terminal building to provide passenger access to the new piers. These works are intended to be of an interim nature until a new terminal building is constructed as part of the Stage 2 works. Minor upgrade works are also proposed to the entrance and open space to the east of the ferry terminal building. The following built form and landscape modifications are proposed:

- Construction of a new façade to the Ferry Terminal entrance. The façade is proposed to be 22m wide, double height and fully glazed.
- Removal of the East Annexe Building.
- Removing the ticket gates at the entrance to the Ferry Terminal.
- Removing the upper louvres below the roof of the terminal and replacing these with glass to bring more natural light into the terminal to create a more open and visible space.
- Construct new retail/food and beverage facilities within the terminal building and modify the north-eastern ‘block wall’ to insert new glazing.
- Adapting the historic shelter within the ferry terminal to enhance its function as a pedestrian walkway to the new piers by modifying the northern face of the shelter and inserting skylights in the roof at each central bay between the collar ties to increase the amount of natural light to the walkway.
- Relocate bicycle parking to the east side of the building.
- Relocating the rubbish facility located on the north side of the terminal building to inside the terminal building.
- Relocate the existing ancillary office space in the main terminal to the Pier 2 terminal building. This includes repositioning passenger waiting space to the north of the building.

- Modifications to open space to the east of the terminal building including,
  - New paving to the entrance of the terminal building.
  - Reposition the existing marine bollards.
  - Provide new bench seats in the area of the existing Pou forest.

5.3.6 Infrastructure

The proposed changes to the existing infrastructure include new services to the berths including potable water supply and a new standalone sullage system with connections back to the existing reticulation on Quay Street. As the new berths are to replace existing berths (Pier 3 and 4) and retain the existing ferry capacity; the overall net increase in wastewater will be minimal and is described in more detail in the Infrastructure Services Assessment in Attachment V.

It is proposed that the berths will be serviced by three new sullage points. It is intended that similar arrangements to the existing sullage operations from Pier 1 using a dedicated sullage discharge tank and new connection to the public reticulation will be provided for the new berths to minimise and mitigate the impact on the existing private infrastructure. A new pump system will be required to connect the sullage points to the tank along the approximately 300m distance from the furthest berth to the holding tank. This tank will then connect to the public system in a similar arrangement to existing services.

Stormwater run-off from the new pontoons and gangways is not proposed to be captured or treated and will discharge directly into the Waitemata Harbour. All new pontoons, gangways and shelter materials will comprise of inert materials which will not be high contaminant yielding.

The current proposed design includes a fire hose reels at each berth. Two fire hydrants are located on Quay St within approximately 200 to 375 m from the new berths. A specific fire-fighting assessment will need to be undertaken to determine the fire-fighting water supply requirements for the development as part of the detailed design process.

Dry services such as power, CCTV and communications will connect with the existing services and to an existing distribution room. A services corridor will carry the services to the proposed new ferry berths.

5.4 Demolition

The proposal includes the demolition of the existing Piers 3 and 4 infrastructure including the removal of the gangways, pontoons and piles. The gangways will be unbolted from the Quay Street breastworks, the concrete pontoons removed and the existing piles sheared-off at seabed level. Balustrading will be installed.
following the removal of the gangways at the edge of the Quay Street breastworks No works are proposed to the existing historic harbour board fence (the “blue fence”) and measure are proposed to ensure that the blue fence is protected during demolition works. Where possible components of the existing infrastructure that are still in good condition will be re-used in other parts of the ferry network. The timeframe for the demolition of both piers will be determined once the new berths are constructed and operational. For the purposes of this application, it has been assumed that the demolition may occur at any time within the term of the consent being sought (35 years).

The existing piled fender structure adjacent to Queens Wharf is also proposed to be demolished. The horizontal timber fenders will be removed and existing piles sheared-off at seabed level. The fenders are not attached to Queens Wharf and do not form part of the scheduled historic place.

5.5 **WATERSPACE USE AND COASTAL OCCUPATION OF THE CMA**

The proposal includes occupation of the CMA by marine structures for the ferry berths including the piles, floating pontoons, gangways, fenders, dolphins and breakwater. As detailed in Section 4.10 above, the area is subject to an existing occupation permit held by AT as well as POAL’s deemed coastal occupation permit (under section 384A of the RMA). The application includes a new coastal occupation area sought to align with the area of waterspace required for the marine structures for the ferry berths including the piles, floating pontoons, gangways, fenders, dolphins and breakwater. It also includes the area connecting the north of the existing Ferry Terminal Building with the southern-most gangway that is required to operate the ferry services. This is illustrated in Figure 13 below.
The construction of the marine structures also requires occupation of the CMA by temporary and/or floating structures for the length of the construction phase of the project, being approximately twelve months.
5.6 **CONSTRUCTION METHODLOGY**

The project is proposed to be delivered in time for the America’s Cup and APEC in 2021. This requires the commencement of construction by May 2019 with an anticipated construction duration of 12 months. A draft Construction Management Plan is contained in Attachment P.

It is proposed that fabrication of the pontoons including guides and gangways will occur off site. The construction method has been developed based on working from either the existing Queens Wharf using temporary access staging, or from floating marine plant, with a worksite elsewhere and reduced works at Queens Wharf. Three construction methods are identified:

- **Temporary Jetty** - construction of and working from a temporary jetty at the Western side of Queens Wharf
- **Jack-Up Barge** - using a jack-up type barge to work at each location
- **Floating Barge** - using a floating type barge with simple spuds and dynamic positioning (primarily for piling works) or alternatively using a conventionally moored barge with a casing mounted drill such as a Bauer Fly Drill or a reverse circulation drill.

In terms of piling construction, it is anticipated that breakwater piles would be installed by a piling rig positioned on Queens Wharf. All other piles would be installed from a barge or temporary staging. Up to three piling rigs are anticipated to be operating simultaneously. The proposed construction methodology relies on primarily vibro driven piles, although some are proposed to be impact driven. Excavation of the soil inside the casing/bored holes will be carried out and either loaded directly in to skips or stockpiled in contained spoil zone or removed by barge to temporary jetty or stockpile area, for drying before being loaded and removed off-site to appropriate landfill facilities. Silt plumes due to piling activities will be contained through the use of silt curtains.

The noisy construction works are proposed to be undertaken during normal construction hours of 7am – 10pm, Monday – Saturday. There is the potential for low noise activities such as equipment/material deliveries and concrete pours to take place outside of these hours where it is less disruptive to do so. Activities that create the most significant noise and/or vibration such as impact pile driving, vibro pile driving, concrete cutting and concrete breaking will not be undertaken at night (10pm to 7am) or on Sundays.

There will be minimal impact for pedestrians and vehicles accessing Queens Wharf during the construction period. It is expected that access to Queens Wharf for the general public will be maintained except on the western side of The Cloud. The potential full closure of western edge of the Wharf for the duration of construction is being explored with Wharf users. The full closure of the western edge incurs operational
implications for the current stakeholders. The varying nature of the activities undertaken on the Wharf require a flexible solution to incorporate the requirements for each. The intention is to utilise the northern section of the central access, north of the Cloud entrance, as a two way traffic operation whilst accommodating the various requirements to support the ongoing functions. In support, a temporary turning facility and ramp at the northern end of the access (to the south of the Lighthouse) is proposed to facilitate alternative turning facilities for coach, taxi, service vehicles. The turning facility would replace the current operation where vehicles traverse northbound on the western wharf edge, turning at the northern end of The Cloud, proceeding south along the central access. The ramp concept is based on an approximate height difference in the order 0.9 metres between the Wharf general level and the northern paddock upper level. The turning facility enables vehicles such as coaches to turn onto the ramp, enter the upper paddock, and proceed south through the northern paddock car park departing through the existing paddock ramp. This is covered in detail in the Transport Impact Assessment and is illustrated on Figure 32 of the TIA (Page 41).

Access for specific events, such as when Cruise ships are in dock or events at the Cloud will be maintained and managed via a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) that will be prepared in consultation with the key stakeholders.

During the construction period the estimated maximum number of trucks will be 20 per day. The truck movements will be staged to not coincide with ferry or cruise ship peak activities or other events. Some construction traffic, such as for the delivery of over-dimension equipment and materials, will be delivered out of peak periods to minimise the impact on any Queens Wharf activities. The primary truck movements to the site will be for concrete deliveries to the western side of Queens Wharf. Concrete pours will be coordinated with the broader wharf activities to minimise disruption and conflicts.

There are currently a small number of pre-booked events in The Cloud during the construction period, and it is proposed that the construction programme will accommodate these to minimise the effects of construction activity on these events. As Shed 10 is further from the construction works, it is expected that any construction effects can be managed using standard adaptive management and communication protocols, through the Construction Management Plan catering for the following scenarios for existing activities on Queens Wharf:

- Normal operations
- A cruise ship in dock, non-exchange day
- A cruise ship in dock, exchange day
- An event is taking place
- A cruise ship and event.
The ferry services/passengers connectivity and flow associated with Piers 1, 2, 3, and 4 will be maintained during the construction work at the Terminal Building to avoid confusion and to ensure passenger delays are minimised (refer Figure 3). The existing walkway and shelter leading from Quay Street to the terminal are planned to be removed. The timing of these works will be such as to minimise the disruption to ferry passengers and as much work as possible will be undertaken over a weekend or at night.

Temporary construction lighting may be required at the site for activities which may continue after dark. Lighting will be localised and directed at the specific activities to minimise light spill to adjacent areas. Task lighting may be required for specific activities and will also be required on marine vessels. Lighting levels will be designed to comply with the requirements of the AUP.

Overall, construction effects will be mitigated through a suite of management plans, including the following:

- Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)
- Built Heritage Construction Management Plan (BHCMP)
- Communication and Consultation Plan (CCP)
- Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP)
- Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)
- Maritime Safety Management Plan (MSMP).

5.7 CONSENT DURATION AND LAPSE

Consent is sought for all coastal marine structures including the floating pontoons, gangways, fenders, dolphins, breakwater for a period of 35 years. The piles have been designed for a period of 50 years, while the pontoons have a 25 year design life. This provides for the maximum duration possible under section 123 of the RMA.

5.8 PROPOSED CONDITIONS OF CONSENT

In order to mitigate the potential effects of construction of the marine infrastructure, terminal upgrade and demolition works the following table outlines the conditions proposed to be offered as part of this application. It is considered that the proposed conditions will appropriately avoid, remedy or mitigate and adverse effects as a result of the proposal in accordance with Section 108 of the RMA. A copy of the applicant’s proposed conditions of consent is contained in Attachment R. The table below summarises the key matters covered by the proposed conditions.
### Table 3: Matters Covered in Proposed Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Proposed Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape and Visual Amenity</td>
<td>Submit final details of the materials and finishes for the shelters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Submit final details of the modification of the Ferry Shelter and location, style and material for balustrading on Queens Wharf. Prepare a Built Heritage Construction Management Plan to identify methods for the protection of historic heritage during construction works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Processes</td>
<td>Include in a Construction Management Plan, methods such as the use of silt curtains to minimise the effects of sedimentation during piling works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Ecology</td>
<td>Standard auditory management protocols to minimise potential effects on marine mammals to be included in the Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP). The use of suitable methods, such as silt curtains around piles to manage the effects on water quality to be included in the Construction Management Plan (CMP).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Traffic                       | Prepare a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) to manage the adverse effects of construction on the transport network. The objectives of the CTMP, as far as reasonably practicable is to, avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of construction on transport, ferry services transport and property access. This is to be achieved by:  
  - Maintained passenger access to the main terminal building during construction, through peak commuter periods. This will ensure the same number of access points are available during the construction works to minimise disruption to ferry services.  
  - Maintained access to both The Cloud and Shed 10 during construction, primarily by way of the central access way.  
  - The CTMP will be developed in conjunction with and be cognisant of the other DIDP works, namely the seawall and utility construction works, where both the pedestrian and vehicle access to the Wharf and Ferry Terminal will be maintained to a satisfactory level during peak commuter periods.  
  - Maintaining pedestrian access to Ferry Piers 3 and 4 on the northern side of Quay Street with a minimum of one entry and exit point (only required if ferry services are continuing to utilise all or some of Piers 3 and 4).  
  - Maintaining pedestrian access to and from Piers 2 during construction. |
| Noise                         | Prepare a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP) in accordance with the following objectives:  
  - Identify and adopt the Best Practicable Option (BPO) for the management of construction noise and vibration;  
  - Define the procedures to be followed when construction activities cannot meet the noise and vibration standards;  
  - Inform the duration, frequency and timing of works to manage disruption; |
- Require engagement with affected receivers and timely management of complaints; and
- Protect the wellbeing of marine mammals.

**Navigation and Safety**
Prepare a *Marine Safety Management Plan* (MSMP) to minimise the effects of construction activity on the movement of vessels in the ferry basin. The plan shall include:
- Procedures for operational communications e.g. with Ports of Auckland Ltd Harbour Control and the Auckland Transport Ferry Services Team;
- Details of the maritime safety risk controls to be implemented and adhered to;
- Notification responsibilities; and
- Details of those responsible for implementing the MSMP and their responsibilities including the contact details of the Construction Manager and all those in charge of construction vessels.

**Construction**
Prepare a *Construction Environmental Management Plan* (CEMP) to address temporary construction effects.

**Signage**
Submit final details of the location and placement of signs for wayfinding and information in accordance with the wayfinding strategy.

**Lighting**
Submit final details of the location, placement and specifications of lighting in accordance with the lighting strategy.
6 CONSENT REQUIREMENTS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Resource consent is required under the AUP and Plan Change 4 to the Auckland Unitary Plan. Without limiting this application being for all necessary resource consents, resource consents appear to be required at least under the following provisions below. Resource consent are being sought to enable the proposal (as described in this report) and the application intends to include all necessary consents for those activities to occur. The list of reasons for consent may not be an exhaustive list and if further consent matters are identified post lodgement of the application, these should also be considered as forming part of this application.

6.2 AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN: OPERATIVE IN PART 2016 (THE UNITARY PLAN)

Resource consent is required for the reasons outlined in the tables below. The activity tables in the overlay, Auckland-wide, zone and precincts specifies the activity status for land use and development activities pursuant to section 9(3) of the Resource Management Act 1991 and the activity status for works, occupation and use in the coastal marine area pursuant to sections 12(1), 12(2) and 12(3) of the Resource Management Act 1991. This includes any associated discharges of contaminants or water into water pursuant to section 15 of the Resource Management Act 1991, or any combination of all of the above sections where relevant. Occupation of the CMA is sought for the area identified in Figure 12 above.

Reasons for consent are identified in Table 4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUP Rule</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Heritage Overlay - Chapter D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| D17.4.1 (A9) Modifications and restoration | Modifications to, or restoration of, buildings, structures, fabric or features of a scheduled historic heritage place, except where provided for as a permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary activity in another rule in this overlay.  
The proposal includes modifications to the deck of Queens Wharf to provide passenger access platforms to the three proposed gangways, the fixing of the Breakwater to Queens Wharf, the installation of balustrades between the shelters covering the gangways, modifications to the surfacene Queens Wharf and within the Ferry Building Extent of Place. The proposal also includes modifications of the heritage ferry shelter including modifications to its northern façade, skylights, lighting, wayfinding and signage. | Restricted Discretionary |
<p>| D17.4.1 (A10) Buildings and structures – New | New buildings or structures within the scheduled extent of place of a Category B place. | Restricted Discretionary |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUP Rule</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>buildings or structures</td>
<td>The proposal includes the installation of new structures (including access platforms, balustrades, seating and lighting).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17.4.1 (A10) Buildings and structures – New buildings or structures</td>
<td>New buildings or structures within the scheduled extent of place of Category A and A* places. The proposal includes the relocation or installation of new structures within the Ferry Building Extent of Place (eg bollards).</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17.6.6 (1) Standards Temporary buildings and structures and signs</td>
<td>Temporary buildings, structures and signs, including those accessory to a temporary activity must not result in, (b) the building, structure or sign being affixed to any existing building, structure or feature within the scheduled historic heritage place, other than a building, structure or feature identified in the exclusions column in Schedule 14.1 Schedule of Historic Heritage; or (c) must not be in place longer than 21 consecutive days in any 60-day period. Temporary structures are required within the Historic Heritage Extent of Place during construction, including temporary signage. The standards will be complied with except for the D17.6.6.1 (b) and (c) and therefore resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity is required in accordance with C1.9(2).</td>
<td>Restricted Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17.6.7 (1) Standards Identification and safety signs</td>
<td>Identification and safety signs within scheduled historic heritage places, other than road safety signs in accordance with New Zealand standards, or identification signs within the interiors of buildings where the interior is identified as an exclusion, must not: (a) be attached, painted, fixed, or projected on to the exterior of any scheduled building, object, feature, or structure; (b) exceed two signs per scheduled historic heritage place (taking only one side of double-sided signs into account, or if a sign has more than two sides, then taking all of the faces of the sign into account); (c) exceed 0.5m² per sign; (d) be flashing, illuminated or variable; or (e) involve any disturbance of land or the foreshore or seabed to construct the sign where archaeological rules in Table D17.4.2 Activity table – Activities subject to additional archaeological rules apply. During construction, it is likely that there will be temporary construction related signage, therefore resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity in accordance with C1.9(2) is required.</td>
<td>Restricted Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Wide – Chapter E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4 4.1 (A15) Other discharges of contaminants</td>
<td>Discharge of water or contaminants (including washwater) onto or into land and/or into water not complying with the relevant standards or not otherwise provided for by a rule in the Plan. Subject to rule (A15) the discharge of contaminants onto or into land and/or into water not otherwise provided for by a rule in the Plan is sought for construction purposes associated with piling.</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8.4.1 (A10) Stormwater-Discharge and diversion</td>
<td>All other diversion and discharge of stormwater runoff from impervious areas not otherwise provided for.</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Coastal – General Coastal Marine Zone – Chapter F2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Permitted Activity Standards</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2.19.7 (A70)</strong></td>
<td>Discharges to the coastal marine area</td>
<td>Discharges into coastal water not otherwise authorised by a rule in the Plan, or covered by the Resource Management (Marine Pollution) Regulations 1998, that do not comply with the permitted activity standards</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2.19.8 (A84)</strong></td>
<td>Occupation of the common marine and coastal area and associated use</td>
<td>Use and occupation of the common marine and coastal area and associated use which has a functional need to be below mean high water spring.</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2.19.8 (A92)</strong></td>
<td>Use and activities</td>
<td>Marine passenger operations.</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2.19.8 (A114)</strong></td>
<td>Use and activities</td>
<td>Underwater blasting, impact and vibratory piling, marine seismic surveys.</td>
<td>Restricted Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2.19.10 (A121)</strong></td>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>Coastal marine area structures and buildings unless provided for elsewhere</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2.19.10 (A125)</strong></td>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>Demolition or removal of any buildings or coastal marine area structures</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Signs – Chapter E23**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Permitted Activity Standards</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E23.4.1 (A53)</strong> Signs</td>
<td>Comprehensive development signage, including amendments or additions to existing approved comprehensive development signage.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restricted discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E25.4.1 (A2)</strong> Noise and vibration</td>
<td>Activities that do not comply with a permitted activity standard.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restricted discretionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Noise and Vibration – Chapter E25**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Permitted Activity Standards</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E23.4.1 (A53)</strong> Signs</td>
<td>Comprehensive development signage, including amendments or additions to existing approved comprehensive development signage.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restricted discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E25.4.1 (A2)</strong> Noise and vibration</td>
<td>Activities that do not comply with a permitted activity standard.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restricted discretionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The proposal involves the discharge of stormwater from impervious area, greater than 1,000 m² associated with the new pontoon structures.

Consent is sought for the occupation of the area identified in Drawing 1004393.1000-RC105 (Engineering Concept Plans) for the ferry berths and associated structures.

Consent is sought for the ferry operations including the berthing of vessels.

The proposal involves impact and vibratory piling associated with the proposed marine structures.

Consent is sought for temporary structures (e.g. temporary staging and working platforms) in the CMA including use and associated discharges.

Consent is sought for the removal of the existing fender piles adjacent (but not attached) to Queens Wharf and Piers 3 and 4, including associated discharges.
### Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F2.19.10 (A141) Structures</th>
<th>Consent is sought for the proposed marine passenger facilities (structures) required for the ferry operations.</th>
<th>Discretionary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Standards: Noise and Vibration

| F2.21.1.1 | Interface with other zones: activities in the coastal marine area must not exceed the relevant levels specified in E25 Noise and vibration. |
|-----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
|           | Intermittent exceedances of the noise levels are predicted for some aspects of the project. A conservative approach is being taken in the application by applying for this exceedance, meaning Standard I202.6.1.5(1) relating to construction noise is assessed as not being met. Resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity is required in accordance with C1.9(2). | Restricted Discretionary |

### Standards: Temporary Coastal Marine Area

| F2.21.10.4(1) Standards: Temporary Coastal Marine Area | The temporary structures must be in place for no more longer than 14 days within any six month period (except that temporary structures associated with maintenance, repair, reconstruction, alteration, extension or construction works must be in place no longer than the duration of the construction project or 40 working days, whichever is the lesser). Temporary structure will be required in the CMA during construction for a period of up to 12 months, therefore resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity is required in accordance with C1.9(2). | Restricted Discretionary |

### Central Wharves Precinct — Chapter I202

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I202.4.1 (A18) Use and activities and associated occupation</th>
<th>Offices, retail, commercial services and entertainment facilities. The proposal includes new retail/food and beverage and relocated office activities within the ferry terminal buildings (Piers 1 and 2).</th>
<th>Discretionary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I202.4.1 (A28) Development</td>
<td>Hard protection structures including wave attenuation devices. The proposal includes the construction of a breakwater to provide tranquil waterspace adjacent to the pontoons.</td>
<td>Restricted Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I202.4.1 (A35) Development</td>
<td>New buildings, and alterations and additions to buildings not otherwise provided for. The proposal includes the alteration of the DFT building.</td>
<td>Restricted Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I202.6.1.5 Standards: Construction Noise</td>
<td>Construction noise within the Central Wharves Precinct must not exceed the noise levels specified in E25.6.28. Intermittent exceedances of the noise levels are predicted for some aspects of the project. A conservative approach is being taken in the application by applying for this exceedance, meaning Standard I202.6.1.5(1) relating to construction noise is assessed as not being met. Resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity is required in accordance with C1.9(2).</td>
<td>Restricted Discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I202.6.1.9 Public Accessways</td>
<td>(1) Public accessways must be provided at ground level around the perimeter of Princes Wharf and Queens Wharf. The public accessways must have minimum dimensions as follows: (a) Princes Wharf: 6m (b) Queens Wharf: 10m</td>
<td>Restricted Discretionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) All public accessways within and around Princes Wharf and Queens Wharf must be available to the public at all times except where it is necessary to temporarily restrict access for security, safety or operational needs associated with marine and port activities or temporary events permitted under the Auckland-wide temporary activity rules or by resource consent.

(3) Buildings or structures must not locate within the accessways. This standard does not apply to verandahs or lawful temporary buildings or structures.

The proposal includes both temporary and permanent seating and lighting within the public accessway. Resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity is required in accordance with C1.9(2).

### 6.3 PERMITTED ACTIVITIES

Schedule 4 of the RMA requires that where an application is relying on a permitted activity as part of the proposal, a description of the permitted activity that demonstrates that it complies with the requirements, conditions and permissions for the permitted activity must be provided.

The following permitted activities set out in Table 5 below form part of the proposal:

#### Table 5: Permitted Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUP Rule</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic Heritage Overlay - Chapter D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17.4.1 (A11) Buildings and structures</td>
<td><strong>Temporary buildings and structures, including structure accessory to temporary activities</strong>&lt;br&gt;The proposal includes temporary structures for construction within the scheduled extent of place of Category A and B places.</td>
<td><strong>Permitted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17.4.1 (A13 and A14) Signs and ancillary structures</td>
<td><strong>Identification and safety signs and temporary signs</strong>&lt;br&gt;The proposal includes identification and safety signs and temporary signage during construction within the scheduled extent of place of Category A and B places.</td>
<td><strong>Permitted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D17.4.1 (A16) Signs and ancillary structures</td>
<td><strong>Security lighting and alarm systems</strong>&lt;br&gt;The proposal includes the installation of security lighting.</td>
<td><strong>Permitted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Wide – Taking, Using, Damming, and Diversion of Water – Chapter E7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7.4.1 (A27) Diversion of groundwater</td>
<td><strong>Diversion of groundwater caused by any excavation (including trench) or tunnel</strong>&lt;br&gt;The proposed piling activity meet Standards E7.6.1.10.</td>
<td><strong>Permitted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland Wide – Lighting Chapter E24</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24.4.1 (A1) Lighting</td>
<td><strong>Activities that comply with all the relevant permitted activity standards</strong>&lt;br&gt;The proposal will meet the standards in E24.6.1 for both temporary and permanent lighting.</td>
<td><strong>Permitted</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Auckland Transport

November 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUP Rule</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Activity Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F2.19.2</td>
<td>Coastal marine area depositing of material where the deposited sediment is extracted from within the same coastal cell maximum of 1,500m² per 12 month period.</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2.19.4</td>
<td>Coastal marine area disturbance that is associated with movement up to 1,500m³ of sediment per calendar year within the same coastal cell.</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2.19.8</td>
<td>Vehicle use, other than parking, on existing lawful coastal marine area structures.</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2.19.10</td>
<td>Navigational aids.</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I202.4.1</td>
<td>Public amenities.</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4 National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health 2011 (NES Soil)

The NES Soil regulations relating to soil disturbance and land use change are not applicable as the proposal related to the CMA and does not include soil disturbance or land use change.

### 6.5 Reasons for Consent Summary

Overall, the proposal is to be assessed as a **Discretionary Activity** under the AUP.
7 ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS ASSESSMENT

Section 104(1) sets out that when considering an application for resource consent a Council must have regard to any actual and potential effects on the environment of allowing the activity. In accordance with section 104(2) when forming an opinion on the actual and potential effects on the environment a consent authority may disregard an adverse effect of the activity on the environment if a national environmental standard or the plan permits an activity with that effect. The following assessment is an analysis of both positive and negative actual and potential effects arising from the proposal.

7.1 PERMITTED BASELINE

Although the AUP provides for some activities to be undertaken within the Central Wharves Precinct as permitted activities, without the need to obtain resource consent, the proposal does not rely on a permitted baseline. There are no unimplemented resource consents that would affect the existing environment.

7.2 URBAN DESIGN

A Design Statement has been prepared by Isthmus and is in Attachment C. The report sets out the project brief for the ferry piers and the terminal upgrade. The following design response For the Ferry terminal upgrade seeks to retain the current terminal for the next 5 to 10 years and upgrade the terminal where necessary to improve customer experience through:

- Spatial efficiency for anticipated increased customer patronage
- Shelter from rain and sun
- Lighting particularly natural light
- Connections to Queens wharf and city
- Removal of the gates to the facilities
- Improved wayfinding.

For the ferry piers and infrastructure the proposed infrastructure has been designed to accommodate an anticipated 20 year capacity and to allow improvements to the ferry berthing.

The design includes six berths so that they can accommodate all of the vessels in the current fleet, shelter for waiting passengers on the gangways only, gangways with three lanes to provide two waiting queues and one egress queue per gang-way (noting this configuration can be changed depending on requirement), enough pontoon space to allow efficient boarding and servicing, minimal spatial requirements on Queens Wharf and transport infrastructure of a civic nature.
In responding to the brief, the design “is intended to be highly efficient, logical and coherent. The design is rationalised to a series of near identical pontoons and a suite of designed functional parts that makeup all the seaward ferry infrastructure. The design intends to create a look and feel that befits its civic transport infrastructure nature while firmly placing it within the Waitamata of Tāmaki Makaurau”.

For the pier infrastructure, the design seeks to respect Queens Wharf as an important civic space on Auckland’s Waterfront and create a simple and clear design, which is legible but reflective of the civic nature and scale of the location.

For the terminal, the modifications seek to reveal the terminal by removing the East Annexe, create a public terminal by removing the ticketing gates, open the northern and western sides of the terminal, re-purpose the existing heritage walkway to function as a pedestrian thoroughfare, provide more lighting and improve seating, signage and way-finding.

The design has positive effects in that it upgrades and consolidates ferry infrastructure in the ferry basin, utilises the existing terminal as the gateway to the expanded ferry infrastructure, removes the East Annexe building and opens the ferry terminal to the general public, utilises Queens Wharf as part of the public infrastructure of the city and enables a new public open space to be developed adjacent to Quay Street.

The upgraded ferry facilities enhance ferry transport in the region, makes the Central City more accessible and integrates with other transport networks including bus, rail and cycling.

7.3 CHARACTER, VISUAL AMENITY AND LANDSCAPE

The RMA defines amenity values as those natural or physical qualities and characteristics of an area that contribute to people’s appreciation of its pleasantness, aesthetic coherence and cultural and recreational attributes. Isthmus has prepared a Landscape, Visual and Urban Design Assessment in support of the application contained in Attachment F. The report makes the following observations in terms of the location and context of the ferry basin and the natural character of the area:

- The Waitemata Harbour is the Central City’s most significant natural feature, important to the city’s history and character. From the northern side of Quay Street adjacent to the inner part of the ferry basin outlook to the Waitemata Harbour is limited to a framed view towards Stanley Point and Shoal Bay. This contrasts with the northern end of Princes Wharf and Queens Wharf where the outlook is more panoramic.
The Ferry Basin has been used for ferry services since the early nineteen century with larger ferries using saw-toothed berths on Piers 1 and 2 and smaller ferries using the berths perpendicular to Quay Street.

The city’s harbour edge is the Quay Street seawall beyond which wharves project into the harbour perpendicular to the seawall.

The original topography of the coastal edge, characterised by bays and headlands has been lost through successive reclamations.

West of Queens Wharf, the waterfront has progressively been ‘opened up’ to greater public access and use.

Queens Wharf has a particular significance as the connection between Auckland and the Waitemata Harbour.

Queens Wharf is 3.26m above Auckland Datum 1946, mean sea level is 0.16m and the highest tide is 1.96m. Auckland has a large tidal range of approximately 3m and up to 3.65m at maximum tides.

The waterfront is framed by Quay Street and the Central City to the south with the Quay Street frontage comprising a mix of heritage buildings and taller modern towers. One of the key views from the City Centre to the ferry basin is along Albert Street.

The ferry basin has highly modified natural character, with a geometric shape, an original landform transformed by reclamation.

Waves and tidal currents influenced by wharf structures, no natural terrestrial vegetation and low ecological values.

Despite the degraded characteristics and qualities of the ferry basin, it retains aspects of natural character, including being characterised by water, including the rise and fall of the tides, the sight and smell of the sea and the visual connections to the wider harbour.

### 7.3.1 Amenity Values

The report assesses the effects of the proposed marine structures (floating pontoon, gangways, breakwater) on the amenity values of the ferry basin. The report notes that the ferry berths have an obvious functional need to locate in the CMA and the ferry terminal facilities have an operational need to locate adjacent to the berths. The report considers that the proposal will be in keeping with the visual character of the ferry basin. The assessment of amenity values is undertaken in the context that ferries are an integral part of the ferry basin’s existing amenity values and that such activities are anticipated in the planning documents.

In terms of the proposed marine structures the landscape architect considers that specific aspects of the design minimise the impact of the berths on the amenity values of the basin, including that the:
“Pontoons have a reasonably low profile (in this case approximately 1.6m) compared to fixed wharves, and they respond to the rise and fall of the tide.

Pontoons will be visually anchored by Queens Wharf. The alignment of the gangways parallel with the wharf – along with the main pontoon and piling line – assists in this regard.

The alignment of berths along one side of the ferry basin minimises interruption of outlook to the wider Waitematā Harbour.

The layout and design will reduce potential visual clutter. The pontoons follow a simple ‘saw-tooth’ layout and will have a consistent base freeboard height. The gangways, piling and fender dolphins similarly follow a regular arrangement. The benefit of a simple arrangement is that it will reduce the extent to which the berths reduce legibility of the ferry basin itself – sometimes referred to as clear figure-ground differentiation. In other words, the cleaner and less cluttered the berths, the less they will distract from the ability to ‘read’ the ferry basin as a whole. To illustrate by contrast, existing Piers 1 and 2 do distract from legibility of the ferry basin because of their cluttered appearance: Piers 1A, 1B and 1C each have a different design, gangways aligned at contrasting angles, freeboards of varying height, and a variety of canopies and other fittings."

The gangways leading to the pontoons are proposed to be covered to offer shelter to passengers as they wait for their ferry service. The shelter is proposed to be fixed to the breakwater and will be independent of the gangways which will rise and fall with the tide. The three 60m long structures are regularly spaced along the western wharf edge and they will sit 6.0m above the wharf level. As a result they will be a relatively prominent structure, however factors to mitigate adverse landscape and visual effects include that the structures will be of a scale that are in keeping with the wharf and will have low horizontal proportions when compared to The Cloud and Shed 10 which form the backdrop to these structures. They also reduce the prominence of the gangways and reinforce the horizontal lines of the wharf with views to and from the wharf retained through and between the structures. The height of the structures complies with the 18m height limit that applies to the wharf and the structures are not located on the wharf and maintain the 10m public accessway required around the perimeter of Queens Wharf.

The report assesses the impact of the proposed breakwater on Queens Wharf. The report notes that the proposed breakwater will “create an impression of a seawall along the eastern edge of the basin” and that it will “eliminate the visual transparency under the wharf”, appearing more solid and reducing the legibility of the wharf. The report concludes however that the presence of the breakwater will result in Queens Wharf taking on an appearance more akin to a quay and that any adverse effects of the breakwater structure on the wharf are minimised given the width of the wharf and that views beneath it are already somewhat localised and limited.
Breakwaters are a common structural element in the CMA, particularly where floating pontoons are provided in order to provide more sheltered and tranquil waterspace. While the structure will be visible, its prominence will be reduced by the piles being sheathed in black polyethylene and the gangway and floating pontoon structures located in front of it, which will rise and fall with the tide. The dynamic environment and presence of other structures will reduce the prominence of the breakwater structure such that any adverse effects on the legibility and visual amenity of Queens Wharf are minor.

The proposed floating pontoons, gangways, shelters and breakwater are not uncommon features in the CMA and are structures characteristic of an active water’s edge for maritime passenger operations. The proposed marine structures are in keeping with the character and amenity of the ferry basin and add to the vitality and visual interest that the movement of boats and people brings to his part of the waterfront.

7.3.2 Visual Effects

The report addresses the visual effects of the proposal on the area surrounding the Ferry Basin including Queens Wharf, the Ferry Building, Princes Wharf and parts of Quay Street. The report assesses the visual effects from eight representative locations around the Ferry Basin and assesses these collectively to form an understanding of the visual effects on the surrounding area, of which a number are illustrated in visual simulations. The report concludes that overall, the magnitude of change will be low around most of the basin, with more localised moderate effects from Queens Wharf and from the water in the vicinity of the berths. The following viewpoints have been identified and assessed in the report.

- Viewpoint 1 – Princes Wharf: The ferry berths and structures will be seen against the backdrop of Queens Wharf, with the structures being slightly more apparent from upper floors of the building with the magnitude of effect being moderate-low and the nature of the effect largely benign.

- Viewpoint 2 – Quay Street: The ferry berths and structures will also be seen against the backdrop of Queens Wharf and will be partially blocked by Pier 2, with the exception of a small portion of the outer berth. The magnitude of effect is assessed as being low and the nature of the effect largely benign. It is noted that the removal of Piers 3 and 4 will open up views of the basin and have positive effects from this area.

- Viewpoint 3 – Albert Street: The proposed marine structures will not be visible from Sightline 16 in the AUP down Albert Street.

- Viewpoint 4 – Ferry Building: The ferry structures are assessed as potentially reducing harbour views from the deck of the Ferry Building, although it is acknowledged that these are constricted in the
foreground by the existing piers and vessels. The magnitude of effect is assessed as being low-moderate and the nature of the effect largely benign.

- Viewpoint 5 – Upper Floors of Ferry Building: The ferry berths are assessed as being more visible from the upper floors of the Ferry Building, including the terraces where views of the open water over the existing ferry structures are visible. Notwithstanding this, the outlook from the upper floors over the wider harbour, in addition to the ferry basin. While the reduction in the extent of open water will be adverse in nature these effects will be mitigated by the design of the berths are considered to be low-moderate.

- Viewpoint 6 – Downtown Buildings: The ferry structures will be visible form the upper floors of the tower buildings in Downtown Auckland with the ferry structures having similar visual effects as described above for the Ferry Building, although more removed. For the upper levels of these buildings the ferry basin is a relatively small component of the wider harbour view and the magnitude of effects is assessed as being low.

- Viewpoint 7 – Queens Wharf: The report notes that the most noticeable effects on views will be from the western side of Queens Wharf in the immediate vicinity of the ferry berths. The largest audience is assessed as being the future ferry passengers with the berths reducing the existing extent of open water. These effects are somewhat mitigated by the design of the ferry structures. While the character of the views will change, they are in keeping with the existing character and amenity values of the basin. The effects are assessed as being moderate from this area with a mix of benign and adverse impacts.

- Viewpoint 8 – From the Water: The berths are assessed as being visible from on the water within the ferry basin and the immediate adjacent part of the Waitemata Harbour. Again, the berths will reduce the existing extent of open waterspace within the ferry basin, although this will be mitigated to some extent of the design of the structures. The magnitude of effects is assessed as being moderate within the ferry basin and low in the immediate approached to the ferry basin.

The report concludes that the nature of such effects will largely be benign, although there will be some adverse effects resulting from a reduction in the extent of open water in the Ferry Basin and an interruption in the open outlook from Queens Wharf. The character of the views will also change from a relatively uncluttered wharf edge (when vessels are not berthed) to an outlook characterised by ferry facilities. Notwithstanding this, ferry activities are an aspect of the existing character and amenity of the ferry basin, are contemplated in the planning documents and part of a working waterfront. In addition the ferry berths
will have visual connection to the Ferry Building and other piers and is in keeping with the overall character and amenity of the area.

While the proposal will change the existing landscape, the effects on this on the surrounding environment are considered to be appropriate when viewed in the context of the highly modified coastal environment and the maritime nature of the proposed activity. The proposal sits within the City Centre Downtown Waterfront and the proposed uses and structures are contemplated in the AUP zoning and precinct provisions.

### 7.3.3 Effects on Queens Wharf

The landscape report assesses the effects of the proposed ferry facilities on the character of the Queens Wharf and the use of the wharf as a public space and makes the following observations:

- "The location of ticketing gates on the gangway landings means the facilities will not constrain public access to Queens Wharf. On the contrary, the removal of ticketing gates will open up public access to Queens Wharf through the ferry terminal.
- The western side of Queens Wharf currently has low use as a public place – mainly because people are drawn beyond this area to the end of the wharf.
- The greatest current informal recreational use of Queens Wharf – and the greatest potential open space opportunities, is at the northern end of the wharf. The area is a natural destination, it connects with the wider harbour, it offers panoramic views and provides an expansive openness that contrasts with the adjacent downtown urban streets. The pontoons will stop short 6m of the end of Queens Wharf, and the outermost gangway structure will stop some 23m short of the end of the wharf and the inside angled corner of this structure will be set back approximately 6m short of the end of 'the Cloud'. The proposed ferry facilities will increase activity and will likely attract more people to the wharf: Currently people are likely to be dissuaded by its somewhat deserted appearance".

The report also assesses the potential conflict between passengers and vehicles servicing activities on Queens Wharf (including the Cloud and cruise ships operations). The main area of potential conflict is between The Cloud and the western edge of the wharf, which is approximately 7-8m wide. Currently, this area serves as general pedestrian access to the northern end of the wharf, access to vessels berthed on Queens Wharf West and as a thoroughfare for vehicles servicing events in the Cloud and passengers and freight when a cruise ship is in port. Although some pedestrian/vehicle conflict already exists, a number of options to mitigate the increase in the number of passengers accessing ferries along the western edge have been considered in conjunction with the applicant’s traffic engineer including either a shared space treatment, or a physical segregation with barriers. The ITA proposes that the latter option, using a mix of
permanent benches and temporary traffic control elements on those occasions when buses are servicing cruise ships. The benches are to be aligned –together with lighting and signs – in a straight line offset approximately 3.5m from the edge of Queens Wharf (to the back of the benches) providing a 3.5m-5.5m lane for buses during cruise ship servicing. At other times the full 7m-9m width would be available for pedestrians. This is illustrated in Figure 14 below and shows a commuter zone and vehicle zone separated by permanent and temporary seating.

![Figure 14: Proposed Traffic Management on Queens Wharf (Source: Isthmus Architectural Drawings)](image)

While the character of the western side of the wharf will change from an area that is occasionally used for the mooring of vessels to a ferry passenger operation, the later activities are an integral part of a downtown waterfront setting and characteristic of an important gateway to the city centre. The western side of the wharf will become more “visually busy” with the movement of ferries and people and the rise and fall of the infrastructure with the tides, however such effects are not adverse in themselves. Rather, they are part and parcel of an active downtown waterfront and includes structures and facilities required to enable this important gateway to the city centre to function. The activities and structures add to the theatre of the waterfront, making it a visually interesting place to visit, view and traverse and are compatible with existing activities undertaken on Queens Wharf.

7.3.4 Connectivity and Sense of Place

The landscape report assesses the connectivity and circulation of the proposal and its contribution to sense of place. Overall, the landscape architect concludes that the legibility of ferry services will be improved with the consolidation of ferry services on Queens Wharf and the accessing of these berths through a common,
and more accessible terminal building. Further, it is assessed that the following elements of the proposed design assist circulation and wayfinding:

- The three gangway structures generally aligning with the central axis of the Ferry Building helping the piers visually connect with that historic building.
- Numbered markers on the fender piles (‘marker dolphins’) to each berth.
- The installation of glass louvres increasing visibility of the Ferry Building from within the ferry terminal.
- The use of the historic ferry shelter for pedestrian circulation.
- Improved lighting to the historic ferry shelter.
- The splay introduced to the retail facilities at the north end of the terminal will open up physical and visual connections to Queens Wharf.

An assessment of the National Guidelines for Crime Prevention through Environmental Design assesses that the proposal accords with the seven qualities that characterise well designed and safe spaces in that it improves sightlines and passive surveillance, is legible and has active security measures.

Overall, the author agrees with the conclusions of the landscape architect that the strengthening of the ferry basin for ferry services will positively contribute to the sense of place of Auckland’s waterfront particularly given the proposed cultural expression of the ‘marker dolphins’, the retention of the historic features of Queens Wharf, the use of the historic ferry shelter for its original purpose (as a passenger thoroughfare) and the strengthening of the visual connections with the Ferry Building.

7.3.5 Natural Character

The ferry basin, and indeed the Central Wharves, is highly modified coastal environment, altered through successive reclamations and the construction of wharves, piers, pontoons, fenders and other marine structures within the waterspace. There are limited remnants of naturalness (abiotic or biotic) associated with the ferry basin and the area is not a pristine coastal environment, rather it is assessed as having low ecological value. The landscape architect considers that any adverse effects on natural character will be low given the existing degree of modification of the coastal environment, the existing qualities and characteristics of the ferry basin and the extent of waterspace to be occupied.

While the proposal will result in additional marine structures, ferries have a functional need to locate in the CMA and the proposal is located adjacent to existing ferry services, makes efficient use of existing infrastructure and avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of use within the CMA. The proposed use is anticipated use in the statutory and non-statutory planning documents and is appropriate within the context
of the areas highly modified nature and consistent with the maritime function of the area. The location and
design of new marine structures minimises their impact on the waterspace within the ferry basin and are in
keeping with the character of uses typically located adjacent to wharf structures.

Overall, the proposal will result in a relatively small extent of additional water space being occupied with a
small reduction in the perceived natural character of the ferry basin leading the landscape architect to assess
that the ferry facilities are an appropriate activity in an appropriate location and notwithstanding the low
extent of existing natural character, the proposal avoids and minimises potential effects on those
characteristics and qualities of natural character that do remain.

7.3.6 Construction Effects

The landscape architect has assessed the landscape and visual effects arising from construction and
concludes that while they will have ‘moderate-high’ adverse visual effects in their immediate vicinity
the effects are localised, of a short duration, set in the context of a working port and will be interpreted
as part of the redevelopment of the downtown waterfront.

7.3.7 Summary

The proposal will result in some visual change in the ferry basin and to the level of activity on the western
side of Queens Wharf and will alter the nature of existing views to the CMA from the surrounding visual
catchment. The proposed activity has a functional need to locate in the CMA and integrates with and makes
efficient use of existing infrastructure. While some existing public and private views will change, the
proposed use is anticipated within the statutory documents and ferry services are an established activity
within the ferry basin. The proposal is in keeping with the character and amenity values of the ferry basin
and contributes to an integrated public transport network, given the areas close proximity to other modes
of transport: bus, rail and cycling.

The level of adverse effect has been assessed as being moderate in degree and mostly benign in nature with
adverse landscape, visual and natural character effects limited to occupation of water within the ferry basin,
and interruption of outlook from locations on the western side of the basin. While the proposed breakwater
will also reduce the extent to which Queens Wharf is legible as a wharf, this is mitigated to some extent by
the location and design of the proposed berths and the movement of the infrastructure with the tides. At
the same time, the landscape architect assesses that there will be positive effects with respect of landscape,
visual, natural character and urban design matters, arising from consolidation of ferry facilities on the
western side of the basin, reconfiguration of the ferry terminal, and the removal of the existing piers from
the Quay Street end of the basin.
Taking the above into account, it is considered that the potential adverse landscape, visual amenity and natural character effects of the proposal will be minor.

7.4 **HISTORIC HERITAGE**

The works are proposed in an area of Auckland developed in the early 1900s and unsurprisingly, the proposal includes physical infrastructure works either on, attached to, or in close proximity to historic heritage including the following scheduled items:

- Queens Wharf
- The Ferry Shelter
- The Ferry Building
- The Public Shelters
- The Auckland Harbour Board ‘Blue Fence’ and historic ‘Red Fence’.

Plan Heritage has prepared a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) in support of the application, and specifically to provide as assessment on the proposed interventions and methodologies relevant to protection and enhancement of the historic heritage building and features located in this area. The HIA also assess the impact of the proposal on the historic setting of the heritage items. The HIA is contained in Attachment G.

The proposal results in the following proposed changes to built heritage places as part of the project:

- Modifications to the Ferry Terminal building located on the scheduled Queens Wharf and adjacent to the scheduled Ferry Building.
- Resurfacing and new landscaping treatments to a portion of Queens Wharf adjacent to the Ferry Terminal and within the Ferry Building Extent of Place.
- New wharf extensions to connect to three proposed gangways located along the western edge of the Queens Wharf and balustrading between the gangway shelters.
- Permanent and temporary seating (including lighting poles) along the western side of Queens Wharf to delineate between pedestrian and vehicle traffic.
- A vehicle ramp fixed to the surface of Queens Wharf between The Cloud and Shed 10 to enable service vehicles and coaches to utilise the central accessway during construction.
- Modifications to the historic ferry shelter structure located on Queens Wharf within the Ferry Terminal building. This includes the modification of the northern façade of the structure and the installation of skylights in the roof.
The HIA assesses the effects of these changes on the historic heritage buildings and a previously relocated section of the AHB fence will be retained and are not impacted by the demolition of Piers 3 and 4. Overall, the HIA includes the following assessment:

- Three new wharf extension connections required to locate gangways onto the main wharf structure will abut the existing wharf. To accommodate these, discrete sections of the concrete ‘lip’ which runs along the edge of the wharf will need to be removed to create level access. While these sections will be permanently removed, they are not substantial and of a negligible adverse effect given the extent of the concrete lip remaining.

- The removal of modern structures and features in the Ferry Terminal Building does not affect the heritage values of the wharf and is likely to improve the legibility of the Queens Wharf Ferry Shelter.

- The modifications proposed to the historic ferry shelter will improve way-finding and permeability and ensure that the shelter continues to have a functional use.

- Modifications of the landscaped area to the east of the terminal building will be undertaken in a manner that retain and enhance the legibility of historic features ‘in-ground’ on the Queens Wharf superstructure itself. These include the rail tracks which are a primary feature of the wharf and the former weighbridge located adjacent to the Queens Wharf gates. Permanent and temporary seating will be placed in a manner that retains and does not obscure the existing rail tracks.

- The construction of the breakwater and saw-tooth ferry berths along the western edge of the Queens Wharf will result in a loss of visual legibility of the Queens Wharf superstructure from key viewpoints along Princes Wharf and from the southeast of the Ferry Basin, particularly during high tide times. However, the wharf itself will still be visible as a whole and there will be no loss of understanding of the wharf as part of the historic context of the harbour area.

- The use of the wharf for berthing of vessels will not be altered, so that its primary historical function remains apparent.

- The proposal will result in improvements to the kinetic experience of the Queens Wharf, the AHB Fence, and the Ferry Building when on the wharf itself. There are also improvements at key views to the Wharf, the AHB Fence and the Ferry Building when experienced from the junction with Lower Queen Street and Quay Street, and from the Wharf itself. When looking out from the Wharf, there will be no significant loss of appreciation for the Princes Wharf, and other Built Heritage places identified within the Ferry Basin.

- Queens Wharf will continue to serve the same function as it did historically and the enhanced use of the wharf for ferry services will ensure a long-term viable and appropriate use for the built heritage structure.

- No cumulative effects have been identified to historic heritage places as a result of this proposal that will result in significant adverse effects to the historic heritage values of Queens Wharf, or any
other scheduled built heritage places in the vicinity of the works. The cumulative physical changes proposed to Queens Wharf will result in minor adaptation of the historical fabric and will maintain the form, purpose and materiality of the structure, including the primary heritage features of the Wharf. The effect of this physical change on the overall heritage values of Queens Wharf is assessed as being of a permanent but ‘less than minor’ adverse effect.

- The historic Ferry Shelter has been modified since its construction in the early 1900s however its current form and location forms part of the existing environment and was approved as part of the coastal permit issued when the main ferry terminal building was redeveloped around 2003. The HIA outlines that at this time, the southern portion of the Ferry Shelter was reduced in size and orientated so that the southern terminal of the historical shelter is parallel with the eastern wall of the Ferry Terminal, and stops in line with the ticket gates. The HIA concludes that the northern extent of the shelter appears to occupy its original location within the wharf, which itself has been extended further to the west as part of the previous Ferry Terminal redevelopment. The HIA notes that the environment that currently exists is unchanged from that at the time of scheduling, and therefore it is this environment which forms the basis for consideration of cumulative change to the Ferry Shelter. In this regard, the HIA concludes that the proposed modifications are not considered to generate cumulative effects to the Ferry Shelter. The Ferry Shelter remains essentially in its historical context, and will be fully appreciable as an original Edwardian wharf structure.

- There will be a high beneficial effect to the historic heritage values of Queens Wharf through the removal of modern structures which have accreted onto the Wharf and which currently obscure or interrupt the understanding of the heritage values for Queens Wharf, the adjacent Ferry Building and the AHB Fence.

The HIA report concludes the following:

“The proposed works require discrete modifications to the western edge of Queens Wharf for gangway connections to serve the proposed ferry berthing pontoons. The proposals also seek to remove or modify modern wharf structures which have progressively reduced the legibility of historic wharf structures and nearby built heritage places such as the Ferry Building. As part of the proposed terminal upgrade, minor interventions are proposed to the existing ferry shelter located on the Wharf, and some alterations at ground level to the Wharf superstructure. The proposal is assessed overall as having less than minor adverse effects to Queens Wharf, and less than minor adverse effects to the AHB Fence and Ferry Building, as a result of physical changes within the extent of place. The proposal will also generate less than minor adverse effects to the setting of Queens Wharf, and nearby built heritage places.”
On the basis of the heritage assessment, it is considered that any adverse effects on heritage values arising from the proposal are less than minor overall. Further, the proposal will generate long-term positive effects on the heritage values of Queens Wharf through improved use of Queens Wharf for public transport uses.

7.5 Geotechnical and Groundwater

The proposed structures associated with the ferry basin redevelopment will be supported on piles, which significantly reduces the potential interaction with the seabed. Tonkin & Taylor has undertaken project specific geotechnical investigations to develop a geological model of Downtown Auckland, including part of the Ferry Basin. The subsurface geology in the vicinity of the proposed works consists of Upper Tauranga Group (Holocene age sediments), Lower Tauranga Group (Pleistocene age sediments) and Waitematā Group sandstone and siltstone rock.

T&T has undertaken and assessment of the geotechnical and groundwater effects that may result from the proposed works. The report is contained in Attachment H. The report states that the use of well-proven design, construction methodologies, and practices are expected to appropriately avoid, remedy or mitigate potential geotechnical and groundwater effects.

In assessing the geotechnical effects associated with the excavation of deep pile holes, it is concluded in the report that the pile design process will specifically addresses pile (and excavation) stability to ensure that a suitable factor of safety is maintained to prevent the occurrence of ground subsidence and instability at or below the seabed. In addition, casing will be used where necessary to construct piles which will provide temporary support to the ground.

The report considers the geotechnical risks during construction due to large machinery (cranes and piling rigs) positioned on top of the existing Queens Wharf that could potentially induce instability. It is concluded that this can be avoided or remedied as part of detailed design with temporary staging and/or propping of existing structures able to be utilised if necessary and a monitoring and contingency plan implemented during the works if required.

The report states that no meaningful volume of groundwater will be extracted during pile construction and as a result, there is not considered to be any groundwater related effects as groundwater drawdown is not expected to occur as a result of the of the works.

Overall, the geotechnical and groundwater effects are assessed as being less than minor to negligible.
### 7.6 Contamination

T&T has undertaken a ground contamination assessment which is contained in Attachment I. The report notes that the environmental effects of ground contamination present in the CMA primarily relate to discharges of contaminated sediment during piling works that disturb the seabed. The Coastal Processes Assessment undertaken by T&T and discussed in Section 7.7 below concludes that the probability of large silt plumes as a result of the piling operations is considered low. It is recommend to use silt curtain during construction. Provided spoil generated by the piling works is managed ground contamination related effects on the environment are expected to be less than minor. The Contamination Report also recommends that measures to mitigate any health effects associated with the handling and disposal of marine sediments be include in the CEMP.

### 7.7 Coastal Processes

An assessment of the effects of the proposal on coastal processes has been prepared by T&T and is included in Attachment J. The report assesses the effects of the temporary disturbance of the seabed through piling and construction activities and the effects of the proposed coastal marine structures on the propagation of wave and tidal currents within the Ferry Basin, which may change sediment transport processes.

The report describes physical setting of the proposed works being a tidal estuary situated on the southern shore of the inner harbour. The Bathymetry of the west side of Queens Wharf is dredged to -11.5m CD and slopes up towards the seawall along Quay Street. No dredging is required or proposed for this application. There are relatively shallow depths of fine sediment adjacent to the Ferry Basin seawall and predominantly very fine sands to mud in the vicinity of the proposed works. The inner harbour area is relatively sheltered form swells however waves are generated from wakes acting on the water surface and the wakes produced by manoeuvring vessels. The main tidal currents are generated along the main channel flowing west to east. Mean current speeds towards the end of Queens Wharf reach approx. 0.15m/s and reduce within the ferry basin to around 0.06m/s. The propeller wash of mooring vessels and sediment transport is detailed with vessel movements around the shallower parts of the ferry basin expected to disburse seabed sediments. The remobilised sediment is disbursed through the water column and ultimately resettles in natural depositional areas, such as under Queens Wharf.

#### 7.7.1 Construction effects

The report details that the main disturbance to the seabed will be from the pile installation and assesses the probability of large silt plumes as a result of the piling operations to be low and of a short term duration. The technique of using bored piles within casings will contain most of the disturbed sediments within the
steel casings. During this process of boring through the seabed a fraction of the material is expelled during the fragmentation resulting in the suspension of sediments. Coarse material will settle close to the area of disturbance but there is likely to be a visual effect by slightly higher levels of discolouration around the work area. Due to the low tidal currents within the basin the sediment is likely to settle back within the commercial harbour area for the majority of the works. During piling towards the end of Queens Wharf some sediment may be transported by the faster tidal currents in to the estuary. The probability of large silt plumes as a result of the piling operations during the construction phase is considered low and the short term effects to the coastal processes are considered to be minor. It is recommend to use silt curtains during construction to mitigate sedimentation effects.

7.7.2 Tidal Currents

The report assesses the effects of the breakwater on the tidal currents by comparing the mean current speed for the existing and proposed scenarios during spring and neap conditions. The modelling shows that tidal currents are modified by the presence of the proposed breakwater. The report outlines that during ebb conditions the tidal flows are redirected along the breakwater in to the Ferry Basin and during flood conditions slightly higher velocities are seen in the large eddy formation that develops within the Ferry Basin. The report details that mean current speeds are mostly undisturbed towards the northern end of the breakwater but are increased along the remainder of its length. Overall the conclusion drawn is that while the breakwater increases tidal currents by up to 60% in places the overall mean current speeds remain low at around 0.10 m/s. It is considered that this may have the added benefit of increasing circulation around the Ferry Basin to improve water quality and maintain adequate flushing of the ferry basin.

In order to provide further evidence of flushing, contaminant transport modelling was undertaken to track the spread and dilution of contaminants through the Ferry Basin and surrounding wharves. This showed that while the relative influence of the breakwater on flushing is small, the small change in velocities resulting from the breakwater actually improves dilution times due to increased mixing.

7.7.3 Waves

The report considers the effect of the proposed breakwater on the waves entering the Ferry Basin from the north-west and north and assesses these as being largely undisturbed by the presence of the breakwater although there is some sheltering in its leeward side at Queens Wharf east. The purpose of the breakwater is to provide sheltering in the Ferry Basin for waves from the north-east and east. Overall, wave heights are reduced by up to 0.5 m for waves from the north-east and almost 1m from the east in some locations for the 100 year ARI storm conditions.
7.7.4 Sediment

Sediments within the Ferry Basin can be transported by propeller wash, waves and tidal currents. The report details that at the water depths along Queens Wharf, velocities produced by ferries are unlikely to reach the seabed and therefore will not change the sediment transport. This is due to the type of waves that arrive at the site being deep and short period waves. As a result, their orbital velocities will therefore not reach the seabed and as such will not disturb the sediments deposited there.

The report notes that tidal currents are the greatest force attributing to the movement of sediments in and around the proposed works. The report details that the flow of the tidal currents with the presence of the proposed breakwater has been shown to be slightly modified from the present situation. The report concludes that it is likely that the area to the east and west of the piled breakwater will become a natural area of sedimentation, much like the existing wharves and waterfront. However, due to the existing depth and the fact that the wharf has been used for deeper draft vessels, it is concluded that any sedimentation is unlikely to affect the ferry operations. Overall the effects of the proposed works on sediment transport are considered to be minor.

7.7.5 Natural Hazards

The Coastal Processes report considers coastal hazards including storm surges, sea level rise and Tsunami. While the NZCPS includes policies relating to Tsunami’s, the AUP does not include specific policy direction or rules relating to this risk. Emergency management procedures in are place in the Central City and waterfront area co-ordinated by the Council’s Emergency Management response which include evacuation procedures for both the threat of and in response to a Tsunami event.

In accordance with the NZCPS (Policies 24 and 25), sea level rise (SLR) should be considered over a 100 year planning period. The Ministry for Environment’s (MFE) recently-released national guidance (MFE, 2017) recommends use of four SLR scenarios corresponding to different Representative Concentration Pathways. Table 6 lists the SLR allowances for these scenarios for short to long term periods. This guidance is comparable with the AUP which requires consideration of a SLR allowance of 1.0m over 100 years for land use planning controls for coastal development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>RCP 2.6 M</th>
<th>RCP 4.5 M</th>
<th>RCP 8.5M</th>
<th>RCP 83rd %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2070</td>
<td>0.32 m</td>
<td>0.36 m</td>
<td>0.45 m</td>
<td>0.61 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2120</td>
<td>0.55 m</td>
<td>0.67 m</td>
<td>1.06 m</td>
<td>1.36 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. M = median
It is proposed that for the ferry basin the floating infrastructure is designed for a 25 year design life and 50 year design life for the piles, as such a 50 year SLR will be considered of 0.5m to account for the lifetime of the proposed infrastructure. This is considered appropriate to respond to coastal risk hazards.

### 7.7.6 Marine Ecology

The coastal marine habitat of the Ferry Basin area is subtidal and the area is contained by man-made structures. The seabed has been mapped and classified as ‘soft gloopy mud’ and is not associated with high intrinsic ecological values. The AUP does not identify any Significant Ecological Areas within the Ferry Basin or in the adjacent Auckland Waterfront area.

An assessment of the effects of the proposal on marine ecology has been prepared by T&T and is included in Attachment K. The report makes the following observations in terms of the general habitat of the area:

- Marine mammals are only likely to be occasionally present within the wider ferry basin area due to the level of activity in the area.
- There is no information to suggest that the Ferry Basin project area is specifically utilised by fish species recorded near the project area to the extent that the species is dependent upon the existing habitat.
- While it is likely that coastal bird species recorded in the outer Viaduct Basin area would occasionally use the Ferry Basin area, it is unlikely that they would nest within the project area, or the immediate surrounding area.
- The hard substrate habitats offered by the seawalls, wharfs, pontoons and wave panels have been colonised by various encrusting biofouling species. Overall, the benthic assemblage was generally typical of soft sediment inshore communities with a small amount of hard substrate.
- Kaimoana species identified within the project area are limited to introduced Pacific oysters which were found along the existing wharf structures and seawall. Overall, the kaimoana values of the site are considered low.

To characterise the existing benthic fauna communities within the project footprint and surrounding area a total of eight benthic fauna samples were collected from the Ferry Basin.

The report assesses the effects of the proposed works on marine mammals, fish species, coastal birds, benthic fauna, and kaimoana. Overall the report concludes that marine ecology effects associated with the proposed works will be low for the following reasons:

- The overall effect on marine mammals and fish species is assessed as ‘very low’ and less than minor as the project footprint has been assessed as of low value for marine mammals and fish species, the
The project footprint is small and the proposed construction activity is temporary in nature. Auditory management measures will be implemented to minimise effects on marine mammals and fish species, such as the use of a dolly, following ‘soft start’ procedures, visual monitoring within a pre-established underwater management zone and low power/shut down procedures if a marine mammal is identified.

- The magnitude of effects on coastal birds is considered negligible as there is limited roosting habitat present along the shoreline of Ferry Basin, a high level of human disturbance and the coastal birds are likely to avoid the area during the construction period. The overall effect on coastal birds is assessed as ‘very low’ and less than minor.

- The project footprint has been assessed as low value for benthic fauna on the basis that there are no ‘threatened’ or ‘at risk’ species present. While the magnitude of effects is considered high in the short-term given all benthic organisms will be lost, these communities will rapidly recover in the medium term (1-3 years). Overall, the effect on benthic fauna is considered low in the short-term and very low in the long-term.

- The overall effect on kaimoana is assessed as ‘very low’ and less than minor as pacific oysters are the only kaimoana species known to be present in the project footprint, and these are not readily accessible. They are an introduced species of no conservation concern and are expected to rapidly recolonise the newly created habitat at the proposed ferry relocation site.

On the basis of the foregoing assessment, the marine ecological effects associated with the proposed project are assessed to be low overall and no more than minor. To avoid potential adverse effects on marine mammals, it is recommended that standard auditory management protocols be implemented and that a biosecurity management plan is developed and implemented prior to construction commencing.

7.8 TRANSPORT

An Integrated Transport Assessment has been prepared by Flow Transportation Specialists and is included in Attachment L. The report assesses the effects of the operation of the new piers and reconfigured ferry terminal building and the construction and cumulative effects on existing activities on Queens Wharf and surrounding buildings. The report provides a detailed description of the existing transport environment by mode type and provides information concerning the Downtown Ferry operations, current public transport facilities, cycling infrastructure, pedestrian flow, and broader Queens Wharf operation.

7.8.1 Pedestrian Movements

The Downtown Ferry Terminal serves commuter, tourist and charter services with passengers access landside either direct from Quay Street (for Piers 3 and 4) or from Quay Street through the existing Ferry
Building or Queens Wharf pedestrian access (for Piers 1 and 2). The facilities rely on Quay Street as their primary pedestrian access. The ferry terminal caters for approximately 7.6 million passengers per year (2017/18) with future patronage expected to increase to some 13 million passengers by 2027/28. Surveys of the annual passenger departures provides an indication of the level of pedestrian activity at each pier:

- Pier 1: 3,000,000
- Pier 2: 2,300,000
- Pier 3: 500,000
- Pier 4: 1,800,000

Pedestrian activity in the area is high with the main pedestrian thoroughfare connecting the central city to the Ferry terminal occurs at the Queen Street intersection with Quay Street. This crossing point is particularly busy in both the morning and evening commuter peaks and during the summer months. Pedestrian volumes on Quay Street are high with the section between Albert and Queen Streets recording the highest peak hour and daily volumes, likely to be influenced by ferry services located at Piers 3 and 4. Pedestrian volumes are considerable higher during the summer months.

### 7.8.2 Queens Wharf

Vehicle access to the Ferry piers is via two points: the primary access at Queens Wharf located to the east of the Ferry Building; and a secondary access to the west of the Ferry Building which is restricted to vehicles servicing this building and Pier 2. An ingress and egress lane is provided at the Queens Wharf access point, through the historic red fence. There are dedicated taxi/shuttle and drop-off/pick-up spaces located on either sides of the accessway. The number of vehicles entering the wharf, on non-cruise or event days, is in the order of 70 vehicles (entering/exiting) during the peak periods.

Vehicle activity is high when a cruise ship is berthed on Queens Wharf east and/or if there is an event taking place in The Cloud. Typically, peak traffic movements associated with a cruise ship in dock on a full exchange day consists of approximately 150 taxis and 50 coaches to and from the wharf. These are the highest traffic movements associated with the cruise activities. While RFA does not typically hold significant events on Queens Wharf when cruise ships with more than 3,000 passengers are berthed on the wharf, an Event Management Plan is activated when both a cruise ship is in the dock, and an event is taking place on the wharf.

Vehicle access to the Wharf during the seawall temporary works will retain the same number of lanes and remain open at all times. In order to maintain the access, the seawall works will be undertaken in the following two phases across the entrance/exit of Queens Wharf:
Phase one will commence on the eastern side of the existing Queens Wharf access, while during Phase two, the temporary works will flip to the western side.

Therefore, the vehicle access will be maintained by way of at least one entry and one exit lane during the whole construction stage of seawall works. It will be restricted to Left-In/Left-Out for eastbound general traffic.

The TIA details that subsequent to the lodgement of consent for the Queens to Marsden seawall upgrade, the vehicle access to the Wharf from Quay Street has been reviewed in respect of the proposed removal of the right turn vehicle bay into the wharf and impacts on existing wharf operations. Following the review, the proposed TTM has been subsequently amended to reinstate the right turn into the wharf from Quay Street. The right turn will be of a similar length to that currently provided, and controlled through the onsite approved Site Traffic Management Supervisors (STMS) to ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists crossing the wharf access.

The traffic engineer has assessed the capacity of the proposed three gangways. The intention is for the gangways to cater for passengers waiting to board their ferry service. Each of the three gangways can accommodate between 230 and 330 queued passengers and on a typical day, meaning no passengers will be required to queue on either the wharf or the floating pontoons. The traffic engineer considers that the worst case passenger scenarios can be accommodated with in a manner that does not cause pedestrian/vehicle conflicts on Queens Wharf. Ferry passengers and vehicles servicing cruise ships are proposed to be separated by the placement of permanent benches/seating and temporary traffic control measures when cruise ships are docked to provide demarcation as illustrated in Figure 13 above. The details of the proposed arrangement are contained in the Urban Design Report on Plans 2.15, 2.16 and 2.17 (Pages 31-33).

7.8.3 Terminal Upgrades

The upgrade of the Ferry Terminal Building proposes to open the terminal to both the north and east, allowing passengers to connect to the ferry piers to the north of the wharf and egress to the passenger drop off and eastern concourse area. In addition, the existing ticketing gates will be removed, thereby opening the terminal and improving passenger waiting areas and connections to the ferry piers. The traffic engineer concludes that the proposed terminal layout, additional six berths and associated gangway access points have been designed to maximise passenger experience and flow through the terminal to the ferry berths.
7.8.4 Construction

Construction effects, including cumulative effects have also been assessed by the traffic engineer. During construction, some of the car parks on the north-eastern corner of the wharf may be required by the contractor for site establishment, some storage of materials may be required on Queens Wharf and temporary use of a portion of the central roadway may also be required for piling material. Construction vehicle numbers for concrete pours are anticipated to be in the order of 20 truck movements to the site per day. In following matters are relevant to the consideration of construction effects:

- A CTMP is proposed to maintain the existing terminal functions and those activities on Queens Wharf for the duration the temporary works. The CTMP will be designed to cover the cumulative construction works for the Downtown projects, to mitigate the effects of all transport in the area.
- While the construction of the new berths, pontoons and associated works requires the western edge of the wharf, between the Cloud and the wharf edge, to be closed during some of the construction works, access will be maintained at specific times when events and/or when a cruise ship is in the dock. There are ongoing discussions with relevant stakeholders as to the potential full closure of western edge of the Wharf for the full construction period. The western edge, between the seaward side and the Cloud would be utilised for construction activities only for the duration of construction period. Vehicle access would be maintained via a central vehicle accessway with the installation of a temporary vehicle ramp to enable vehicles to access the northern end of the Wharf.
- Works in the terminal building will be timed to minimise the disruption to ferry passengers and avoid peak period, where practicable.
- The construction works for the Downtown Ferry Basin Redevelopment Stage 1 and the proposed Mooring dolphin¹ will be undertaken by one contractor. The timing, staging, and any associated construction access required for both works will be planned and managed by same crew from the contractor to accommodate the requirements of each project as and when required. As such, both projects are anticipated to be managed appropriately without conflicts.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal will give rise to minor adverse effects on the local transport network and any construction effects, which are temporary in duration, can be adequately mitigated through a CTMP.

¹ Lodged by Panuku Development Auckland
7.9 **NOISE AND VIBRATION**

Construction of the physical infrastructure has the potential to produce noise. Furthermore, demolition and piling activities during construction may cause vibration. The proposed works are located in close proximity to a number of sensitive receivers including:

- The Cloud
- Pier 1 Ferry Terminal Building (offices)
- Shed 10
- Pier 2 (waiting area)
- Princes Wharf Apartments and Hilton Hotel
- Ferry Building.

Demolition of Piers 3 and 4 is also located close to sensitive receivers who may be adversely impacted by demolition noise and vibration, including:

- ANZ Building
- Ferry Building
- Adventure Jet ticket booth
- Pier 2 Building (ticket booth and office)
- PWC, HABC and M Social buildings
- Princes Wharf apartments and Hilton Hotel

In addition, demolition and piling activities during construction may cause vibration effects and the location of the proposed demolition and construction works in the CMA may raises the potential for underwater noise to impact sea life.

Operational noise will generally be associated with the berthing of ferries which will have negligible effects over and above the existing berthing activities of ferries on Piers 1 and 2 and is anticipated in the provisions in the Central Wharves Precinct.

The Acoustic Assessment provided by Marshall Day and included in Attachment M provides a comprehensive assessment of the likely construction noise and vibration effects as a result of the proposal. The report addresses the proposal’s compliance with the relevant Unitary Plan noise standards relating to activity within the city centre, the noise and vibration standards applicable to demolition and construction activity and underwater noise.
7.9.1 **Airborne Noise**

The report outlines the existing daytime noise environment (based on measurements) with levels ranging from 59 – 72 dB $L_{Aeq}$, with the main noise sources being traffic, ferry movements and construction. Although high, this is typical for a central city location.

The proposed works are located within the CMA and within the Central Wharves Precinct. The relevant noise standard in the Central Wharves Precinct (Rule I202.6.1.5) states:

> “Construction activity within the Central Wharves Precinct must not exceed the noise levels specified in E25.6.28 Construction noise levels in the Business – City Centre Zone and the Business – Metropolitan Centre Zone, when measured 1m from the façade of any building on the south side of Quay Street”.

While there are no construction noise rules that apply to receivers in the CMA (e.g. Princes Wharf apartments or Queens Wharf Ferry Terminal), the construction noise limits in Rule E25.6.28 have been used to inform the effects assessment at Princes Wharf and enable a consistent approach for adaptive management protocol and as a measure of what is reasonable. The noise limits for a total construction duration of 15 consecutive calendar days or more are summarised in Table 7 below. These noise limits apply at 1m from the façade of any building on the south side of Quay Street that is occupied during the construction work.

**Table 7: Construction Noise Limits (AUP(OP) Table E25.6.28.2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>$L_{Aeq}$ (30min)</th>
<th>$L_{A_{max}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday to Friday</td>
<td>0630 – 2230</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>0700 – 2300</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>0900 – 1900</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other times (night-time)</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicative construction noise levels are included in the acoustic report including the predicted noise contours for impact and vibro piling driving methods. Construction noise is predicted to comply with the relevant noise limits in AUP(OP) rule I202.6.1.5. In terms of other receivers the following short-term exceedances of the above standards are identified:

- The activities associated with the demolition of Piers 3 and 4 Demolition, such as concrete breaking and concrete cutting are predicted to exceed the standards in Table above without mitigation at short distances from the ANZ and Ferry Buildings. The report notes that these exceedances are predicted to be for short durations, and can, in most cases, be mitigated by noise barriers, or by use
of smaller equipment (e.g. using a small concrete breaker instead of a larger one where appropriate). It is proposed that mitigation and management measures would be detailed in the Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP) for these activities.

- The refurbishment of the Ferry Terminal Building will include construction activities such as concrete cutting and use of handheld breakers. These are predicted to result in intermittent disruption of building occupants and commuters, however can be mitigated through advanced communication of works that are likely result in disturbance for occupants.

- There is the potential for the daytime noise standards to be exceeded by up to 10 decibels at the northern façade of the Pier 1 Ferry Terminal Building during piling works for the southern gangway landing. The report assesses that noise barriers are predicted to provide marginal mitigation benefit. However, the exceedances of the 75 dB L_{Aeq} noise limit amount to less than 1 hour in total while the 7 piles for the landing are installed.

- The breakwater piling works are predicted to produce noise levels of up to 75 dB L_{Aeq} at the façade of the Pier 1 Ferry Terminal Building for the southern-most piles. These levels are comparative to the existing ambient noise levels during the day.

- The proposed construction works are predicted to generate noise levels of 85 – 90 dB L_{Aeq} at the western façade of The Cloud event space as the breakwater piling works are approximately 10m from the façade of The Cloud. However, as The Cloud is not proposed to be used for events during construction works, it will not be a noise and vibration sensitive receiver.

- Although Shed 10 is mostly shielded by The Cloud, noise generated from the construction of the breakwater and piling for Gangway 1 are predicted to be up to 75 dB L_{Aeq} at the façade of the southern and northern ends of the building.

- Noise levels at the residential receivers on Princes Wharf are predicted to be 60 – 65 dB L_{Aeq} for the representative peak piling period, which is well below the daytime project standard of 75 dB L_{Aeq}. These noise levels would be noticeable due to the character of the noise source, but generally similar in level to the existing noise environment.

A draft Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP) has been prepared for the application and a final CNVMP is proposed as a condition of consent. The plan will include that noise standards should, as far as practicable, be complied with to enable a consistent approach for adaptive management protocol (noting that no construction noise rules apply to receivers within the Central Wharves Precinct). The CNVMP will also specify:

- Predicted noise and vibration levels for relevant equipment and/or activities.
- Construction noise and vibration mitigation and management measures.
- Noise and vibration monitoring requirements.
• Communication, consultation and complaints response procedures.

While the short-term exceedances of the noise standards will be noticeable and may cause some level of irritation or annoyance they will not cause significant disturbance. The effects are considered reasonable provided they are of limited duration and BPO measures are implemented through a CNVMP to avoid, remedy and mitigate the effects as far as practicable. The CNVMP will also include methods to ensure effective communications with sensitive noise receivers for the duration of construction.

It is considered that noise associated with the construction can be appropriately mitigated to ensure that the adverse effects on sensitive receivers are no more than minor.

7.9.2 **Underwater Noise**

The report details that piling is predicted to produce the highest levels of underwater construction noise. Underwater noise levels are dependent on the installation method (impact, vibro or drilled/bored), pile type (steel, concrete or timber), pile size and mitigation. Noise propagation underwater is dependent on the bathymetry in the project vicinity and seafloor properties (rock, sand, mud etc.).

There are no specific standards in the AUP providing maximum noise levels for underwater noise, however the acoustic report assesses the underwater noise levels for the proposed piling works, noise modelling and the effects of sound on marine mammal base on zones of influence sourced from overseas jurisdictions. The potential behavioural response zone extends to Bayswater to the north, Chelsea Bay to the west, and Devonport to the east.

The report notes that suitable adaptive management and monitoring measures should be implemented to manage potential effects of underwater noise on marine mammals, including visual monitoring and implementing low power or shutdown procedures when a marine mammal is identified within the zones of influence. These measure can be include within the CNVMP. It is considered that any underwater noise associated with pile construction can be appropriately mitigated to ensure that there are no more than minor adverse effects on marine mammals.

7.9.3 **Construction Vibration**

The report outlines that construction vibration levels for vibratory piling and impact piling have the potential to generate high vibration levels at receivers within short distances. The report outlines that construction vibration is predicted to comply with the relevant cosmetic building damage limits at all locations provided that only small concrete breakers or hand-held breakers are used for demolition works in close proximity to
heritage buildings. However, there is residual potential exceedance of the vibration amenity limits for proximate piling and concrete breaking activities received at the ANZ, Ferry and Pier 1 Ferry Terminal buildings.

It is considered that vibration associated with piling will cause no more than minor adverse effects subject to the final CNVMP including appropriate mitigation measures and effective communication for works proximate to sensitive receivers.

Overall, the effects are assessed in the report as being reasonable provided they are of limited duration and BPO measures are implemented through a CNVMP to avoid, remedy and mitigate the effects as far as practicable.

7.10 Marine Operations and Navigational Safety

An assessment of the marine operations and navigational safety of the proposal has been undertaken in the report prepared by Navigatus Consulting and contained in Attachment O. The report provides a detailed description of the Ferry Basin including the existing environmental conditions, existing maritime activities and constraints and effects on a range of maritime users.

The Ferry Basin is a busy transport hub that provides for a range of maritime uses and activities including ferry services, cruise ship, tourism and vessel layover and berthage and bunkering of cruise ships. Demand for ferry services has been steadily increasing and while demand is seasonal, with higher volumes in summer, patronage is forecast to continue to grow. In addition, the number of cruise ship berthing on Princes Wharf east is increasing with a greater number of days when multiple cruise ships are in port are also forecast to increase. There are a number of Harbour Master Directions for the ferry basin area restricting the movement of large vessels and requirements for vessels to proceed at a safe speed, travel in an anticlockwise direction and be mindful of wake and aware of propeller wash.

A number of pontoon layouts were considered and assessed as part of the options development process and vessel simulations conducted. Of the various layouts considered, the “reverse saw-tooth” layout has been assessed as having the lowest maritime safety risk while allowing a simple movement pattern that minimises the potential for congestion to occur. With suitable berth design and allocation of services to berths, safe operations can be maintained under a wide range of environmental conditions and operational demands.

A navigational safety effects assessment on the “reverse saw-tooth” layout finds that the maritime safety risks can be well managed during both construction and operations. The saw-tooth arrangement has the
ability to operate under a wide range of weather conditions and can cater for existing ferry traffic with cruise ships on Princes Wharf East. The report also assesses the impact of the proposal on general public safety and finds that the proposed design is expected to reduce public exposure to hazards associated with the ferry activities.

The report also assesses the navigational effects of construction. The report details that safety impacts relating to construction can be managed with a suitable risk control framework established under a maritime safety management plan forming part of the construction management plan. The outline of a MSMP is contained in Appendix D of the Navigation Report. It is recommended that the plan include the following measures:

- Additional communications;
- Construction vessels and equipment management;
- Lighting;
- Defined Construction Zone; and
- Basin Construction Control.

Subject to the above measures, an acceptable level of navigational safety can be maintained in the ferry basin during construction works.

Overall and based on the conclusions and recommendations in the Marine Operations and Navigational Safety report, it is considered that the proposal will have less than minor additional navigational safety risks.

7.11 Social Effects

The potential social effects of the Ferry Basin redevelopment relate to the impacts and benefits of the proposed ferry infrastructure upgrade and the provision and maintenance of public access to the water’s edge.

The proposed upgrade will result in a significant improvement and help consolidate the existing ferry services. Redevelopment of the ferry basin will allow a greater number of ferries to dock and depart, leading allowing for higher frequency public transport solution and greater patronage. The ferry terminal redesign offers the opportunity for a more efficient footprint, delivering infrastructure that allows for future service expansion. The generic design of the pontoons increases the ability to use more than one gate by any ferry. This increases flexibility, efficiency, resilience, reduced waiting times and will result in the ability to service increased patronage.
The proposed modifications of the ferry terminal building will enable passengers utilising the new piers to either wait in the ferry terminal for their service to depart or proceed directly to the gangways and ferry pontoons through this facility. While the proposed works do not provide continuous pedestrian cover to the new ferry berths, the gangways will be covered to provide shelter for passengers from the sun and the rain while waiting to board their service. It is considered that this provides a balance between providing a reasonable level of passenger amenity and comfort and acknowledging the importance of the waterfront location by limiting the number of new structures located along the western edge of Queens Wharf. The gangways have been specifically designed to provide sufficient capacity to cater for the number of passengers for the vessels berthing at the piers.

Although passengers for some ferry services will be required to walk a greater distance to access their ferry service in comparison to the existing situation, this is a consequence of the expansion and growth of the city and the need to provide for the growth in patronage of ferry services. Current operational and customer experience at the Downtown Ferry Terminal is below that of similar high-profile transport interchanges for other transport modes. The full redevelopment of the ferry basin and terminal will enhance the customer experience and improve the level of service.

The construction of new ferry berths adjacent to Queens Wharf has the potential to impact the operation or berthing of cruise ships on Queens Wharf or Princes Wharf east. The cruise industry makes a significant contribution to the Auckland economy through increased visitor numbers and the provisioning of ships. The construction methodology anticipates that when cruise ships are in port, construction activities will be restricted to enable normal cruise operations to be maintained. Vehicle and pedestrian access for cruise ships will be managed via the Construction Traffic Management Plan during construction.

There will be some temporary restrictions on public access to the western side of Queens Wharf during construction. Public access will also be restricted during the demolition works associated with Piers 3 and 4 and the modifications to the Ferry Terminal Building, although this will be more localised and still enable pedestrian to ferry services and activities and buildings in the area.

Once the new ferry berths are constructed and operational, full public access to the western side of Queens Wharf will be restored. In addition, the general public will also be able to access the Ferry Terminal Building as the existing ticketing gates will be removed and relocated to the ferry berth gangways. This will further open up waterfront access and enable the public to use the terminal facilities, including the public toilets in an unrestricted manner.
The relocation of the ferry berths to the western side of Queens Wharf and the removal of Piers 3 and 4 also enables the enhancement of public open space and access to the water’s edge, between Princes Wharf and the Ferry Building. This area of the waterfront is a popular passive recreation area for the general public and allows people to sit close to the water’s edge, in sun, with a view of the Ferry Basin, ferry movements, cruise ships and the harbour beyond. Currently, conflicts occur between ferry passengers queuing for ferry services and people sitting and enjoying the view or promenading along the waterfront. Such conflicts will be eliminated and will result in this area being more accessible and able to function as passive open space.

Overall, it is considered that the potential positive social effects to arise from the proposal are significant, and that any potential adverse effects are temporary and negligible.

7.12 CULTURAL EFFECTS

There are no specific sites or places of significance to mana whenua identified in the AUP in the vicinity of the proposed works although the cultural, historic and spiritual importance of the waterfront and harbour to mana whenua are acknowledged and recognised. While there are no identified cultural sites within the application area, the Waitemata Harbour is of cultural, historic and spiritual importance to mana whenua.

The applicant has engaged with mana whenua on the project through the AT Mana Whenua Engagement Framework. In addition, hui and workshop design sessions have been held with a number of iwi. As part of this engagement mana whenua were invited to prepare a Maori/Cultural Values Assessment either as part of the wider waterfront programme of works or related to the ferry redevelopment project. To date, MVA’s/CVA’s were received from Ngati Maru Rananga, Ngaati Whanaunga and Te Akatia Waiohua. Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei has also provided a Downtown Infrastructure Programme Position CVA document. Areas of priority for Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei related to the Downtown Ferry Terminal Redevelopment- Stage 1 include water quality.

Te Aranga Design Principles have been developed for the Downtown Programme projects. The following table includes a summary of the values identified in the MVA’s/CVA’s received and through kōrero at hui and the Te Aranga design principle that they relate to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: MVA Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MVA kōrero/values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mana Whenua interests do not solely relate to the ‘cultural’ realm, and broader interests/values need to be considered</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural heritage to be acknowledged and celebrated, including cultural landscapes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Participation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mana Whenua representation during Stormwater MCA process to ensure values are represented during decision-making</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enact kaitiaki role</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involvement in project</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to contribute to and influence programme and project outcomes and reach</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>opportunity extended to all Mana Whenua groups to undertake MVA/CVA Assessments for Downtown Programme area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mana Whenua representation during Stormwater MCA process to ensure values are represented during decision-making</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mana Whenua direct involvement with project design teams in advancing design work</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Integrity, respect</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mana Whenua representation during Stormwater MCA process to ensure values are represented during decision-making</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting and ensure protocols are upheld across the programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protocols enacted by Mana Whenua at key moments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mana o ngā wai</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mana Whenua representation during Stormwater MCA process to ensure values are represented during decision-making</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognising the mana of Te Waitematā and Te Waihorotiu</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consideration of all waters holistically</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treat and control outfall of all waters to improve water quality from existing levels</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create a more natural environment where land meets the sea</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any Multi Criteria Analysis process to directly involve Mana Whenua</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any Multi Criteria Analysis process to apply correct weighting of cultural criteria to ensure Mana Whenua values</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mana Whenua representation during Stormwater MCA process to ensure values are represented during decision-making</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Native species to be preferred over exotic species</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Native vegetation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mana Whenua representation during Stormwater MCA process to ensure values are represented during decision-making</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carbon Sequestration programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of appropriate native species only</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Select plants that will be able to work/contribute to function of space (e.g. filtering, etc.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensure appropriate methodologies and design thinking provides for long living environments for trees to flourish in place</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology/Biodiversity</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that appropriate lead-in time is provided to plant providers to ensure supply and quality of material</td>
<td>Urban Landscape Design Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilises historic plant communities of this coastline</td>
<td>Application of Te Aranga Māori design Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree and companion plants - diversity not monoculture.</td>
<td>Involvement of Mana Whenua design practitioners/artists, with Mana Whenua involved in procuring services where opportunities present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-source material</td>
<td>Incorporate Māori colours, symbols and building materials where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenance should be locally sourced</td>
<td>inspired design that gives Māori cultural feel- Creating a Point of Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate vegetation in progression to water’s edge to maintain views</td>
<td>When Māori design is integrated and embedded into structure - makes the design great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All vegetation specified to provide both amenity and ecosystem services</td>
<td>Create an environment that is clean, visible and environmentally sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look to traditional placenames in vicinity of programme area for clues as to appropriate vegetation/species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MANA**
**TAIAO**
**MAURI TŪ**

**MANA**
**MAHI TOI**
**MAURI TŪ**

**MANA**
**TOHU**
**WHAKAPAPA**
**AHI KĀ**
| All signage to be dual language | Promote functional language use in wayfinding | Importance of use of appropriate terminology in te reo |
| Developed papakupu contains terminology appropriate to be utilised within DIDP – for spacemaking | Different reo to be utilised for placemaking and may be beyond the current programme timelines |

**Naming**
- Utilise/restore/reinscribe correct historical names
- Challenge existing names where redundant or inappropriate
- Identify opportunities to create new names for spaces/elements
- AC Reo Māori dual naming policies to apply in all instances

**Pūkenga**
- Having appropriate expertise employed at all levels of programme/project
- Application of best practice methodologies at all times
- Identified need for engaging technical design/ecology support for Mana Whenua
- Procurement must be via a democratic process
- EOIs to be prepared across programme calling for assistance in the areas of:
  - Mahi Toi
  - Taiao
  - Urban design
  - Maramataka

**Mauri**
- Minimise work extents within the Coastal Marine Area
- Identify areas of contamination and manage appropriately
- Control stormwater flows into Te Waitemata
- Promote wellbeing of marine species
- Healthy harbour created through a Te Ao Māori lens
- Consider the relationship of programme area and integration with Waitemata harbour and beyond
- Sustainability factors and material selection - locally sourced, recycle from other projects

**Kōiwi/Taonga**
- Implement discovery protocols

**Stormwater**
- Management of stormwater to avoid direct discharge into Waitemata
- Identification of water sources (i.e. roofwater vs. Stormwater off roads

---

MANA TOHU WHAKAPAPA

MANA TAIAO MAURI Tū MAHI TOI

MANA TAIAO TOHU

MANA TAIAO MAURI Tū MAHI TOI
| Traps to capture rubbish/debris to avoid flowing into Waitematā |
| Mana Whenua representation during Stormwater MCA process to ensure values are represented during decision-making |
| Treatment of stormwater to be significantly above Unitary Plan requirements – i.e. supported to maximum level possible |
| All projects to work together to address stormwater management/treatment cohesively |

### Signage

- Provide agreed narratives in a variety of media – 2D/ digital/innovation(?)
- Dual Language, functional use of te Reo in wayfinding and universal/functional signage e.g. exit
- Interpretive signage and educational material should celebrate place, including ‘lost’ features

### Spatial design

- Ensure that consideration of future use/occupation is given in the design of spaces created in all designwork – i.e. can these spaces provide for a broad range of potentials
- Commercial opportunities for Mana Whenua/Māori businesses
- Inclusive Design - consider how space manages people
- Public access to waterways, the coast and between known cultural sites should be provided for (physical/visual)

### Future proofing of structures

- Ensure thought is given to future energy sources/technologies to avoid need to retro-fit structures (e.g. electrical power sources),
- Placemaking efficiency, utilise technological advancements

### Holistic thinking

- Ensure that planning within Downtown Programme is joined up across all parts of the AC whānau to maximise opportunities
- Ensure that planning/design is undertaken initially at a programme wide view before moving to individual projects
- Promote a Waterfront-wide approach to design (i.e. Curran Street to Mechanics Bay)
- Notion of a 24hr Waterfront
- Downtown public space seen as interconnecting city with the water, improving habitat and connecting people
The CVA’s have assisted in identifying the values that iwi hold in this part of Tāmaki Makaurau and inform the concept design of the project as it has developed. In response to the values identified, the proposal has sought to minimise the extent of works within the CMA, maintaining and where possible improving water quality, identifying areas of contamination and appropriately managing these, promoting the wellbeing of marine species (in particular during construction works) and employing best practice methodologies. There remain opportunities to integrate matauranga and tikanga into the detailed design of the marine infrastructure and modifications to the ferry terminal and in the naming protocols and signage. Engagement with mana whenua will continue throughout the project via the AT Mana Whenua Engagement Framework. It is considered that any potential adverse cultural effects from the proposal can be appropriately and sensitively managed to ensure this level of effect is minor.

### 7.13 Lighting and Signage

The Urban Design report includes a proposed lighting and signage strategies that includes the following features:

- Lighting along pontoon edges
- Lighting integrated into Marker piles
- New marker/wayfinding lighting to gangway shelter entry
- Lighting integrated into gangways and shelters
• Lighting along Queens Wharf – integrated into wharf furniture
• Lighting integrated in to the historic ferry shelter
• Lighting along the new entrance façade to the terminal building.
• Fixed signage and markers for pier locations.
• Digital signage for service information.
• Safety signage and facility integration.

The strategies have been developed to ensure that there is an adequate level of lighting and signage to assist with wayfinding and provide for a safe and functional ferry service. Lighting and signage will be designed and installed to complement that provided for the existing ferry facilities and services and in accordance with AT Metro standards.

Lighting will be illuminated in a manner complying with the AUP lighting standards and will be directed below the horizontal plane and localised. Lighting will, where practicable, be designed to integrate with the proposed infrastructure. There will be negligible light spill onto the buildings located on Princes Wharf or have any effect on traffic safety navigation or visual amenity. A condition of consent is proposed to certify that the proposed lighting is located in a manner that accords with the lighting strategy and complies with the AUP lighting standards.

Temporary lighting will be required during construction for safety, security and working purposes. Construction lighting will include temporary light poles located around the construction sites, have lighting between 100-150 lux with zero tilt luminaires. All light is proposed to be projected through the horizontal plane. Specific details of construction lighting will be managed through the proposed CMP.

Taking account of the above, it is considered that the potential adverse lighting effects for both the operation of the infrastructure and during construction will be less than minor.

Signage will be integrated with the design of the ferry infrastructure and be consistent with existing signage in the area. The proposed signage will be located and designed in a manner that provides information to passengers of the ferry services and assist with wayfinding and legibility. It will be consistent with existing signage and placed in a manner that does not detract from the visual amenity of the area. The signage strategy also provides opportunities for cultural expression to strengthen the sense of place and importance of this key gateway to the Central City.

A condition of consent is proposed to certify that the proposed signage is located in a manner that accords with the signage strategy. Given the functional nature of the signage and its integration with the design of
the proposed infrastructure, it is considered that any adverse visual effects of the proposed signage will be less than minor.

### 7.14 INFRASTRUCTURE

The proposal includes the installation of new ducting and pipes for power, water and data services to the new pontoons, gangways and Queens Wharf. This is illustrated on the Proposed General Services Plan in the Marine Drawing set prepared by T&T. In addition an Infrastructure Services Assessment has been prepared for the proposal and is contained in Attachment V. Ducts are proposed to be placed on the underside of the gangways and connected to existing services. The electricity transformer located in the Eastern Annexe, that provides power to the Ferry Building is proposed to be retained in its existing location. Care will be taken to ensure that the visual impact of the ducting is minimised as far as practicable and any fixing to Queens Wharf is undertaken in a manner that does not detrimentally impact of the heritage values of the structure. Overall, the proposal will be adequately serviced by infrastructure and any adverse effects from the provisions of these services will be negligible.

The proposal also includes new sullage pipes, also proposed to be located to the underside of gangways for the pump-out of sewage from vessels into a new holding tank to be located near the ferry terminal with connections back to the existing reticulation on Quay Street. Again, care will be taken to ensure that the visual impact of the ducting is minimised as far as practicable and any fixing to Queens Wharf is undertaken in a manner that does not detrimentally impact of the heritage values of the structure. Any effects of odour will also be minimised. It is considered that the proposal will include sufficient sewerage infrastructure to safely and efficiently enable the transfer of sewage in a manner that does not impact the CMA. Overall, the proposal will be adequately serviced by sewerage infrastructure and any adverse effects from the provisions of these services will be negligible.

### 7.15 EFFECTS CONCLUSION

The above assessment of effects has considered all elements of the proposal including the construction, operation and maintenance of the new ferry piers. These effects have also been comprehensively assessed in the technical reports submitted in support of the application. Overall the adverse effects of the proposal are considered to be minor to less than minor. There are significant positive social benefits resulting from an improvement to the ferry basin infrastructure to provide for growth and capacity in this important public transport mode.
8 STATUTORY ASSESSMENT

The following section analyses the relevant statutory provisions that apply to the application and the locality. The RMA sets out the statutory framework, within which resources are managed in New Zealand. The framework sets out a hierarchy of tests that must be passed in order for resources to be utilised, either on a temporary or permanent basis. Section 104 of the RMA sets out the matters for consideration when assessing a resource consent. Specifically, under s104(1)(b) these include the following relevant documents listed below:

- The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement
- Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act
- Auckland Unitary Plan (operative in Part 2016)

8.1 NEW ZEALAND COASTAL POLICY STATEMENT (2010)

The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) is a national policy statement under the RMA. The purpose of the NZCPS is to state policies in order to achieve the purpose of the RMA in relation to the coastal environment of New Zealand. Lower order policy documents formulated under the RMA are required to give effect to the NZCPS provisions. In addition, section 104(1)(b)(iv) requires that a consent authority, when considering an application for a resource consent, must subject to Part 2 of the RMA, have regard to any relevant provisions of the NZCPS. The proposal includes occupation, structures and activities within the CMA. The assessment of the relevant provisions of the NZCPS is contained in Attachment Q.

In assessing the relevant objectives and policies of the NZCPS the following comments are made:

- The Ferry Basin, and indeed the Central Wharves, is highly modified coastal environment, altered through successive reclamations and the construction of wharves, piers, pontoons, fenders and other marine structures within the waterspace. There are no remnants of naturalness (abiotic or biotic) associated with the ferry basin and the area is not a pristine coastal environment, rather it is assessed as having low ecological value.
- The proposed locality, particularly in regard to the impacts on the seabed and water quality of the locality, can accommodate the proposed development without significantly altering the ecology, habitats or water quality of the Ferry Basin. The proposed coastal structures will not significantly impact the harbour hydrology and will maintain flushing of the Ferry Basin.
- The proposal will have a minimal impact on the natural character as the ferry berths have a functional need to be located in the CMA, ferry services are part of the connection between
Auckland and the Waitemata and the location within the ferry basin and the design minimise the degree to which the facilities will detract from the body of water within the Ferry Basin.

- The expansion of the ferry berths and the proposed activities/structures/buildings are consistent with the uses that are already provided for within the ferry basin and which are anticipated by the relevant planning documents.

- The applicant has engaged with Mana Whenua through Auckland Transport’s Mana Whenua engagement framework. Matters raised in discussion with iwi to date include ecological enhancement, sedimentation, water quality, sullage, options for recycling materials and environmentally friendly construction methods, and opportunities for cultural expression in design. Engagement with mana whenua is ongoing and will continue during the detailed design process.

- The public open space qualities and recreation qualities of the coastal environment are maintained and enhanced on Queens Wharf. It is considered that the ferry operations will be compatible with the public open space activities undertaken on Queens Wharf and will not comprise existing activities or the future development of Queens Wharf as a public open space.

- The proposal provides for the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of the community by upgrading existing ferry facilities to provide for growth in ferry patronage in a highly modified coastal environment and adjacent to existing ferry facilities. The proposal consolidates ferry services within the ferry basin and makes efficient use of existing buildings and wharf structures located in the CMA.

- The proposed infrastructure has been designed in a manner that takes account of coastal hazard risks including climate change, as far as is practicable and within the context of the existing wharf structures.

- The proposal recognises and protects historic heritage located in the CMA with modifications proposed to historic heritage that does not impact on the heritage values of the place or building.

Overall, the proposal is considered consistent with the objectives and policies of the NZCPS. The proposal meets the requirements of the NZCPS by providing ferry infrastructure that supports the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the community and is able to manage any adverse effects of on the coastal environment adequately. The proposed structures have a functional need to be located in the CMA and maintains public access to the western side of Queens Wharf.

### 8.2 Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000

The Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000 (HGMPA) requires that a consent authority must have regard to sections 7 and 8 of the HGMPA when considering an application for a resource consent for the Hauraki Gul,
its islands and catchments. The following sections of the HGMPA set out the relevant parts of sections 7 and 8 that relate to this application are:

7. **Recognition of national significance of Hauraki Gulf—**
   (1) The interrelationship between the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments and the ability of that interrelationship to sustain the life-supporting capacity of the environment of the Hauraki Gulf and its islands are matters of national significance.
   (2) The life-supporting capacity of the environment of the Gulf and its islands includes the capacity —
      (a) to provide for —
         (i) the historic, traditional, cultural, and spiritual relationship of the tangata whenua of the Gulf with the Gulf and its islands; and
         (ii) the social, economic, recreational, and cultural well-being of people and communities:
      (b) to use the resources of the Gulf by the people and communities of the Gulf and New Zealand for economic activities and recreation:
      (c) to maintain the soil, air, water, and ecosystems of the Gulf.

8. **Management of Hauraki Gulf—**
   To recognise the national significance of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments, the objectives of the management of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments are—
   (a) the protection and, where appropriate, the enhancement of the life-supporting capacity of the environment of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments:
   (b) the protection and, where appropriate, the enhancement of the natural, historic, and physical resources of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments:
   (c) the protection and, where appropriate, the enhancement of those natural, historic, and physical resources (including kaimoana) of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments with which tangata whenua have an historic, traditional, cultural, and spiritual relationship:
   (d) the protection of the cultural and historic associations of people and communities in and around the Hauraki Gulf with its natural, historic, and physical resources:
   (e) the maintenance and, where appropriate, the enhancement of the contribution of the natural, historic, and physical resources of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments to the social and economic well-being of the people and communities of the Hauraki Gulf and New Zealand:
   (f) the maintenance and, where appropriate, the enhancement of the natural, historic, and physical resources of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments, which contribute to the recreation and enjoyment of the Hauraki Gulf for the people and communities of the Hauraki Gulf and New Zealand.
Overall, it is considered that the proposal is consistent with the provisions of the HGPMA. The proposal is utilising the physical resources of the Gulf to provide marine passenger facilities and uses that will be beneficial to the social and economic well-being of the general public. While the proposed works will impact coastal processes and marine ecology the adverse effects are considered to be minor or less than minor, while positive effects will also be achieved through the provision if important public transport infrastructure.

Safeguarding the life supporting capacity of water is identified as a purpose of the RMA (section 5(2)(b)) and is recognised as a matter of national significance under the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act (section 7 and 8). Further, the Regional Policy Statement (RPS) and the AUP also recognise the life supporting capacity of marine ecosystems particularly within the Hauraki Gulf and require integrated management of use and development to ensure ecological values and life supporting capacity are protected and where appropriate, enhanced (Chapter B8.5 – Objectives and Policies).

In terms of the proposal, the relevant consideration is whether it affects the life supporting capacity of the environment of the Hauraki Gulf to an extent where it will not be sustained. The proposed marine structure for ferry services are considered an appropriate use of this part of the coastal marine area as they will be appropriately managed and will not adversely affect the sustainable life supporting capacity of the CMA. Both the coastal processes report and the Marine ecology report confirm that any effects on the CMA and its life supporting capacity will be minor or less than minor.

In terms of the provision of the historic, traditional, cultural, and spiritual relationship of the tangata whenua of the Gulf with the Gulf and its island, the applicant is engaging with mana whenua through the Auckland Transport Mana Whenua Forum and has invited iwi groups to determine whether a cultural values assessment is necessary of the project. A number of iwi have provided a CVA, with the identified values assisting in the development of the proposal through concept design. In terms of water quality, marine ecology, coastal processes and environmental effects, the technical specialist’s reports on these matters details that best practice methodologies are proposed to be employed for the project and confirms that the effects of the proposal are no more than minor. Engagement with mana whenua will continue throughout the project, particularly focused on opportunities for cultural expression through more detailed design elements of the proposed infrastructure. In addition, as part of the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011 (MACA) requirements, the details of the resource consent application were sent to the iwi that have registered customary title rights over this part of the CMA. This is addressed in Section 8.10.1 below.

The proposal is located in an area with of historic heritage associated with the early expansion of the waterfront area. This includes Queens Wharf, the historic ferry shelter, the Ferry Building, the Public Shelters, AHB blue fence and launchmans steps. The buildings and structures collectively contribute to the
historic character of the area. While the proposal includes minor interventions and modifications to the surface of Queens Wharf and the historic ferry shelter, they are sympathetic to the heritage values for the items have been scheduled and will ensure that these historic features continue to have a functional use.

For the foregoing reasons, it is considered that the proposal is consistent with the provisions of the HGMPA.

8.3 Auckland Regional Policy Statement

The Auckland Unitary Plan: Regional Policy Statement identifies nine issues of regional significance for resource management in Auckland. The following issues are relevant to this application.

- Urban growth and form
- Infrastructure, Transport and Energy
- Built heritage and character
- Significance to Mana Whenua
- Coastal Environment
- Environmental Risk

8.3.1 B2: Urban Growth and Form

This issue relates to enabling quality urban growth and addresses managing growth in a way that optimises the efficient use of the existing urban area, and supports integrated land use, infrastructure and development. The objectives and policies for ‘urban growth and form’ seek that a quality compact urban form enables a higher-quality urban environment, greater productivity and economic growth, better use of existing infrastructure and efficient provision of new infrastructure, improved and more effective public transport, greater social and cultural diversity, and reduced adverse environmental effects. In terms of open space, the coastal marine area is identified as a significant public open space and recreation resource. The relevant objectives and policies are as follows:

B2.2.1 & B2.2.2 – Urban Growth & Form
B2.3.1 & B2.3.2 – A Quality Built Environment
B2.7.1 & B2.7.2 – Open Space & Recreational Facilities

The proposal seeks to upgrade the ferry infrastructure to provide for improved and more effective transport infrastructure to meet the anticipated future growth on the Auckland ferry network over the next decade. The upgraded ferry facilities are located adjacent to existing ferry infrastructure and consolidate services to the western side of Queens Wharf, enabling efficient use of the existing ferry terminal building facilities and passenger amenities. The consolidation of the ferry services will improve the legibility of the service as a
network and improve connectivity to rail and bus services located nearby. Reconfiguration of the ferry terminal building will enhance passenger facilities and amenities, improve its visibility from Quay Street and better integrate it with the Ferry Building. This accord with objective B2.2.1.1(d) of a quality compact urban form that enables improved and more effective public transport.

The proposed infrastructure is of a highly functional design to provide for safe and efficient ferry service operations under a wide range of environmental conditions and operational demands. While the pontoons will add to the occupation of waterspace, the impacts of this occupation have been minimised as much as possible with the pontoons having a low profile, the berths are aligned to Queens Wharf and the arrangement is minimises visual clutter and will not detract from the amenity of the ferry basin as a whole. As the infrastructure has a design life of 25 years for the pontoons and 50 years for the piles, the overall design has been designed for a sea-level rise of 50 years. This accords with Objective B2.3.1.1(d) and (f) which seeks a quality built environment where uses and development maximise resource and infrastructure efficiency and responds and adapts to the effects of climate change.

In terms of open space and recreation facilities, the RPS, at Objective B2.7.1.2 and Policy B2.7.2.9 seeks to enhance, maintain and enable public access to and along Auckland’s coastline and coastal marine area. It is acknowledged that the location of ferry services adjacent to Queens Wharf West will create a much busier western edge of the wharf, however this is beneficial rather than adverse, bringing a greater level of function and activity to the wharf infrastructure. The proposed ferry infrastructure is being provided in a manner which maintains the general public’s ability to access the perimeter of Queens Wharf and its current open space and recreational uses. The proposal complies with the AUP requirement for a 10m public accessway around the perimeter of the wharf, notwithstanding that additional seating and furniture is proposed to be located within 3.5m of the wharf’s edge.

8.3.2 B3 Infrastructure, Transport and Energy

This issue relates to the provision of transport infrastructure and recognises that it must keep pace with the activities and development it serves. The objectives and policies recognise that development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure and the provision of resilient, efficient and effective infrastructure. The RPS has a focus on integrating land use and transport to achieve a compact urban form focused on centres and transport nodes can also help promote energy efficiency and reduce dependence on non-renewable energy sources. The relevant objectives and policies are noted as follows:

B3.2.1 & B2.3.2 – Infrastructure
B3.3.1 & B3.3.2 – Transport
The proposal provides a much needed upgrade of Auckland downtown ferry infrastructure. The existing ferry infrastructure only has enough capacity to accommodate growth in services and patronage through to 2022/23, at which point additional berths will be required to accommodate predicted growth. An increase in the number of berths cannot be accommodated within the current footprint of the Downtown Ferry Terminal, and the existing infrastructure is unlikely to meet requirements of future ferry operations. Further to this, Piers 1, 2 and 3 are all in need of significant upgrade works to keep them operating over the long term. The new ferry infrastructure has a functional need to locate in the CMA and the consolidation of ferry facilities within the ferry basin enables efficient use of existing infrastructure in close proximity to other public transport services including Britomart, Auckland CBD’s main transport public hub. The proposal provides for the efficient and safe transport of people from destinations around greater Auckland to the Central City facilitating transport choice in a manner that integrates with existing built form and land uses. The reports prepared by technical specialists confirm that the proposed ferry infrastructure is being provided in a manner that avoids, remedies and mitigate adverse effects on the quality of the coastal environment and existing amenity values of the Ferry Basin area. Mitigation measures are proposed to manage the adverse effects of construction in both the CMA and on surrounding uses and activities.

While the location of expanded ferry services on the western side of Queens Wharf has the potential to conflict with adjoining uses and activities (including events in the Cloud and cruise operations on Queens Wharf East) the infrastructure is proposed in a manner that avoids such conflicts as far as practicable and allows all activities to be able to occur at the same time. This includes adopting specific measures to manage pedestrian flows along the western side of the wharf when vehicles are accessing this area to service the Cloud and cruise ship facilities located on the wharf. Further, specific mitigation measures are proposed through the CTMP to ensure that the operation of the Cloud and cruise terminal facilities is maintained during construction.

8.3.3 B5 Built Heritage and Character

The objectives and policies relative to historic heritage relate to the recognition, protection, conservation and appropriate management of historic heritage places to help future generations appreciate what these places mean to the development of the region. The RPS identifies that historic heritage places are a finite resource that cannot be duplicated or replaced with historic heritage places recognised for their significance and protection through restrictions on demolition and modification and the protection of their values through appropriate use (including adaptive re-use). The relevant objectives and policies are noted as follows:
B5.2.1 and B5.2.2 Historic Heritage

The proposal includes physical infrastructure works either on, attached to, or in close proximity to historic heritage including Queens Wharf, the Ferry Shelter, the Ferry Building, the Public Shelters and the Auckland Harbour Board ‘Blue Fence’ and ‘Red Fence’. Minor interventions and modifications are proposed to the surface of Queens Wharf and the ferry shelters in a manner that protects the heritage values for which the items have been scheduled. A HIA has been completed for the proposal and confirms no significant adverse effects are identified as a result of this proposal. There is an opportunity to mitigate any minor or less than minor adverse effects, and to enhance beneficial effects through detailed design, for example to the public open space in front of the Ferry Terminal. Conditions are proposed to ensure appropriate mitigation and avoidance measures are adopted the proposal meets these regional objectives.

8.3.4 B6 Mana Whenua

These objectives and policies relate to recognising the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and providing for the sustainable management of natural and physical resources including ancestral lands, water, air, coastal sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga and Mana Whenua participation in resource management processes. The relevant objectives and policies are noted as follows:

B6.2.1 & B6.2.2 – Recognition of Te Tiriti O Waitangi partnerships and participation
B6.3.1 & B6.3.2 – Recognising Mana Whenua Values
B6.4.1 & B6.4.2 – Maori Economic, Social & Cultural Development
B6.5.1 & B6.5.2 – Protection of Mana Whenua Cultural Heritage

The coastal environment is a natural resource of high value to tangata whenua, the protection of which is identified in the Treaty of Waitangi. Engagement with iwi is being undertaken by the applicant through AT’s Mana Whenua Engagement Framework. The details of this consultation are set out in Section 8.11.6 of this report. The engagement process established by AT and the ongoing opportunity for engagement with all iwi will enable partnerships to be built and maintained with iwi and provide for timely, effective and meaningful engagement. The applicant has also undertaken consultation requirements required under the MACA Act and has written to all iwi that have applied for customary title of the coastal marine area of the Waitematā Harbour.

The AUP provisions do not specifically identify any sites or areas of significance to iwi within the proposed ferry basin area or on Queens Wharf. Regardless, the proposed development aims to minimise impacts on the coastal marine area and seabed as far as is practicable, whilst ensuring that provision of public transport infrastructure. The coastal processes and marine ecology reports conclude that the ecological and water
quality effects of the proposed development fall within the negligible to minor range and are therefore acceptable.

### 8.3.5 B8 Coastal Environment

The relevant objectives and policies are identified below:

- B8.2.1 & B8.2.2 – Natural Character
- B8.3.1 & B8.3.2 – Subdivision, Use & Development
- B8.4.1 & B8.4.2 – Public Access & Open Space
- B8.5.1 & B8.5.2 – Managing the Hauraki Gulf/Te Moana Nui o Toi/Tīkapa Moana

The RPS sets an objective to preserve areas of the coastal environment with outstanding and high natural character and seeks that development is otherwise designed, located and managed to preserve the characteristics and qualities that contribute to natural character.

The objectives and policies relating to the above topics have been considered throughout this report within the effects assessment, the assessment of the NZCPS and HGMPA. The assessment undertaken in these sections also applies to the above RPS objectives and policies. Assessment of the HGMPA provisions is provided above and it is considered that the proposal is consistent with the provisions of this Act.

The proposal is located in a highly modified area of the waterfront which is not identified as an area of outstanding natural character, landscape, nor an area of high natural character. The proposal will have minimal adverse effects on the natural character and is considered appropriate given the facilities have a function need to be located in the CMA, ferry services are part of the connection between Auckland and the Waitemata and the location within the ferry basin and the proposed design minimises the degree to which the facilities will detract from the body of water within the ferry basin.

The proposed development represents a logical extension to and utilisation of existing wharves and buildings within the area for enhanced ferry infrastructure and services. The marine structures proposed are consistent with the existing character and amenity of the ferry basin. The upgrade of the ferry infrastructure will contribute positively to the social, economic and cultural well-being of people and communities. The infrastructure is required to support the growth of ferry transport between the Central City and other parts of the region. Being adjacent to existing infrastructure and in close proximity to other modes of transport including bus, rail and cycling supports the broader RPS objectives of an integrated transport network. The infrastructure has an obvious functional need to be located in the CMA. The use of the Central Wharves for
ferry services is identified in the strategic planning documents and contemplated in the General Coastal Marine zone and Central Wharves Precinct.

In terms of public access, the proposal maintains public access along the western side of Queens Wharf and provides appropriate management methods to manage any conflicts between ferry passengers and other uses and activities taking place on Queens Wharf in association with the Cloud or cruise ship facilities. The current recreational and open space opportunities on Queens Wharf are retained. The proposal also provides the benefit or removing Piers 3 and 4, thereby opening up public views to the inner ferry basin area for the adjacent public space.

8.3.6 B10 Environmental Risk

This section of the RPS addresses natural hazards and climate change. The relevant objectives and policies are identified below:

B10.2.1 & B10.2.2 – Natural Hazards & Climate Change.

The issues relating to sea level change, storm surge, erosion and tsunami have been addressed in the coastal processes report and sufficient mitigation measures included to mitigate potential adverse effects relative to infrastructure in this area. As outlined above, the infrastructure has a design life of 25 years for the pontoons and 50 years for the piles, with the overall design being designed for a sea-level rise of 50 years. This is considered appropriate for the given the function and intended design life of the infrastructure.

8.3.7 Summary

Overall, the proposed development is considered to be complementary to the relevant AUP RPS objectives and policies. The proposal will result in a development that will be designed and constructed in a manner which acknowledges the values of the coastal landscape in which it sits and will be acceptable within the existing character of the locality.
8.4 **AUP Objectives and Policies**

The following is an assessment of the relevant objectives and policies of the AUP.

8.4.1 **D17.2 – Historic Heritage Overlay Objectives**

**Objectives**

(1) The protection, maintenance, restoration and conservation of scheduled historic heritage places is supported and enabled.

(2) Scheduled historic heritage places are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, including inappropriate modification, relocation, demolition or destruction.

(3) Appropriate subdivision, use and development, including adaptation of scheduled historic heritage places, is enabled.

**Policies**

**Use and development, including adaptation**

(3) Enable the use, development and adaptation of scheduled historic heritage places where:

   (a) it will not result in adverse effects on the significance of the place;
   (b) it will contribute to the ongoing maintenance and enhancement of the historic heritage values of the place;
   (c) it is in accordance with good practice conservation principles and methods;
   (d) it will not result in cumulative adverse effects on the historic heritage values of the place;
   (e) it will support the long-term viability, retention or ongoing use of the place; and
   (f) it will not lead to significant adverse effects on the surrounding area.

(6) Enable use and development of contributing and non-contributing sites or features within a Historic Heritage Area where it is compatible with the historic heritage values of the area.

(7) Require the assessment of the effects for proposed works to scheduled historic heritage places, including where one or more places are affected, to address all the effects on:

   (a) the heritage values of the place/s;
   (b) the significance of the place; and
   (c) the setting and the relationship between places.

**Modifications, restoration and new buildings within historic heritage places**

(8) Maintain or enhance historic heritage values by ensuring that modifications to, or restoration of, scheduled historic heritage places, and new buildings within scheduled historic heritage places:

   (a) minimise the loss of fabric that contributes to the heritage values and level of significance of the place;
(b) do not compromise the ability to interpret the place and the relationship to other heritage places;
(c) complement the form, fabric and setting which contributes to, or is associated with, the heritage values of the place;
(d) retain and integrate with the heritage values of the place;
(e) avoid significant adverse effects, including from loss, destruction or subdivision that would reduce or destroy the heritage values of the place; and
(f) avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the heritage values of the place.

(9) Enable modifications to, or restoration of, scheduled historic heritage places, and new buildings within scheduled historic heritage places where the proposal:

(a) will not result in adverse effects on the significance of the place;
(b) will contribute to the ongoing maintenance and enhancement of the historic heritage values of the place;
(c) is in accordance with good practice conservation principles and methods;
(d) will not result in cumulative adverse effects on the historic heritage values of the place; and
(e) will contribute to the long-term viability, retention or ongoing functional use of the place.

(10) Support modifications to, or restoration of, scheduled historic heritage places that will do any of the following:

(a) recover or reveal heritage values of the place;
(b) remove features or additions that compromise the heritage values of the place; or
(c) secure the long-term viability and retention of the place

(11) Provide for modifications to, or restoration of, parts of buildings or structures where this is necessary for the purposes of adaptation, repair or seismic strengthening, either in its own right or as part of any modifications.

Temporary activities

(21) Provide for signs associated with temporary activities within scheduled historic heritage places where any adverse effects on the heritage values of the place are avoided, remedied or mitigated.

In relation to the relevant objectives and policies, the following comments are made:

- The proposal achieves the protection and conservation of Queens Wharf through the proposed use of the Wharf as a long-term berth for ferry services to and from Central Auckland.
- This use is considered appropriate and represents a continuation of one of the original uses of Queens Wharf following its construction.
- The proposed use also supports the historical relationship between the Queens Wharf and other scheduled or listed built heritage places around the Ferry Basin. In particular this includes the Ferry Building and the AHB Fence, both of which are Category A scheduled items.
The proposed changes to the historical fabric of the Wharf are limited to those considered necessary to achieve the required adaption of the structure and to enhance an appropriate existing use.

The proposed physical changes will result in the minor loss of historical fabric and they are not assessed by the heritage specialist as being significantly adverse either individually or collectively. They will not result in any reduction of historic heritage value either to Queens Wharf or to other built heritage places within the vicinity of the works.

The proposal will result in high beneficial effects of a permanent nature which support both the continued use of Queens Wharf, the historic harbour edge, and neighbouring built heritage places generally. It is not anticipated that any of these places would suffer a significant reduction of historic heritage values as a result of the proposed work and the works themselves will not compromise the ability to interpret any of the built heritage places within or near the subject site.

The proposed works will help secure long-term use and viability for the Queens Wharf, as well as indirectly benefiting several other built heritage places within the vicinity of the proposed works.

The proposed breakwater and wharf extensions to construct the gangways are considered essential infrastructure requirements to provide for the ongoing use of the Wharf as a ferry berth.

The proposed adaption of the historical QW Ferry Shelter is considered an appropriate adaptation to allow for its identified new function as a wayfinding element within the Ferry Terminal building which directs users towards the new ferry berths. Similarly, the proposed changes to the public realm are considered to be an appropriate adaptation of mainly modern structures and fabric which presently exist on the Wharf.

The temporary construction activities will require temporary signage within the extent of place for directional and Health and Safety purposes and this will most likely be fixed to temporary hoarding or free-standing fencing. Where necessary temporary signage such as hazard signs could be indirectly fixed to gate and fence posts, for example with cable ties. This would generate no adverse effects.

8.4.2 E1 Water Quality and Integrated Management (Including E4 Discharges)

Chapter E1 of the AUP sets out the policy approach for rules contained in various chapters which seek to manage adverse effects on water quality. Overall, the objectives seek to maintain water quality and improve water quality over time in degraded areas.

Objectives

(1) Freshwater and sediment quality is maintained where it is excellent or good and progressively improved over time in degraded areas.
(3) Stormwater and wastewater networks are managed to protect public health and safety and to prevent or minimise adverse effects of contaminants on freshwater and coastal water quality.

**Policies**

**Stormwater management**

(8) Avoid as far as practicable, or otherwise minimise or mitigate, adverse effects of stormwater runoff from greenfield development on freshwater systems, freshwater and coastal water by:

(a) taking an integrated stormwater management approach (refer to Policy E1.3.10);

(b) minimising the generation and discharge of contaminants, particularly from high contaminant generating car parks and high use roads and into sensitive receiving environments;

(c) where practicable, minimising or mitigating the effects on freshwater systems arising from changes in water temperature caused by stormwater discharges; and

(d) providing for the management of gross stormwater pollutants, such as litter, in areas where the generation of these may be an issue.

(9) Minimise or mitigate new adverse effects of stormwater runoff, and where practicable progressively reduce existing adverse effects of stormwater runoff, on freshwater systems, freshwater and coastal waters during intensification and redevelopment of existing urban areas by all of the following:

(a) requiring measures to reduce contaminants, particularly from high contaminant-generating car parks and high-use roads;

(b) requiring measures to reduce the discharge of gross stormwater pollutants;

(11) Avoid as far as practicable, or otherwise minimise or mitigate adverse effects of stormwater diversions and discharges, having particular regard to:

(a) the nature, quality, volume and peak flow of the stormwater runoff;

(b) the sensitivity of freshwater systems and coastal waters, including the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park;

(c) the potential for the diversion and discharge to create or exacerbate flood risks;

(d) options to manage stormwater on-site or the use of communal stormwater management measures;

(e) practical limitations in respect of the measures that can be applied; and

(f) the current state of receiving environments.

(12) Manage contaminants in stormwater runoff from high contaminant generating car parks and high use roads to minimise new adverse effects and progressively reduce existing adverse effects on water and sediment quality in freshwater systems, freshwater and coastal waters.

(13) Require stormwater quality or flow management to be achieved on-site unless there is a downstream communal device or facility designed to cater for the site’s stormwater runoff.

**Wastewater**
(17) Avoid the discharge of wastewater to the coastal marine area and to freshwater, unless:
alternative methods, sites and routes for the discharge have been considered and are not the best practicable option;

(a) Mana Whenua have been consulted in accordance with tikanga Māori and due weight has been
given to section 6, section 7 and section 8 of the Resource Management Act 1991;
(b) the affected community has been consulted regarding the suitability of the treatment and disposal
system to address any environmental effects;
(c) the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated on areas of:
   i. high recreational use, or that are used for fishing or shellfish gathering;
   ii. areas of maintenance dredging;
   iii. commercial or residential waterfront development; (iv) high ecological value; and
   iv. marine farms.

Other discharges
(26) Prevent or minimise the adverse effects from construction, maintenance, investigation and other
activities on the quality of freshwater and coastal water by:

(a) adopting best management practices and establishing minimum standards for the discharges; or
(b) where Policy E1.3(26)(a) is not practicable, have regard to the following:
   i. the nature, volume and concentration of the contaminants in the discharge;
   ii. the sensitivity of the receiving environment to the contaminants in the discharge;
   iii. other practicable options for the discharge, including reuse or discharge to the trade sewer;
   and
   iv. practicable measures to reduce contaminant concentrations prior to discharge or otherwise
      mitigate adverse effects.

In relation to the relevant objectives and policies for freshwater quality and ecosystem health, stormwater
management, groundwater, wastewater and discharges the following comments are made:

- The proposal includes the addition of impervious areas within the coastal marine area (pontoons
  and gangways). Due to the nature and design of the infrastructure, no specific stormwater
  treatment or collection/detention devises are proposed. The amount of stormwater generated by
  these structures will be minimal and will discharge directly into the CMA.
- The proposal does not involve high contaminate generating activities and will use inert roofing
  material.
- The proposal involves works within the CMA which involve discharges associated with construction
  works. A management plan approach is proposed and use of mitigation methods such as silt
  curtains are proposed to ensure that works are carried out in accordance with best practice
techniques having particular regard to the receiving environment. Overall, works will be limited in duration and extent.

- In assessing the geotechnical effects associated with the excavation of deep pile holes, it is concluded that the pile design process will specifically addresses pile (and excavation) stability to ensure that a suitable factor of safety is maintained to prevent the occurrence of ground subsidence and instability at or below the seabed. In addition, casing will be used where necessary to construct piles which will provide temporary support to the ground.
- There will be no meaningful volume of groundwater extraction during pile construction and as a result, there is not considered to be any groundwater related effects as groundwater drawdown is not expected to occur as a result of the of the construction works.
- No discharge of wastewater to the CMA is proposed. Facilities for the transfer of sewage from vessels is included as part of the marine infrastructure proposed. Sewage is proposed to be piped to the reticulated wastewater network.

8.4.3 E18 Natural Character of the Coastal Environment & E19 Natural Features and Natural Landscapes in the Coastal Environment

Chapters E18 and E19 contain policy direction which gives effect to Policy 13(1)(b) of the NZCPS and RPS Objective B8.2.1.(2) and Policy B8.2.2.(4). Chapter E19 gives effect to Policy 15(b) of the NZCPS and RPS Objectives B4.2.1 and the policies in B4.2.2. These chapters of the AUP are considered to apply to activities in the coastal environment in areas which are not identified as having outstanding or high natural character or Outstanding Natural Features Overlay or the Outstanding Natural Landscapes Overlay. The proposal is not subject to any of these overlays but is located in the coastal environment.

E18.2 Objectives

(1) The natural characteristics and qualities that contribute to the natural character of the coastal environment are maintained while providing for subdivision, use and development.

(2) Where practical the natural character values of the coastal environment are restored or rehabilitated

Policies

(3) Manage the effects of subdivision, use and development in the coastal environment to avoid significant adverse effects, and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects, on the characteristics and qualities that contribute to natural character values, taking into account:

a. the location, scale and design of the proposed subdivision, use or development;

b. the extent of anthropogenic changes to landform, vegetation, coastal processes and water movement;
c. the presence or absence of structures, buildings or infrastructure;
d. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;
e. the physical and visual integrity of the area, and the natural processes of the location;
f. the intactness of any areas of significant vegetation, and vegetative patterns;
g. the physical, visual and experiential values that contribute significantly to the wilderness and scenic values of the area;
h. the integrity of landforms, geological features and associated natural processes, including sensitive landforms such as ridgelines, headlands, peninsulas, cliffs, dunes, wetlands, reefs, freshwater springs, streams, rivers and surf breaks;
i. the natural characteristics and qualities that exist or operate across mean high water spring and land in the coastal environment, including processes of sediment transport, patterns of erosion and deposition, substrate composition and movement of biota, including between marine and freshwater environments; and
j. the functional or operational need for infrastructure to be located in a particular area.

E19.2. Objective

(1) The characteristics and qualities of natural landscapes and natural features which have particular values, provide a sense of place or identity, or have high amenity value, are maintained while providing for subdivision, use and development in the coastal environment.

Policies

(2) Manage the effects of subdivision, use and development in the coastal environment to avoid significant adverse effects, and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects on the characteristics and qualities of natural landscapes and natural features which have particular values, provide a sense of place or identity, or have high amenity values, taking into account:

a. the location, scale and design of the proposed subdivision, use or development;
b. the extent of anthropogenic changes to the natural characteristics and qualities;
c. the presence or absence of structures, buildings or infrastructure;
d. the temporary or permanent nature of any adverse effects;
e. the physical and visual integrity and the natural processes of the location;
f. the intactness of any areas of significant vegetation, and vegetative patterns;
g. the physical, visual and aesthetic values that contribute significantly to the natural landscape’s values;
h. the integrity of landforms, geological features and associated natural processes, including sensitive landforms such as ridgelines, headlands, peninsulas, cliffs, dunes, wetlands, reefs, freshwater springs, streams, rivers and surf breaks; and
i. the functional or operational need for infrastructure to be located in a particular area.

In relation to the relevant objectives and policies, the following comments are made:

- The Ferry Basin is a highly modified coastal environment with a man-made geometric shape, and original landform transformed by reclamation. Waves and tidal currents are influenced by wharf structures and there is no natural terrestrial vegetation and low ecological values. The natural characteristics and qualities that contribute to the natural character of this area of the waterfront include the area of open water, the rise and fall of the tides, the sight and smell of the sea and the visual connections to the wider harbour. As such, the proposal accords with the general characteristics of the environment and the modified nature of this part of the waterfront.

- The proposal is not located near any identified areas having outstanding or high natural character or Outstanding Natural Features or the Outstanding Natural Landscapes and is not assessed as resulting in significant adverse effects. The proposal has a functional need to be located in the CMA in a manner that provides direct access to water, makes efficient use of existing infrastructure in the ferry basin and is reflective of the current uses and marine structures of the existing environment.

- The location, scale and design of the proposed infrastructure has been influenced by the need to provide for the safe and efficient movement of vessels, loading and unloading of passengers safely in varied weather conditions and the need to provide an acceptable level of passenger amenity. The design responds to these requirements by providing pontoons, gangways and shelters that are functional, safe and legible in a manner that minimised visual effects in this waterfront environment.

- The alignment of berths along one side of the Ferry Basin minimises interruption of outlook to the wider Waitematā Harbour and the simple pattern of the pontoon layout will help reduce potential visual clutter. The design has a simple and regular arrangement will reduce the extent to which the ferry berths might distract from legibility of the ferry basin as a space.

8.4.4 E23 Signs

*Objectives*

(1) Appropriate billboards and comprehensive development signage contribute to the social and economic well-being of communities through identifying places, providing information including for convenience and safety purposes, and advertising goods and services.

(2) Billboards and comprehensive development signage are managed to maintain traffic and pedestrian safety, historic heritage values and the visual amenity values of buildings and the surrounding environment.
Policies

(1) Require billboards and comprehensive development signage to meet the relevant permitted activity standards (for example building height) that apply in the zone in which they are located.

(2) Require the placement, location and size of billboards and comprehensive development signage on buildings to not significantly detract from the profile or appearance of a building, or cover any significant architectural features on the façade of a building.

(3) Enable billboards and comprehensive development signage while avoiding signs creating clutter or dominating the building or environment by controlling the size, number and location of signs.

(5) Manage the effects of billboards and comprehensive development signage to maintain the values of scheduled historic heritage places and visual amenity values.

In relation to the relevant objectives and policies, the following comments are made:

- The proposal includes the provision of comprehensive identification, wayfinding and information signage necessary for the provision of ferry services. Signage will be located on and within the terminal building, adjacent to the gangways and on the Piers.

- The proposal includes “markers” located on the dolphin piles at the end of each pier to identify the pier and/or service associated with the berth. The signs will form part of the Metro Auckland branded signage used on the ferry network throughout Auckland.

- The exact location and specific detail of the proposed signage and wayfinding has not been finalised at this stage. A condition of consent is offered to ensure that the location, size and placement of signage is appropriate, particularly in relation to historic heritage items and navigational safety.

8.4.5 E24 Lighting

Objectives

(1) Artificial lighting enables outdoor activities and the security and safety of people and property.

(2) The adverse effects of outdoor lighting on the environment and safety of road users are limited.

Policies

(1) Provide for appropriate levels of artificial lighting to enable the safe and efficient undertaking of outdoor activities, including night time working, recreation and entertainment.

(2) Control the intensity, location and direction of artificial lighting to avoid significant glare and light spill onto adjacent sites, maintain safety for road users and minimise the loss of night sky viewing.

(3) Use area or activity specific rules where the particular functional or operational needs of the area or activity make such rules appropriate.
In relation to the relevant objectives and policies, the following comments are made:

- A lighting strategy has been prepared which includes adequate level of lighting and signage to assist with wayfinding and provide for a safe and functional ferry service. Lighting and signage will be designed and installed to complement that provided for the existing ferry facilities and services and in accordance with AT Metro standards. The exact location and specific detail of the proposed lighting and has not been finalised at this stage. A condition of consent is offered to ensure that the location, size, placement and lux levels are appropriate, particularly in relation to historic heritage items.
- Lighting of the piers will be undertaken in a manner that meets navigational safety requirements.
- Construction lighting will include temporary lighting poles around the ferry basin and along Queens Wharf West, with zero tilt floodlight (orientated parallel to the ground) to reduce light spill and glare with no lighting being directed to the night sky. Any light spill towards the Princes Wharf apartments and Ferry Building will comply with the AUP standards in order to maintain amenity for residents.

8.4.6 E25 Noise and Vibration

Objectives
(1) People are protected from unreasonable levels of noise and vibration.
(2) The amenity values of residential zones are protected from unreasonable noise and vibration, particularly at night.
(4) Construction activities that cannot meet noise and vibration standards are enabled while controlling duration, frequency and timing to manage adverse effects.

Policies
(1) Set appropriate noise and vibration standards to reflect each zone’s function and permitted activities, while ensuring that the potential adverse effects of noise and vibration are avoided, remedied or mitigated.
(2) Minimise, where practicable, noise and vibration at its source or on the site from which it is generated to mitigate adverse effects on adjacent sites.
(3) Encourage activities to locate in zones where the noise generated is compatible with other activities and, where practicable, adjacent zones.

Noise arising from lakes, rivers and the coastal marine area
(8) Require activities to be insulated or protected, from unreasonable manmade noise and vibration emitted from the use and development of neighbouring lakes, rivers or the coastal marine area.
Construction, demolition and maintenance activities

(10) Avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of noise and vibration from construction, maintenance and demolition activities while having regard to:

(a) the sensitivity of the receiving environment; and
(b) the proposed duration and hours of operation of the activity; and
(c) the practicability of complying with permitted noise and vibration standards.

In relation to the relevant objectives and policies, the following comments are made:

- Offered conditions of consent setting maximum noise level limits and a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP) will ensure that construction noise levels will be maintained at levels suitable to protect sensitive receivers from levels of airborne noise that are considered unreasonable in the context of the environment and location, while providing for the necessary construction activities.
- It is considered appropriate to have maximum construction noise levels reflective the Business - City Centre zone applied in the CMA zone, as the occupied wharves are essentially an extension of the CBD in terms of uses and functions and it is therefore considered appropriate to apply consistent limits for the proposed works as would be applied to sensitive receivers within the Business - City Centre zone.
- Operational noise will generally be associated with the berthing of ferries which will have negligible effects over and above the existing berthing activities of ferries on Piers 1 and 2 and is anticipated in the provisions in the Central Wharves Precinct.

8.4.7 E26 Infrastructure

Chapter E26 recognises that infrastructure is critical to the social, economic, and cultural well-being of people and communities and the quality of the environment. The objectives and policies provide a framework for the development, operation, use, maintenance, repair, upgrading and removal of infrastructure and seek the following outcomes. While these objectives and policies are not specifically included as RCP provisions, they have been used as general guidance in terms of the AUP approach to infrastructure.

Objectives

(1) The benefits of infrastructure are recognised.
(2) The value of investment in infrastructure is recognised.
(3) Safe, efficient and secure infrastructure is enabled, to service the needs of existing and authorised proposed subdivision, use and development.
(4) Development, operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, renewal, upgrading and removal of infrastructure is enabled.

(5) The resilience of infrastructure is improved and continuity of service is enabled.

(6) Infrastructure is appropriately protected from incompatible subdivision, use and development, and reverse sensitivity effects.

(9) The adverse effects of infrastructure are avoided, remedied or mitigated.

Policies

(1) Recognise the social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits that infrastructure provides, including:
   (a) enabling enhancement of the quality of life and standard of living for people and communities;
   (b) providing for public health and safety;
   (c) enabling the functioning of businesses;
   (d) enabling economic growth;
   (e) enabling growth and development;
   (f) protecting and enhancing the environment;
   (g) enabling the transportation of freight, goods, people; and
   (h) enabling interaction and communication.

(2) Provide for the development, operation, maintenance, repair, upgrade and removal of infrastructure throughout Auckland by recognising:
   (a) functional and operational needs;
   (b) location, route and design needs and constraints;
   (c) the complexity and interconnectedness of infrastructure services;
   (d) the benefits of infrastructure to communities with in Auckland and beyond;
   (e) the need to quickly restore disrupted services; and
   (f) its role in servicing existing, consented and planned development.

Adverse effects on infrastructure

(3) Avoid where practicable, or otherwise remedy or mitigate adverse effects on infrastructure from subdivision, use and development, including reverse sensitivity effects, which may compromise the operation and capacity of existing, consented and planned infrastructure

Adverse effects of infrastructure

(4) Require the development, operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading and removal of infrastructure to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, including, on the:
   (a) health, well-being and safety of people and communities, including nuisance from noise, vibration, dust and odour emissions and light spill;
(b) safe and efficient operation of other infrastructure;
(c) amenity values of the streetscape and adjoining properties;
(d) environment from temporary and ongoing discharges; and
(e) values for which a site has been scheduled or incorporated in an overlay.

(5) Consider the following matters when assessing the effects of infrastructure:

(a) the degree to which the environment has already been modified;
(b) the nature, duration, timing and frequency of the adverse effects;
(c) the impact on the network and levels of service if the work is not undertaken;
(d) the need for the infrastructure in the context of the wider network; and
(e) the benefits provided by the infrastructure to the communities within Auckland and beyond.

(6) Consider the following matters where new infrastructure or major upgrades to infrastructure are proposed within areas that have been scheduled in the Plan in relation to natural heritage, Mana Whenua, natural resources, coastal environment, historic heritage and special character:

(a) the economic, cultural and social benefits derived from infrastructure and the adverse effects of not providing the infrastructure;
(b) whether the infrastructure has a functional or operational need to be located in or traverse the proposed location;
(c) the need for utility connections across or through such areas to enable an effective and efficient network;
(d) whether there are any practicable alternative locations, routes or designs, which would avoid, or reduce adverse effects on the values of those places, while having regard to E26.2.2(6)(a) - (c); (e) the extent of existing adverse effects and potential cumulative adverse effects;
(e) how the proposed infrastructure contributes to the strategic form or function, or enables the planned growth and intensification, of Auckland;
(f) the type, scale and extent of adverse effects on the identified values of the area or feature, taking into account:

(i) scheduled sites and places of significance and value to Mana Whenua;
(ii) significant public open space areas, including harbours;
(iii) hilltops and high points that are publicly accessible scenic lookouts;
(iv) high-use recreation areas;
(v) natural ecosystems and habitats; and
(vi) the extent to which the proposed infrastructure or upgrade can avoid adverse effects on the values of the area, and where these adverse effects cannot practicably be avoided, then the extent to which adverse effects on the values of the area can be appropriately remedied or mitigated.
whether adverse effects on the identified values of the area or feature must be avoided pursuant to any national policy statement, national environmental standard, or regional policy statement.

(7) Enable the following activities within natural heritage, historic heritage, historic character and Mana Whenua cultural heritage overlays:

(a) the use and operation of existing infrastructure; and

(b) the minor upgrading, maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure, while ensuring that the adverse effects on the values of the area are avoided and where those effects cannot practicably be avoided, minimise any such effects and ensure they are appropriately remedied or mitigated.

New technologies

(11) Provide flexibility for infrastructure operators to use new technological advances that:

(a) improve access to, and efficient use of services;

(b) allow for the re-use of redundant services and structures where appropriate;

(c) result in environmental benefits and enhancements; and

(d) utilise renewable sources.

In relation to the relevant objectives and policies, the following comments are made:

- The proposal provides for redevelopment and upgrades to existing ferry infrastructure in a manner that makes efficient uses of existing terminal and wharf facilities and infrastructure.
- The Ferry Basin is a key transport hub connecting people to the city centre and is located close to other transport networks, including rail services in Britomart, the northern bus services located in Lower Albert Street and the southern and eastern services located around Britomart. The redevelopment and upgrade of ferry facilities will provide for future growth in the ferry network and enhance the integration of ferry services with other modes of transport including bus, rail and cycling.
- The ferry terminal redesign offers the opportunity for a more efficient footprint, delivering infrastructure that allows for future service expansion. The generic design of the pontoons increases the ability to use more than one gate by any ferry. This increases flexibility, efficiency, resilience, reduced waiting times and will result in the ability to service increased patronage.
- The proposed infrastructure is being provided in a manner that minimises adverse effects on the coastal environment.

8.4.8 E27 Transport
The relevant objectives and policies for Transport are located in sections E27.2 and E27.3 of the AUP. The objective and policies relate to the provision of an integrated transport network and efficient parking, loading and access arrangements, while maintaining pedestrian safety and amenity.

**Objectives**

(1) Land use and all modes of transport are integrated in a manner that enables:

(a) the benefits of an integrated transport network to be realised; and

(b) the adverse effects of traffic generation on the transport network to be managed.

(2) An integrated transport network including public transport, walking, cycling, private vehicles and freight, is provided for.

**Policies**

(1) Require subdivision, use and development which:

(a) generate trips resulting in potentially more than minor adverse effects on the safe, efficient and effective operation of the transport network;

(b) are proposed outside of the following zones:

   (i) the Business – City Centre Zone, Business – Metropolitan Centre Zone, Business – Town Centre Zone;

   (ii) Residential – Terrace Housing and Apartment Buildings Zone; Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in part 3 E27 Transport

   (iii) the Centre Fringe Office Control as shown on the planning maps; or

(c) do not already require an integrated transport assessment or have been approved based on an integrated transport assessment to manage adverse effects on and integrate with the transport network by measures such as travel planning, providing alternatives to private vehicle trips, staging development or undertaking improvements to the local transport network.

(2) Require major proposals for discretionary consent to prepare an integrated transport assessment including provision for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport users, freight and motorists.

In relation to the relevant objectives and policies, the following comments are made:

- The proposal provides for the upgrade of ferry infrastructure at the Downtown Ferry Terminal, the main hub for ferry services in Auckland, serving destinations around the region. The upgrade provides for future growth in ferry services.
- The proposed works will provide for growth in the ferry network in a location that is in close proximity to other transport modes include rail, bus and cycling.
- Pedestrian amenity and access is maintained to both existing ferry services and the access to the water’s edge on Queens Wharf.
8.4.9 **E30 Contamination**

The objectives and policies are for contamination are located in sections E30.2 and E30.3 of the AUP. The objectives and policies relate to identification of contaminants and management or remediation during development. The proposal does not trigger the need for consent under the NES or AUP. An assessment of the environmental effects of ground contamination present in the CMA notes that they primarily relate to discharges of contaminated sediment during piling works that disturb the seabed. The probability of large silt plumes as a result of the piling operations is considered low and the short term effects and can be effectively mitigated through the use silt curtains during construction.

8.4.10 **E36 Natural Hazards and Flooding**

The objectives and policies in E36 seek to manage risks associated with natural hazards, including coastal hazards.

**Objectives**

1. Subdivision, use and development outside urban areas does not occur unless the risk of adverse effects to people, property, infrastructure and the environment from natural hazards has been assessed and significant adverse effects are avoided, taking into account the likely long-term effects of climate change.
2. Subdivision, use and development, including redevelopment in urban areas, only occurs where the risks of adverse effects from natural hazards to people, buildings, infrastructure and the environment are not increased overall and where practicable are reduced, taking into account the likely long term effects of climate change.
3. Subdivision, use and development on rural land for rural uses is managed to ensure that the risks of adverse effects from natural hazards are not increased and where practicable are reduced.
4. Where infrastructure has a functional or operational need to locate in a natural hazard area, the risk of adverse effects to other people, property, and the environment shall be assessed and significant adverse effects are sought first to be avoided or, if avoidance is not able to be totally achieved, the residual effects are otherwise mitigated to the extent practicable.
5. Subdivision, use and development including redevelopment, is managed to safely maintain the conveyance function of floodplains and overland flow paths.
6. Where appropriate, natural features and buffers are used in preference to hard protection structures to manage natural hazards.

**Policies**

**General**
(1) Identify land that may be subject to natural hazards, taking into account the likely effects of climate change, including all of the following:
   (a) coastal hazards (including coastal erosion and coastal storm inundation, excluding tsunami);
   (b) flood hazards;
   (c) land instability; and
   (d) wildfires.

(2) Investigate other natural hazards to assess whether risks to people, property or the environment should be managed through the Plan or otherwise.

(3) Consider all of the following, as part of a risk assessment of proposals to subdivide, use or develop land that is subject to natural hazards:
   (a) the type, frequency and scale of the natural hazard and whether adverse effects on the development will be temporary or permanent;
   (b) the type of activity being undertaken and its vulnerability to natural hazard events;
   (c) the consequences of a natural hazard event in relation to the proposed activity;
   (d) the potential effects on public safety and other property;
   (e) any exacerbation of an existing natural hazard risk or the emergence of natural hazard risks that previously were not present at the location;
   (f) whether any building, structure or activity located on land subject to natural hazards near the coast can be relocated in the event of severe coastal erosion, inundation or shoreline retreat;
   (g) the ability to use non-structural solutions, such as planting or the retention or enhancement of natural landform buffers to avoid, remedy or mitigate hazards, rather than hard protection structures;
   (h) the design and construction of buildings and structures to mitigate the effects of natural hazards;
   (i) the effect of structures used to mitigate hazards on landscape values and public access;
   (j) site layout and management to avoid or mitigate the adverse effects of natural hazards, including access and exit during a natural hazard event; and
   (k) the duration of consent and how this may limit the exposure for more or less vulnerable activities to the effects of natural hazards including the likely effects of climate change.

(4) Control subdivision, use and development of land that is subject to natural hazards so that the proposed activity does not increase, and where practicable reduces, risk associated with all of the following adverse effects:
   (a) accelerating or exacerbating the natural hazard and/or its potential impacts;
   (b) exposing vulnerable activities to the adverse effects of natural hazards;
   (c) creating a risk to human life; and
   (d) increasing the natural hazard risk to neighbouring properties or infrastructure. Coastal hazards (including coastal erosion and coastal storm inundation)
(5) Ensure that subdivision, use and development on rural land for rural uses and in existing urban areas subject to coastal hazards avoids or mitigates adverse effects resulting from coastal storm inundation, coastal erosion and sea level rise of 1m through location, design and management.

(6) Avoid subdivision, use and development in greenfield areas which would result in an increased risk of adverse effects from coastal hazards, taking account of a longer term rise in sea level.

(7) Ensure that buildings in areas subject to coastal hazards are located and designed to minimise the need for hard protection structures.

(8) Ensure that when locating any new infrastructure in areas potentially subject to coastal hazards consider, where appropriate, an adaptive management response taking account of a longer term rise in sea level.

(9) Require habitable areas of new buildings and substantial additions, alterations, modifications or extensions to existing buildings located in coastal storm inundation areas to be above the 1 per cent annual exceedance probability (AEP) coastal storm inundation event including an additional sea level rise of 1m.

Defences against coastal hazards

(10) Avoid the modification, alteration or removal of sand dunes and vegetation on sand dunes which would compromise their function as natural defences for an area subject to coastal hazards and ensure adverse effects on wider coastal processes are avoided or mitigated.

(11) Consider hard protection works to protect development only where existing natural features will not provide protection from the natural hazard and enhancement of natural defences is not practicable.

(12) Require hard protection works involving the placement of any material, objects or structures in or on any area located above mean high water springs to be designed and located to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse environmental effects including all of the following:

   (a) location of structures as far landward as possible to retain as much natural beach buffer as possible;
   (b) any likely increase in the coastal hazard, including increased rates of erosion, accretion, subsidence or slippage;
   (c) undermining of the foundations at the base of the structure;
   (d) erosion in front of, behind or around the ends or down-drift of the structure;
   (e) settlement or loss of foundation material;
   (f) movement or dislodgement of individual structural elements;
   (g) offshore or long-shore loss of sediment from the immediate vicinity;
   (h) long-term adverse visual effects on coastal landscape and amenity values; and
   (i) effects on public access

The proposed marine infrastructure has been designed to be compatible with the existing Queen Wharf structure. The proposal has been appropriately designed to respond the relevant coastal hazard risks within the context of the existing wharf infrastructure. Risks to people and infrastructure are considered to be appropriately mitigated through the design and intended design life of the marine structures.
8.4.11  F2 General Coastal Zone

F2.3 Depositing and Disposing of Material

Objectives

(1) Depositing of material in the coastal marine area is undertaken in appropriate locations to provide for public benefit including erosion management or habitat enhancement and the beneficial use of dredged material.

(2) Areas identified as having significant values are not adversely affected by material being deposited or disposed of in the coastal marine area.

(3) The adverse effects from the disposal of material, particularly any contaminated material, are minimised, where reasonably practicable, or otherwise avoided, remedied or mitigated.

(4) The depositing or disposal of material in the coastal marine area must not have significant adverse effects on the ecological, recreational, cultural, and amenity values of the Hauraki Gulf.

(5) The depositing and disposal of material in the coastal marine area must avoid, remedy or mitigate the spread of harmful aquatic organisms.

Policies

(3) Avoid the disposal of material in the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park other than where it is part of:
   (a) an approved reclamation;
   (b) a rehabilitation or restoration programme in degraded areas of the coastal marine area; or
   (c) provided for in accordance with section 15B of the Resource Management Act 1991 or Part 3 of the Resource Management (Marine Pollution) Regulations 1998.

(4) Avoid the disposal of material in the coastal marine area where it will have significant adverse effects on any of the following:
   (a) sites scheduled in the D17 Historic Heritage Overlay or scheduled in the D21 Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua Overlay; or
   (b) significant surf breaks identified in Appendix 4 Surf breaks.

(5) Avoid the disposal of material where it will have adverse effects on significant navigation channels.

(6) Avoid the disposal of solid inorganic waste or other matter, such as vessels, or structures in the coastal marine area...

(7) Avoid significant adverse effects from the disposal of material, other than the disposal of material in approved reclamations and determine the appropriateness of proposals by taking into account all of the following:
   (a) the volume of material;
   (b) the degree of contamination and resulting effects on water quality, sediment quality and ecology;
(c) the presence of harmful aquatic organisms in the material to be disposed of and the risk of introducing these into areas where they are not present;

(d) the sensitivity of the receiving environment, with particular reference to natural character and ecological values;

(e) the public use of the area;

(f) the characteristics of the disposal area, with particular reference to the potential for contaminants to be released from the area, and the potential for re-suspension of the material;

(g) the disposal technique, and for dredged material, the water content or solidity of the material at the time of disposal;

(h) available alternative disposal techniques, including stabilisation, use as mudcrete, or disposing of the material on land;

(8) Avoid the disposal of significantly contaminated material in the coastal marine area that is not undertaken as part of an approved reclamation, unless, after undertaking an assessment of waste management options described in Part 1, Schedule 3 of the Resource Management (Marine Pollution) Regulations 1998, it can demonstrate all of the following:

(a) there are no practicable alternative disposal methods or areas; and

(b) the contaminants can be satisfactorily contained within the disposal area, or if it is a dispersive environment, that the adverse effects associated with the release of contaminants will not be significant.

(9) Require the disposal of material to be undertaken in an area that will minimise the spread or loss of sediment and other contaminants to the surrounding seabed and coastal waters, or demonstrate that the site is the best practicable option given the type of material to be disposed of.

(10) Require proposals to dispose of material in a dispersive environment to ensure that the adverse effects associated with the release and spread of contaminants and sediment can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.

(11) Require any disposal of material to be undertaken at a location and time that will avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on all of the following:

(a) the ecological function of the area, such as the growth and reproduction of marine and coastal fauna and flora, including feeding and spawning habitats and migratory pathways;

(b) other established activities, including recreational and commercial use; and

(c) water quality, including any contributing factors which may lead to or promote algal blooms.

In relation to the above objectives and policies, the following comments are made.

- The proposal involves the potential temporary depositing of pile bore material on the CMA floor prior to removal of the material, ensuring no long-term material deposition within the CMA.

- The proposal does not involve undertaking beach replenishment.
• Any contaminated material will be appropriately managed to ensure that the spread or discharge of contaminants does not adversely affect the receiving environment.
• While the proposal includes works within a Historic Heritage Overlay, only minimal modifications are proposed and these will not detract from the values for which the items have been scheduled.
• The works areas do not involve any Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua Overlay and will not affect an identified surf break.
• The pile boring material from within the CMA will only temporarily be deposited on the CMA floor and will be managed so as not to affect navigational channels or navigational safety.
• The areas of the work sites where deposition and works will take place are highly modified and not particularly sensitive to changes.
• Available alternative disposal techniques will be considered through the CMP.
• The depositing of the pile boring material will not significantly impact on the ecological function of the area, other established activities or water quality promoting algal blooms as the disposal would take place within the work zones and would be temporary in time.
• The disposal of sewage from vessels will be via sullage pump-out facilities connecting to existing holding tanks.

F2.5 Disturbance of the Foreshore and Seabed

Objectives
(1) Use and development in the coastal marine area that has only short-term and minor impacts on the foreshore and seabed is enabled.
(2) Activities that have long-term impacts or involve more than a minor level of disturbance avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on natural character, ecological values, coastal processes, historic heritage and Mana Whenua values.

Policies
(1) Enable use and development in the coastal marine area that results in a minor level of disturbance to the foreshore and seabed, or that can be remedied by wave and tidal processes.
(2) Provide for the disturbance of the foreshore and seabed outside areas identified as having significant values, for the purposes of the following:
   (a) existing or new infrastructure or drainage systems or where the disturbance is in an appropriate location;
   (b) the operation, maintenance, repair, reconstruction and use of existing lawful structures, or infrastructure;
   (c) the safe and efficient functioning of drainage systems;
   (d) public health and safety; or
(e) the normal operation of vessels.

(3) Provide for the disturbance of the foreshore or seabed that is necessary to protect, maintain or enhance historic heritage or Mana Whenua values, geological, ecological or habitat values, or for public access or research, where this is consistent with maintaining the values of the area.

(4) Limit the area of foreshore and seabed disturbance to the extent practicable and for the works to be done at a time of day or year, that will avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on all of the following:

(a) the feeding, spawning and migratory patterns of marine and coastal fauna, including bird roosting, nesting and feeding;

(b) stability of coastal features such as dunes and coastal vegetation;

(c) public access, recreational and commercial use of the coastal marine area;

(d) other established activities;

(e) traditional gathering, collection or harvest of kaimoana by Mana Whenua; and

(f) historic heritage and Mana Whenua values.

(5) Require activities or works to be done by methods, at times and in conditions that will avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects arising from the release of sediment and contaminants into coastal water.

(6) Avoid disturbance of the foreshore and seabed that will result in the following:

(a) significant changes to natural coastal processes that will have adverse effects on surf breaks identified in Appendix 4 Surf breaks; and

(b) cause or exacerbate coastal erosion.

(7) Require where practicable visible disturbance of the foreshore or seabed to be remedied or restored upon completion of works to be in keeping with the natural character and visual amenity of the area that has been disturbed.

In relation to the objectives and policies above, the following comments are made:

- Activities included in the proposal involving disturbance of the sea floor are for piling for the development of new pontoons, gangways, shelters and breakwater structures. These will be temporary in duration. Sit curtains are proposed to contain sediment during construction works.
- The area is a highly modified environment with no significant ecological habitat present.
- The proposals will not impact on any ecologically sensitive marine ecology and conditions are proposed to ensure marine mammal safety.
- Given the low energy environment the proposals are not anticipated to cause significant erosion.
Given the depth of the proposals and the harbour environment it is not considered there would be any visible disturbance that would require remediation upon completion of works.

**F2.11 Discharges**

The relevant objectives and policies relating to discharges in the CMA are located in sections F2.11.2 and F2.11.3 of the AUP. The objectives and policies relate to the ensuring the protection of the coastal marine area from inappropriate disposal of materials and ensuring that any materials that are deposited within the CMA are deposited in appropriate locations.

**Objectives**

(1) Water and sediment quality in the coastal marine area is maintained where it is excellent or good and progressively improved over time in degraded areas.

(2) The life-supporting capacity and resources of the Hauraki Gulf, are protected and, where appropriate, enhanced.

(3) Stormwater and wastewater networks protect public health and safety by preventing or minimising the adverse effects of contaminants on the coastal water quality.

**Policies**

(1) Avoid the discharge of contaminants where it will result in significant modification of, or damage to any areas identified as having significant values.

(2) Require any proposal to discharge contaminants or water into the coastal marine area to adopt the best practicable option to prevent or minimise adverse effects on the environment, having regard to all of the following:

   (a) whether it is practicable or appropriate to discharge to land above mean high water springs;

   (b) whether there is a wastewater network in place that should be used;

   (c) whether the receiving environment has the capacity to assimilate the discharged contaminants after reasonable mixing, particularly within areas identified as degraded or as having significant ecological value;

   (d) the extent to which present or foreseeable future adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated on:

      (i) areas of high recreational use;

      (ii) relevant initiatives by Mana Whenua established under regulations relating to the conservation or management of fisheries;

      (iii) the collection of fish and shellfish for consumption; and

      (iv) areas associated with maintenance dredging;

   (e) high ecological values;
(f) cleaner production methods are used where practicable to minimise the volume and level of contaminants being discharged; and

(g) the discharge after reasonable mixing, does not either by itself or in combination with other discharges results in any or all of the following effects:

(i) oil or grease films, scums or foams, or floatable or suspended materials;
(ii) conspicuous change in the colour or visual clarity;
(iii) any emission of objectionable odour;
(iv) any significant adverse effects on aquatic life; or
(v) any significant effects of aesthetic or amenity values.

(3) Provide for discharges that are unavoidable but intermittent, where:

(a) the discharge occurs infrequently;

(b) there are technical and practical difficulties which prevent measures being taken to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of the discharge; or

(c) there is an appropriate programme, consistent with the best practicable option approach, in place to prevent or minimise adverse effects within a reasonable timeframe.

(4) Minimise, to the extent practicable, the discharge of contaminants in areas that require maintenance dredging.

(5) Encourage source control of contaminants, through the management of land use and discharges, as a method to prevent or minimise contaminant generation and discharge to coastal receiving environments, where source contaminant control devices and methods can practicably be installed and maintained on an ongoing basis.

(6) Reduce the amount of litter entering coastal waters, and mitigate the effects of litter disposal, by encouraging design, maintenance and management initiatives, for discharge structures, road cleaning and other activities, that will help minimise the amount of litter discharged into the coastal marine area.

(7) Enable discharges associated with new or redevelopment of infrastructure to meet the economic and social needs of people and communities, taking into account all of the following:

(a) the practicability of upgrading the part of the infrastructure at issue, the state of the infrastructure and the costs of upgrading it;

(b) public health priorities;

(c) the nature of both the receiving environment and the discharge;

(d) priorities for flooding and inundation protection;

(e) the operational need for stormwater or wastewater infrastructure and associated discharges to be located in the coastal marine area; and

(f) Policies E1.3(8) – (14), (17) – (21) of E1 Water quality and integrated management;

(8) Avoid the discharge of wastewater to the coastal marine area, unless:
(a) alternative methods, sites and routes for the discharge have been considered and are not the best practicable option;

(b) Mana Whenua have been consulted in accordance with tikanga Māori and due weight has been given to section 6, 7 and 8 of the Resource Management Act 1991;

(c) the affected community has been consulted regarding the suitability of the treatment and disposal system to address any environmental effects;

(d) the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated on areas of:
   (i) high recreational use, or areas that are used for fishing or shellfish gathering;
   (ii) maintenance dredging;
   (iii) commercial or residential waterfront development;
   (iv) high ecological value; and
   (v) marine farms.

(9) Require operators of ports, marinas, ferry terminals and other marine facilities to take all practicable steps to prevent contamination of coastal waters, substrate, ecosystems and habitats that is more than minor.

(10) Require adequate and convenient facilities in ports, marinas, ferry terminals and other marine facilities for the containment, collection and appropriate disposal of:
   (a) sewage, bilge water and litter from vessels;
   (b) recyclable material including waste oils;
   (c) residues from vessel servicing, construction, maintenance and repair;
   (d) spills from refuelling operations and refuelling equipment;
   (e) spills, residues and debris from cargo operations; and
   (f) the discharge of stormwater generated from the port facilities, including facilities located above mean high water springs.

In relation to the relevant objectives and polices the following comments are made:

- The main disturbance to the seabed will be from the pile installation and any silt plumes resulting from piling activity will low and of a short term duration and can be mitigated through the use of silt curtains.
- There are no discharges of wastewater into the CMA proposed as part of this application.
- The proposal includes the addition of impervious areas within the coastal marine area (pontoons and gangways). Due to the nature and design of the infrastructure, no specific stormwater treatment or collection devices are proposed. The amount of stormwater generated by these structures will be minimal and inert materials used for the pontoon and gangways structures.
F2.12 Untreated Sewage Discharge from Vessels

The relevant objectives and policies relating to discharge from vessels is located in sections F2.12.2 and F2.12.3.

Objectives

(1) The values of the coastal marine area, and the activities that rely on high water quality, are protected from the adverse effects from the discharge of untreated sewage from vessels, while providing for the health and safety of vessels and their occupants.

(2) The high recreation and amenity values of the inner Hauraki Gulf are maintained.

Policies

(1) Avoid the discharge of untreated sewage from vessels within areas that have been identified as inappropriate due to the proximity to shore, marine farms, marine reserves, or shallow water depth while providing for the health and safety of vessels and their occupants.

(2) Require provision of sewage collection and disposal facilities for vessels at ports, marinas and other allied facilities, or at the time of significant upgrading of these facilities.

(3) Promote the installation of public toilet facilities at high use boat ramps and boating destinations, at construction, or during significant upgrades of such facilities.

The objectives and policies relate to ensuring the protection of the coastal marine area form the adverse effects of untreated sewage discharge from vessels, while providing for the health and safety of vessels and their occupants.

Untreated sewage will not be discharged within the Ferry Basin from vessels berthed at the pontoons. Sullage pump-out facilities are located within the Ferry Basin to transfer sewage from vessels to holding tanks. The proposal includes the provision of infrastructure for the transfer of sewage from vessels into the existing sewage holding tanks.

F2.14 Use, Development and Occupation of the CMA

Objectives

(1) The high public value of the coast and coastal marine area as open space area with free public access is maintained.

(2) Occupation rights are provided for in appropriate locations, and in appropriate circumstances for use and development that has a functional need to be located in the common marine and coastal area, and for
infrastructure that has an operation need to be located below mean high water springs and cannot be practically located on land.

(3) Limit exclusive occupation to where it can be demonstrated it is necessary for the efficient functioning of the use and development or is needed for public safety, and any loss of public access and use as a result is minimised and mitigation is provided where practicable.

(4) Efficient use is made of coastal marine area by consolidating use and development within appropriate areas, where practicable.

(5) Activities that do not have a functional or operational need to be undertaken in the common marine and coastal area are provided for within zones or precincts only where they can demonstrate:

- (a) the need for a common marine and coastal area location;
- (b) they cannot practicably be located on land outside of the coastal marine area; and
- (c) they are consistent with the use and value of the area, including the adjacent land area, and do not compromise natural character, ecological, public access, Mana Whenua, historic heritage, or amenity values.

(6) Activities that do not have a functional or operational need to be undertaken in the coastal marine area do not unduly limit the use of areas for marine and port activities or result in adverse cumulative effects.

(7) Use and development in the coastal marine area is supported by all necessary land-based access and infrastructure.

Policies

(1) Enable use and occupation of the common marine and coastal area to provide for use and development that:

- (a) has a functional or operational need to be below mean high water springs and may require public access to be restricted; or
- (b) is necessary to provide for the use of the coastal marine area by Mana Whenua for Māori cultural activities and customary uses; and
- (c) will not compromise or limit the operation of existing activities that have occupation rights within the common marine and coastal area.

(2) Provide for exclusive occupation rights in the common marine and coastal area only where it can be demonstrated this is necessary for the efficient functioning of the use and development or is needed for public safety, and will enable the most efficient use of space by activities in the common marine and coastal area and require that the loss of public access and recreational use is mitigated.

(3) Avoid use and occupation of the common marine and coastal area by activities that do not have a functional need to be undertaken below mean high water springs, unless the proposed use:

- (a) can demonstrated it needs to be located in the common marine and coastal area and cannot practicably be located on land outside of the common marine and coastal area;
(b) is consistent with the objectives and policies for the relevant zone or precinct;
(c) will enhance amenity values and not conflict with marine activities; or
(d) any necessary land-based infrastructure can be provided.

(4) Avoid granting rights of exclusive occupation in areas with high public use and where it will have a significant adverse effect on public access and recreational use of the common marine and coastal area.

(5) Provide for use and occupation of the common marine and coastal area by infrastructure, where it does not have a functional need to locate in the common marine and coastal area but has an operational need, and only where it cannot be practicably located on land and avoids, remedies, or mitigates other adverse effects on:

(a) the existing use, character and value of the area;
(b) public access, recreational use and amenity values;
(c) natural character and scenic values, from both land and sea; (d) water quality and ecological values;
(e) coastal processes including erosion;
(f) other lawfully established use and development in the coastal marine area or on adjoining land;
(g) the anticipated future use of the area for marine activities; and
(h) Mana Whenua or historic heritage values.

(7) Enable temporary occupation of the common marine and coastal area by structures or activities associated with events or temporary activities, while minimising adverse effects on public access, use, and ensuring safety.

(10) Require any proposed use and development for activities in the common marine and coastal area to demonstrate that any necessary land-based access and infrastructure can be appropriately provided for.

(11) Determine the appropriate duration for granting rights of occupation having regard to the:

(a) extent of public use and access of the area and the impact of restrictions on the loss of public use and access;
(b) level of investment in the development and need for security of tenure to ensure its financial and economic viability and/or long term public benefit;
(c) land use and coastal development changes proposed in the vicinity through any statutory management strategies or plans that anticipate a change in public use and access in the area; and
(d) term of other consents in the vicinity, and the strategic benefit of all consents in an area expiring simultaneously.

In relation to the relevant objectives and policies, the following comments are made:

- Public access is retained on the western side of Queens Wharf and the existing recreation and public space uses of Queens Wharf are not compromised. In addition, views from the public open space adjacent to Piers 3 and 4 are enhanced with the removal of the pier infrastructure.
• Occupation of the CMA by the ferries have an operational and functional need to be located within the CMA. The occupation of the CMA is needed in order to appropriately manage the waterspace in the ferry basin for operational needs and ensure effective functioning of ferry services.

• The proposal provides for upgraded ferry infrastructure in a highly modified CBD waterfront area, where there is already existing ferry infrastructure occupying the CMA and providing ferry transport services to Greater Auckland.

• The Central Wharves are part of the working waterfront, with transport, tourism and recreational functions. The upgrade and relocation of ferry facilities to the western side of Queens Wharf is considered to be consistent and compatible functions and activities. The wharf and the CBD location provides the necessary land based access and infrastructure to service and support the ferry transport infrastructure.

• Consent is sought for the coastal marine structures including the piles, floating pontoons, gangways, shelters breakwater and other structures for a period of 35 years to provide for the maximum duration possible under section 123 of the RMA for this important transport infrastructure.

• The proposal includes the temporary occupation of the CMA for structures associated with construction. This is for a short duration and will be undertaken in a manner that minimises adverse effects on the sensitive receiving environment.

• While the proposed café/food and beverage activities do not have a functional need to locate in the CMA, they are small in scale and serve an ancillary function to the ferry passenger terminal providing food and refreshments for passenger waiting to board commuter and tourism ferry services.

F2.16 Structures.
The relevant objectives and policies for structures within the CMA are located in sections F2.16.2 and F2.16.3 of the AUP. The objectives and policies relate to the functional need for structures in the CMA, providing public access onto the structures, ensuring appropriate design to minimise adverse visual amenity, ecological, landscape, natural characters and coastal hazard effects.

Objectives
(1) Structures are generally limited to those that have a functional need to be located in the coastal marine area, or those that have an operational need and that cannot be practicably located outside of the coastal marine area.

(2) Structures provide for public access and multiple uses where practicable, other than those restricted by location or functional requirements.

(3) Structures are appropriately located and designed to minimise adverse effects on the ecological, natural character, landscape, natural features, historic heritage and Mana Whenua values of the coastal marine area, and avoid to the extent practicable the risk of being adversely affected by coastal hazards.
(4) Structures are provided in appropriate locations to enable Māori cultural activities and customary use.

Policies

Efficient use of coastal space

(1) Limit structures to the following:

(a) those that generally have a functional need to be located in the coastal marine area, or that have an operational need and cannot be practically be located outside of the coastal marine area;
(b) where the proposed purpose or use cannot practically be accommodated on existing structures or facilities;
(c) those that are necessary to provide access to land where there are no practicable land-based access options, and there is no existing structure in close proximity that could provide reasonable access; and
(d) locations where the purpose and frequency of use warrants the proposed structure, and an alternative that would have lesser effects is not a practicable option.

(2) Avoid adverse cumulative impacts from structures in the Coastal – General Coastal Marine Zone taking into account the number of structures in the immediate and surrounding area.

(3) Limit the impacts from structures associated with infrastructure by:

(a) requiring an assessment of any practicable alternative sites, routes or designs where it is likely that the proposed structure will result in any significant adverse effect on the environment, including land-based alternatives, to demonstrate that the chosen option is appropriate taking into account the purpose and use of the structure and that the adverse effects will be avoided to the extent practicable, and will otherwise be remedied or mitigated;
(b) concentrating infrastructure structures, including pipelines, cables and transmission structures, in locations where similar, or other infrastructure, already exists where reasonably practicable;
(c) ensuring that where practicable cables and transmission structures are located beneath the seabed to avoid the need for anchoring or fishing restrictions; and
(d) encouraging structures for infrastructure to be multifunctional where practicable.

(4) Enable the maintenance, repair, reconstruction and upgrade of existing lawful structures, including where necessary to comply with applicable standards and codes.

(5) Enable the extension or alteration of existing structures in locations where they will:

(a) not have significant adverse effects on other uses and values;
(b) result in greater, more efficient, or multiple use of the structure; or
(c) reduce the need for new structures elsewhere. Ensuring structures are appropriately located and designed

(6) Require structures to be located to avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects on the values of areas identified as:
(a) D17 Historic Heritage Overlay;
(b) D21 Sites and Places of Significance to Mana Whenua Overlay;
(c) D11 Outstanding Natural Character and High Natural Character overlays;
(d) D10 Outstanding Natural Features Overlay; and Outstanding Natural Landscapes Overlay; and
(e) significant surf breaks identified in Appendix 4 Surf breaks, including the recreation, amenity and economic values, and taking into account any effects on coastal processes, currents, water levels, seabed morphology and swell corridors that contribute to significant surf breaks.

(7) Require structures in the Coastal – General Coastal Marine Zone to be located to minimise:
(a) impacts on other coastal activities, including activities provided for in zones or resource consents;
(b) adverse effects on recreational use, including popular anchorage areas;
(c) adverse effects on public access to and along the coastal marine area;
(d) visual impacts, particularly in areas sensitive to effects such as headlands or the outer edges of enclosed bays, as seen from both land and water;
(e) the size of the structure, including its size in relation to wharves and jetties and consider providing for partial rather than all-tide access, unless this is not a practicable option given the function and frequency of use;
(f) the risk of being affected by coastal hazards including sea level rise;
(g) the need for dredging, including ongoing dredging to maintain water access; and
(h) adverse effects on scheduled sites and places of significance to Mana Whenua

(8) Require structures to be designed to:
(a) be the minimum size reasonably necessary to provide for the proposed use;
(b) be multi-purpose where practicable and where it will not conflict with operational or safety requirements;
(c) minimise impacts on natural character and amenity values and generally fit with the character of any existing built elements, including in the use of materials and colours having regard to safety requirements;
(d) not increase rates of coastal erosion; and
(e) take into account dynamic coastal processes, including the expected effects of climate change and sea level rise.

(9) Have regard to the value of retaining the natural character of areas where structures are absent, taking into account the area’s uniqueness and value because of the absence of structures.

(10) Require the building material used for structures to be appropriately marine treated, or if relocated or recycled building material or structures are used, that it is treated or cleaned to prevent the transference or introduction of harmful aquatic organisms.

(11) Require buildings in the coastal marine area to be of a scale, location and design that is appropriate to its context. Structures that enhance public use and access and enable traditional and cultural use
(12) Enable structures in appropriate locations where the structure is to provide, or enhance:
   (a) public access, use or amenity values, including artworks in the coastal marine area; and
   (b) access to the coast by Mana Whenua for customary uses and cultural activities, and for access to
       the coast from papakāinga, marae or Māori land.
(13) Require structures to provide for public access and reasonable use, except in exceptional circumstances,
or where public use needs to be restricted or excluded for operational, or health and safety reasons. Foreshore
protection works – hard protection structures
(14) Avoid a proliferation of hard protection structures in the coastal marine area by requiring:
   (a) hard protection structures to be located landward of mean high water springs where practicable,
       particularly if the structure is for the purpose of protecting private assets;
   (b) evidence to demonstrate that the adjoining landward area, or development in the coastal marine
       area, is at risk from a coastal hazard, and the degree of risk;
   (c) evidence to demonstrate that the options of non-intervention, managed retreat, abandonment or
       relocation of any landward development or structures are not practicable; and
   (d) evidence to demonstrate that the proposed structure is the most appropriate method for remedying
       or mitigating a coastal hazard having regard to the entire area affected or potentially affected by
       the hazard, and taking into account alternative methods, including soft engineering works.
(15) Avoid hard protection structures that are likely to result in:
   (a) undermining of the foundations at the base of the structure;
   (b) erosion behind or around the ends of the structure;
   (c) settlement or loss of foundation material;
   (d) movement or dislodgement of individual structural components;
   (e) the failure of the coastal protection structure should overtopping by seawater occur;
   (f) piping or hydraulic pumping of fine material or backfill;
   (g) offshore or long-shore loss of sediment from the immediate vicinity; and
   (h) any increase in the coastal hazard posed to the coastline elsewhere.
(16) Require the design and location of hard protection structures to:
   (a) minimise adverse effects on natural character and amenity values;
   (b) avoid restricting public access to or along the coastal marine area; and
   (c) take into account dynamic coastal processes, including the effects of climate change, sea level rise,
       assessed at least over a 100 year timeframe, including the potential for inundation or for the coastal
       marine area to advance inland.
(17) Encourage a comprehensive and integrated land-sea management approach to be taken in considering
new foreshore protection works, including:
   (a) the erosion effects from any on-site stormwater discharges;
   (b) whether the discharge method is lawful and the most appropriate option; and
(c) the extent that the hazard risk is being increased as a result of the location and method of stormwater discharges or drainage.

(18) Require consideration to be given to any relevant management strategy, strategic plan or hazard risk assessment relating to the area where foreshore protection works are proposed Ensuring integrated management between land and sea.

(19) Require applications for structures in the coastal marine area to demonstrate that any landward component, development, or use of land-based infrastructure or facilities can be appropriately provided for.

(20) Require applications for structures in the coastal marine area to demonstrate how any significant adverse effects on the use of adjoining land, including reverse sensitivity effects on existing use or development of that land, can be avoided, remedied or mitigated. Ensuring safe navigation.

(21) Enable structures required to ensure safe navigation or for health and safety purposes.

(22) Ensure that structures in the coastal marine area do not pose a risk to navigation or to public health and safety by:

(a) requiring structures to be maintained to an appropriate standard;

(b) requiring structures to be appropriately located and lit; and

(c) enabling the removal of structures, where they are no longer functional or required, or have been abandoned.

(23) Enable the removal of unlawful, abandoned, unsafe and redundant structures where the structure has been assessed as:

(a) not being a site scheduled in the Historic Heritage Overlay;

(b) a potential risk to navigation or public health and safety;

(c) restricting public access and use of the area;

(d) having an adverse effect on the natural character or visual amenity of the area;

(e) having an adverse effect on coastal processes or ecological values;

(f) having poor structural integrity; and

(g) likely to result in anchoring or fishing restrictions if it remained in the coastal marine area.

(24) Avoid structures that will limit the ability to moor vessels in the Coastal – Mooring Zone, other than those structures necessary for infrastructure that have a functional or operational need to be located in the coastal marine area and that cannot practicably be located outside the Coastal – Mooring Zone.

In terms of the above objectives and policies, the following comments are made:

- Public access is maintained on the western side of Queens Wharf and the ferry terminal is proposed to be opened to use by the general public, enabling greater access to the water’s edge.

- The ferry facilities have a functional and operational need to locate in the CMA and enhance the use of the coastal marine area for public water transport.
• The proposed ferry infrastructure and use and development of the coastal marine area will make a significant contribution to the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people and communities by enhancing the provision of ferry services.

• The proposed structures are not able to be used for multiple purposes given the operational requirements for ferry services. However, use and access to the edge of Queens Wharf has been maintained by limiting structures on the western face of the wharf. The location of the ferry infrastructure will draw people further along Queens Wharf.

• The proposal is not expected to give rise to any significant adverse cumulative effects as the proposed works are located within the existing Ferry Basin and involve the relocation of ferry piers and infrastructure.

• While the proposal will result in additional marine structures, the proposal is located adjacent to existing ferry services, makes efficient use of existing infrastructure and avoids sprawling or sporadic patterns of use within the CMA.

• The location and design of new marine structures minimises their impact on the waterspace within the ferry basin and are in keeping with the character of uses typically located adjacent to wharf structures.

• The proposal promotes the efficient use of water space proposed to be occupied as structures. The impacts of such occupation are minimised by the pontoons having a saw-tooth arrangement and low profile with the berth arrangement having a simple and efficient layout for the berthing of vessels and loading and unloading of passengers. Further the modifications to the ferry terminal building will allow general public access to this facility.

• The proposal recognises and protects historic heritage located in the CMA with modifications proposed to historic heritage that does not impact on the heritage values of the place or building.

• The proposed breakwater is required to provide more tranquil and sheltered waterspace and will not impact on the flushing of the ferry basin or cause significant sedimentation.

• The proposal promotes the integration of land and water based activities by providing upgraded ferry infrastructure in close proximity to Auckland’s CBD.

• The proposal has been designed so that it does not pose a navigational risk or a risk to public health and safety. The reverse saw-tooth arrangement has the ability to operate under a wide range of weather conditions and can cater for existing ferry traffic with cruise ships on Princes Wharf East. It has been assessed as having the lowest maritime safety risk while allowing a simple movement pattern that minimises congestion potential.

• Any redundant infrastructure from Piers 3 and 4 is proposed to be removed from the CMA.

F2.18 Underwater Noise
Objective

(1) Underwater noise from identified activities is managed to maintain the health and well-being of marine fauna and users of the coastal environment.

Policies

(1) Require underwater blasting, impact and vibratory piling, and marine seismic surveys in the coastal marine area to adopt the best practicable option to manage noise so that it does not exceed a reasonable level.

(2) Assess the following matters for underwater blasting, impact and vibratory piling, and marine seismic surveys:

   (a) the health and well-being of marine fauna (including threatened and at-risk species) and people from the noise associated with the proposal;
   (b) the practicability of being able to control the noise effects;
   (c) the social and economic benefits to the community of the proposal; and
   (d) the extent to which the adverse effects of the noise will be mitigated.

(3) Enable the generation of underwater noise where that noise is associated with the following activities:

   (a) the operational requirements of vessels;
   (b) construction or operation of marine and port activities, marine and port facilities, marina activities, marine and port accessory structures and services, maritime passenger facilities and dredging, that do not involve underwater blasting, impact and vibratory piling, or marine seismic surveys; and
   (c) sonar not including marine seismic surveys.

The noise generated from proposed piling works will be above the measured existing ambient levels and it is predicted that piling would be audible to marine mammals in the general harbour. However, the harbour is a noisy environment, and furthermore, it is not regularly occupied by marine mammals and is not a critical habitat for feeding, breeding or migration for the species of interest. The CNVMP will include measures to mitigate the effects of underwater noise on marine mammals such as visual monitoring during piling works, use of wooden or plastic dolly for impact driven steel piles, use of soft starts and shut-down procedures when marine mammals are identified in close proximity to the proposed piling works.

8.4.12 I202.2 Central Wharves Precinct

The Central Wharves Precinct incorporates the finger wharves between Viaduct Harbour precinct and the Port Precinct, including Princes Wharf, Queens Wharf and Captain Cook Wharf and the adjacent coastal marine area. The precinct is characterised by its active water edge, maritime passenger operations (including cruise ships), marine and port activities, proximity to the city core, and areas of low-rise character buildings. The stated purpose of the precinct is to provide for ongoing use for maritime passenger operations and
other marine and port activities, and in parts of the precinct to provide an environment and an appropriate scale of built form for public activities, marine facilities and events, while maintaining public access to the waterfront and providing for sustainable land and coastal management within the precinct.

**Objectives**

1. A world-class visitor destination that is recognised for its quality buildings, public open spaces, recreational opportunities, marine and port activities and facilities and events.
2. Development which is of a medium to low scale on the waterfront which integrates and does not conflict with the scale of development in neighbouring precincts.
3. A safe, convenient and interesting environment, which optimises pedestrian and cycling use and connections to the waterfront and to the core central business district, in public areas of the precinct.
4. Public wharf space developed and used for predominantly public activities for the benefit of the people of Auckland and visitors while also enabling marine and port activities and maritime passenger operations.
5. Adverse effects arising from activities and development are avoided, remedied or mitigated, in an integrated manner across mean high water springs.

**Policies**

1. Enable the efficient operation and development of the precinct by providing for activities which have a functional need to locate in or adjacent to the coastal marine area, including maritime passenger operations, marine and port activities and maritime passenger facilities including for the cruise ship industry.
2. Enable a diverse range of activities while:
   - (a) avoiding, mitigating or remediying potential adverse effects in an integrated manner across mean high water springs, including reverse sensitivity effects on marine and port activities and maritime passenger operations; and
   - (b) maintaining and enhancing public access to the water’s edge, except where public access must be excluded for safety, security, biosecurity, Customs, maintenance or operational purposes.
3. Provide for continued use of all berthing areas adjacent to public open spaces for maritime passenger operations and other marine and port activities.
4. Manage building height to:
   - (a) achieve an appropriate scale in relation to the street network and the precinct’s prominent waterfront location;
   - (b) provide a sense of intimacy along streets and waterfront public space frontages;
   - (c) complement the height enabled in the adjacent Britomart, and Viaduct Harbour precincts; and
   - (d) provide a transition in height between the core city centre and the harbour.
5. Encourage the development of a diverse range of high-quality visitor experiences including promenading, coastal recreation and temporary activities.
(7) Provide for a network of different-sized public open spaces in key locations along the water’s edge to cater for a range of recreational opportunities and provide vantage points.
(8) Enable public access and events along Queens Wharf in a manner that does not constrain or conflict with the use of this wharf as a terminal and berthing for maritime passenger operations, cruise ship operations, other visiting non-cargo vessels and public transport facilities.
(10) Manage the land and coastal marine area to avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects on the ecology of the city centre coastal environment.
(11) Limit the loss of identified significant public views from the city to the harbour and adjacent landscape features.

In relation to the above objectives and policies the following comments are made:

- The proposal is compatible with the existing event, cruise operations and public open space uses currently undertaken on Queens Wharf.
- The proposal provides for the efficient development and operation of upgraded ferry facilities close to existing ferry services. The proposal has a functional need to locate in water space adjacent to an existing wharf structure within the CMA. The proposal utilises berthing areas adjacent to public open space for maritime passenger operations.
- The proposal is of a scale commensurate with existing built form and structures located within the Ferry basin and on existing wharves. The proposed infrastructure has been design to be functional, but also to be of a scale, quality and standard that reflects its civic nature. The height of the proposed shelters covering the gangways is of a height and scale that complies with the height standards of the precinct and achieves an appropriate scale to the Cloud and Shed 10. The shelters reinforce the horizontal form of Queens Wharf and combined with the “marker dolphins” provide a sense of arrival at an important gateway to the city.
- The proposal provides for accessible, legible and safe ferry facilities in a manner that optimises pedestrian and cycle connections in close and convenient proximity to other transport modes (bus, rail, cycle) and the central city.
- Adverse effects on marine ecology are assessed as being less than minor.
- The proposal maintains unrestricted public access to the water’s edge on Queens Wharf West and complies with the public access standards of the precinct. Potential pedestrian-vehicle conflict will be managed through the use of a combination of permanent seating and lighting and relocatable seating or other traffic management devices employed when cruise ships are berthed at Queens Wharf East.
• While the proposal does result in some impact on existing public and private views of the ferry basin and from Princes and Queens Wharves, such impacts are minimised as a result of the scale of the proposed infrastructure.
• The proposal include ancillary convenience food and beverage uses to enhance the commuter and visitor experience when using the ferry network.

8.4.13 Assessment criteria

The proposed development is subject to a number of restricted discretionary activities over which the Council has reserved its control or restricted its discretion of the matters that may be considered in the assessment of the application. It is appropriate to consider the relevant assessment criteria in each case. The relevant assessment criteria are contained in Attachment T. The preceding environmental effects assessment and the specialist technical reports compliance address the matters covered by the assessment criteria.

8.5 SECTION 104B DISCRETIONARY ACTIVITIES

The proposal requires a discretionary activity resource consent. Section 104B of the RMA sets out the matters relating the determination of applications for a discretionary activity. After considering a resource consent for a discretionary activity (in terms of matters for consideration in Section 104), a consent authority may, grant or refuse the application; and if it grants the application, may impose conditions under section 108 of the RMA.

The application includes a detailed analysis of the assessment of effects of the proposal and it is concluded that there are a number of positive effects associated with the proposal and any adverse effects will range from negligible to minor. There are significant positive social benefits resulting from an improvement to the ferry basin infrastructure to provide for growth and capacity in this important public transport mode.

In terms of the relevant provisions of the statutory documents and other matters the above analysis concludes that the proposal will not be contrary to the relevant objectives and policies. The proposal has a functional need to be located within the CMA and the proposed use of the waterspace and Queens Wharf is compatible with existing uses and activities undertaken in the Ferry Basin and surrounding waterfront area. Furthermore the maritime passenger operations are contemplated in the provisions of the AUP.

It is considered that the proposal can be granted consent in accordance with section 104B.
8.6 **MATTERS RELEVANT TO DISCHARGE PERMITS (SECTION 107)**

Section 107 restricts the granting of a coastal permit where after reasonable mixing, a contaminant or water discharged to water (either by itself or in combination with the same, similar, or other contaminants or water), is likely to give rise to all or any of the following effects in the receiving waters:

- The production of any conspicuous oil or grease films, scums or foams, or floatable or suspended materials;
- Any conspicuous change in the colour or visual clarity;
- Any emission of objectionable odour;
- The rendering of fresh water unsuitable for consumption by farm animals; and
- Any significant adverse effects on aquatic life.

The discharge effects have been assessed above. It is proposed to manage discharges during construction through the CEMP through mitigation measures such as silt curtains. There are no discharges of wastewater proposed as part of this application. It is considered that the matters in relation to Section 107 set out above are met.

8.7 **CONDITIONS (SECTION 108)**

As set out in Section 5.7 above, the application includes a set of draft conditions of consent contained in Attachment R. It is considered that the proposed conditions will appropriately avoid, remedy or mitigate and adverse effects as a result of the proposal in accordance with Section 108 of the RMA.

8.8 **CONSENT DURATION AND LAPSE (SECTIONS 123 AND 125)**

As outlined in Section 5.8, consent is sought for all coastal marine structures including the floating pontoons, gangways, fenders, dolphins, breakwater for a period of 35 years. The piles have been designed for a period of 50 years, while the pontoons have a 25 year design life. This provides for the maximum duration possible under section 123 of the RMA.

8.9 **PART 2 MATTERS**

The Court of Appeal has recently confirmed (in the R J Davidson Family Trust v Marlborough District Council decision) that when undertaking the section 104 evaluation the Council “must have regard to the provisions of Part 2 when it is appropriate to do so”. In this situation, given that the AUP has only recently been made operative (so it contains provisions prepared having regard to Part 2 and a coherent set of policies to achieve
clear environmental outcomes) and does not add anything to the evaluative exercise, it is not considered necessary to undertake an assessment of the proposal against Part 2.

For completeness however this report provides a brief assessment which concludes that the application satisfies Part 2 of the RMA.

The purpose of the RMA is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. As stated in section 5 of the Act, this means:

5(2) In this Act, sustainable management means managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety while –

(a) Sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and

(b) Safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and

(c) Avoiding, remediying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.

Whether the purpose of the RMA is being achieved consideration of the matters set out in sections 6, 7 and 8 of the Act.

Section 6 sets out matters of national importance relative to the natural character of the coastal environment, protection of outstanding natural features, protection of areas of significant public access along coastal marine areas, lakes and rivers, the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions, protection of historic heritage and customary activities and management of significant risks from natural hazards.

The proposal is considered above in this AEE in relation to the relevant matters, the proposal is considered to be an appropriate use in this coastal location, particularly as the AUP provides for the development of the Central Wharves Precinct for maritime passenger services. Notably, there are no identified outstanding natural character, landscape or feature elements affected by the proposal. The proposal also maintains public access along the western side of Queens Wharf and the open space and recreation use of Queens Wharf is not compromised. Coastal hazard risks have also been assessed as acceptable, as such the proposal is considered to recognise and provide for these.

In terms of the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions to the Waitematā, Auckland Transport has undertaken initial engagement with mana whenua, where the proposal have been presented and discussed generally. Auckland Transport will continue engaging with mana whenua specifically on the
project post lodgement of the resource consent application and for the duration of the project. Further, as part of the MACA requirements, the details of the resource consent application were sent to the iwi that have registered customary title rights over this part of the CMA.

Section 7 requires particular regard be had to ‘other matters’. Of relevance to this application are:

(b) the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources;
(c) the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values;
(f) the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment; and
(g) any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources.

Section 8 requires the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi be taken into account. The applicant has engaged with mana whenua through the Auckland Transport mana whenua engagement framework. AT will continue engaging with mana whenua through the next phases of the project. The details of the resource consent application have also been sent to the iwi that have registered customary title rights over this part of the CMA as required by the MACA requirements and AT is engaging with iwi who have responded. The application accords with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.

The proposal provides for the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources. While the proposal does result in the expansion of structures in the CMA, the proposal has been developed so that intrusion into the waterspace by the additional marine structures and breakwater, is minimised as far as is practicable. The proposed works will provide for upgraded ferry facilities that have a functional need to be within the coastal environment and make efficient use of natural and physical resources. Furthermore, marine passenger operation within the coastal environment is an expected and anticipated part of the CMA and reflects the types of activity that are currently undertaken within the coastal environment.

Matters relating to any potential adverse effects on the environment and proposed mitigation are addressed in this report and associated technical reports. While the proposal will alter the character of the western side of Queens Wharf by creating more intensive use of this part of the waterspace than is currently the case, it is considered appropriate within the highly modified character of the Ferry Basin.

From a built character perspective the proposed marine structures are appropriate within this location and will maintain the existing level of public amenity and interest in the Ferry Basin. In particular, the proposed use will be consistent with the existing marine and port related activities characteristic of the area. In terms of amenity, the proposal will provide an appropriate level of amenity in the context of the Central Wharves Precinct and maintains public access to the western edge of Queen Wharf.
The proposed development maximises the use of this finite resource and is therefore an efficient use and development of natural and physical resources. The proposal will result in an appropriate use and development of this part of the coastal environment. The saw-tooth arrangement has the ability to operate under a wide range of weather conditions and can cater for existing ferry traffic with cruise ships on Princes Wharf East. Of the various layouts considered, the “reverse saw-tooth” layout has been assessed as having the lowest maritime safety risk while allowing a simple movement pattern that minimises congestion potential. With suitable berth design and allocation of services to berths, safe operations can be maintained under a wide range of environmental conditions and operational demands.

The proposal provides for the social and cultural wellbeing of the community through the provision of enhanced ferry facilities adjacent to existing services and in close proximity to other transport modes including bus, rail and cycle networks.

The proposal maintains the quality of the environment by ensuring that coastal processes and ecological effects are managed so that the water quality is not compromised and marine habitats are maintained.

Overall, the proposal satisfies the sustainable management of natural and physical resources purpose and principles of the Act. The proposal represents a sustainable use of the CMA and will be carried out in a manner that meets the principles of Part 2.

8.10 Other Matters (Section 104(1)(c))

8.10.1 Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011

The purpose of the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011 (“MACA”) is to establish a durable scheme to ensure the protection of the legitimate interests of all New Zealanders in the marine and coastal area of New Zealand. It recognises the mana tuku iho exercised in the marine and coastal area by iwi, hapū, and whānau as tangata whenua and provides for the exercise of customary interests in the common marine and coastal area.

Section 62(3) of the MACA requires that any person making an application under the RMA for a proposal within the marine and coastal area must notify and seek the views of any applicant for customary marine title prior to lodging the application.

Auckland Transport notified the applicants’ for customary marine title applicable to the Waitematā Harbour on 24 August 2018 seeking views on the proposal Stage 1 ferry redevelopment works, which is contained in Attachment S
At the time of lodgement the following responses have been received:

- Te Runanga o Ngāti Whatua responded to defer interests to Ngāti Whātua Orākei.
- Ngāti Whanaunga requested copies of documentation, which has been provided as part of AT’s engagement with mana whenua through the mana whenua forum.
- Ngapuhi Nui Tonu requested a site visit. AT met with representatives from Ngapuhi Nui Tonu on 17 September and a site visit was held 3 October.
- Ngāti Kawau te Kōtuku, Te Uri o Te Aho, Ngāti Kuri, Te Waiariki Korora nga Hapū o Ngāpuhi-Nui-Tonu responded to advise the groups agree with the application on following conditions:
  - is for a public purpose;
  - does not confer private, commercial benefits to any person or entity;
  - does not damage the marine and coastal area; and
  - recognises the Tino Rangatiratanga of the local hapū/iwi over the Specified Area.

8.10.2 Auckland Plan 2050

The Auckland Plan 2050, updated in 2018, is produced by the Council under the requirements of sections 79 and 80 of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009. It is a ‘spatial plan’ that provides a 30-year strategy for the development of Auckland and its communities that integrates social, economic, environmental and cultural objectives. The Auckland Plan contains six outcomes, a Development Strategy detailing how Auckland will grow and change over the next 30 years, 20 Direction to achieve the Outcomes and 37 Focus areas. The six outcomes include:

- Belonging and Participation
- Maori Identity and Wellbeing
- Homes and Places
- Transport and Access
- Environment and Cultural Heritage
- Opportunity and Prosperity

Auckland's city centre plays a critical role in the success of Auckland's economy with a concentration of financial and commercial jobs. It is:

- Auckland's primary business area with its mix of commercial, education, employment, cultural and civic activities
- linked to the rest of Auckland by an extensive transport system.
Around a quarter of all jobs in Auckland are located in the city centre, and it contributes around seven percent to national gross domestic product. The residential population of the city centre and fringe areas has increased substantially over the past decade to around 80,000 residents.

In support of the Auckland Plan’s vision, the strategic direction seeks to expand the City Centre into a highly desirable place to live, work, and invest in, and by adding to Auckland’s identity and vibrancy. The vision and outcomes in the Auckland Plan are aspirational and reflective of the 20-30 year planning horizon of the document.

The proposal is supportive of the Auckland Plan vision and outcomes for a well-connected and accessible Auckland. The provision of integrated transport services is an important component of a quality, compact city. By 2022/23, there is a requirement for 14 operational ferry berths, based on current growth predictions, which cannot be accommodated within current footprint of the ferry terminal, and the existing infrastructure will not meet requirements of future ferry operations.

The proposed infrastructure upgrade works will provide will enhance the customer experience and provide for greater patronage. The ferry terminal redesign offers the opportunity for a more efficient footprint, delivering infrastructure that allows for future service expansion. The generic design of the pontoons increases the ability to use more than one gate by any ferry. This increases flexibility, efficiency, resilience, reduced waiting times and will result in the ability to service increased patronage.

8.10.3 City Centre Masterplan

The City Centre Masterplan (CCMP) is Auckland Council’s strategic planning document that provides a 20-year transformational direction for the future of the City Centre to 2030. The vision for the City Centre is:

By 2032 Auckland’s City Centre will be highly regarded internationally as a centre for business and learning, innovation, entertainment, culture and urban living – all with a distinctly ‘Auckland’ flavour.

The CCMP contains eight high-level ‘transformational moves’ aimed at unlocking the potential of the city centre as a place to live, work and relax. Each of the key moves contributes to the realisation of the long-term vision. The key transformational move most relevant to this application is Move 8 – Revitalising the Waterfront - Water City. The details of Move 8 are included in the Waterfront Plan, a companion document to the CCMP and aligned by shared proposals that interface between the city centre and the waterfront.

The CCMP identifies that the waterfront has a unique role to play within the city centre due to its unique amenity, water access for recreation and concentration of water related businesses. The CCMP details that
the waterfront is expected to be a major driver of Auckland’s economic future; both directly and indirectly supporting new fulltime jobs in Auckland through the tourism and events sectors. At a high level, the proposal contributes to the strategic direction of the CCMP as the upgrade of transport infrastructure for the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of the community through the provision of enhanced public transport infrastructure serving Downtown Auckland and the wider region.

This next phase of waterfront regeneration further contributes to the role the waterfront has in unlocking the potential of the city centre as a centre for business, entertainment and culture and builds on decades of planning that envisaged a public working waterfront that linked the city to the sea, and reflected our marine heritage and culture.

8.10.4 The Waterfront Plan

The long-term strategy for unlocking the potential of the waterfront is detailed in the Waterfront Plan, which is a companion document to the City Centre Masterplan. The 2040 vision for the waterfront is:

A world-class destination that excites the senses and celebrates our sea-loving Pacific culture and maritime history. It supports commercially successful and innovative businesses and is a place for all people, an area rich in character and activities that link people to the city and the sea.

The unique role of the waterfront in the context of the city-centre is detailed including its amenity value, access for water-based recreation, and water related businesses such as marine and fishing industries. The plan identifies that usage of harbour-edge water space is as important as what happens on land.

Water space (within the coastal marine area) needs to be managed to enable a wide range of activities meeting demands for marinas and berthage, working boats, boatbuilding and pleasure craft (large and small), recreational and charter services, ferries and cruise ships, and increasingly public access and amenity. Clever integration of land and water-based activity will provide new opportunities, ensuring that the City of Sails’ reputation continues, with easy access to recreational boating contributing to a love of the sea for future generations.

The proposal responds to the goals of the Waterfront Plan which seek to achieve a waterfront that is accessible to the public and retains active marine and maritime uses. The proposal is the first stage of a longer-term objective of consolidating and upgrading ferry services to the west of Queens Wharf. The provision of efficient and safe ferry services from a central waterfront location adds to the marine function of the waterfront, provides interest and activity for the general public and makes the harbour and city centre accessible to commuters and visitors.
8.10.5 **Downtown Framework**

The Downtown Framework is a document prepared by Auckland Council in 2014 to provide strategic context to specific downtown projects located in proximity to the Central Wharves. The purpose of the plan is to context for individual projects based on the Council’s strategic direction. The plan identifies the different projects.

The Downtown Infrastructure Delivery Programme has been identified as critical work that needs to occur in the downtown precinct within the next three years in order to facilitate a successful America’s Cup. This work includes:

- Quay Street Strengthening (seismic strengthening of the Quay Street seawall).
- Quay Street Enhancements (public realm enhancements).
- Downtown Public Space.
- Downtown Ferry Basin Redevelopment – Stage 1.
- Britomart East bus stops.

The DIDP will create an open and welcoming destination along the water’s edge that is recognisably Tāmaki Makaurau. The area will better connect people with the Waitematā Harbour. Residents, workers and visitors will enjoy a more attractive, people-focused environment in which to move, to rest, and to meet.

By 2021, Auckland’s will see Quay Street become a revitalised waterfront boulevard. Part of this programme is Stage 1 of the Downtown Ferry Basin Redevelopment; the relocation of piers 3 and 4. In their place will be a public open space: Downtown Public Space, which will embrace the harbour’s edge.

The piers’ new location is consistent with Auckland Transport’s plans to move all downtown ferry services to the west side of Queens Wharf, creating a world-class facility suitable for Auckland’s growing transport needs.

8.10.6 **Waterfront Refresh 2017**

Auckland Council adopted a refreshed planning direction for the Waterfront Plan and the CCMP in September 2017.

The refreshed plans illustrate a series of projects that deliver the transformational move of a ‘harbour edge stitch’, uniting the waterfront with the city centre. Delivery of the plans continues to support a ‘smart working waterfront’, and growing the network of publicly-accessible waterfront spaces.
8.10.7 **Central Wharves Strategy**

Collectively the plans outline that each of the city centre wharves have a role to play to serve the city and community’s needs:

(a) Wynyard Wharf – Auckland’s premier waterfront public space with a headland park, mixed use development, and a marine and cultural precinct.

(b) Halsey Wharf, Hobson Wharf and water space – a permanent water-based event space supporting the growth of sporting, recreational, cultural, community, commercial and tourist activities that improves access to the Waitematā Harbour.

(c) Queens Wharf - transitioning from the primary cruise terminal, back to a public wharf and supporting modernised ferry infrastructure and services.

(d) Captain Cook Wharf - transitioning from a freight use into New Zealand’s primary cruise terminal.

(e) Princes Wharf and Queens Wharf Basin - to accommodating better ferry infrastructure and public access to the downtown basin.

The 2017 refresh of the Waterfront Plan maintains the vision and direction of the CCMP and WP and focuses on the next phase of delivery for the downtown waterfront corridor, mid-town area, central wharves and Wynyard Quarter. These focus areas are critical parts of Auckland’s city centre and waterfront and are key to unlocking growing expectations for public transport, waterfront access and high quality public space.

The project, in conjunction with the other Downtown Waterfront projects, advance the transformation of the downtown waterfront area and transitioning Queens Wharf to supporting modernised ferry infrastructure and services. The current ferry facilities at Downtown Auckland are running at full capacity with no provision to increase services to additional ferries in the peak periods. This restricts the ability to offer a higher frequency service in the future. Redevelopment of the Ferry Basin will allow a greater number of ferries to dock and depart, leading to a higher frequency public transport solution.

The proposal also preserves public access to the western side of Queens Wharf and does not preclude the future enhancement of the wharf for public open space.

8.10.8 **Ngāti Whātua Ōrakei Iwi Management Plan**

Ngāti Whātua Ōrakei has prepared a CVA document of the downtown programme of works and has prepared an iwi management plan as a statement of Ngāti Whātua Ōrakei’s interests and values as they apply in resource management matters. The purpose of the plan is to be a succinct “manual” for resource management practitioners particularly developers and decision makers operating under the RMA. The plan does not cover everything relevant to tribal development, rather is focused on land use and RMA matters.
The proposal is located within Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei’s rohe which runs from Te Wai o Tāiki (the Tāmaki River and estuary) across the isthmus to the foothills of the Waitākere Ranges, and includes the whole of the inner Waitematā Harbour and the North Shore.

Within the Central Isthmus, and in relation to specific development projects, Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei has identified the following matters for engagement:

- Stormwater and discharge of contaminates.
- Reclamation, dredging and marine structures.
- Terrestrial biodiversity.
- Earthworks.
- Air quality.
- Transport.

AT has held discussions with Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei in relation to the project and has specifically discussed the proposed marine structures proposed to be located within the ferry basin, water quality, transport infrastructure and cycle provision.

The Iwi Management Plan includes a Kaitiakitanga Framework including the following desired outcomes of relevance to the project:

(a) Incorporation of Mātauranga Māori values and active exercise of kaitiakitanga in ecological reporting and in the development and implementation of initiatives for environments in the rohe.

(b) Increased acknowledgement of and support for Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei values and our active exercise of kaitiakitanga. Improved strength of Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei relationships with other parties in developing and implementing initiatives to sustain cultural resources in the rohe.

(c) There should be a significant shift in investment away from car based transport towards mass transit and low carbon modes including rail, bus, cycling and walking.

(d) City-level urban design should fully integrate land use with mass transit and low carbon transport networks.

(e) Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei supports the compact city design objectives which underpin the Auckland Unitary Plan, in particular the intensification of development around mass transit networks and the development of green infrastructure networks to facilitate cycling and walking.

(f) All public spaces and buildings should be equipped with recycling facilities.

(g) Site waste management plans should be required as a condition of resource consent for major projects.

(h) Water should be managed, and where necessary restored, to maintain or enhance mauri and to protect ecosystem, amenity, and mana whenua values.
New development should incorporate the use of sustainable (low impact) design practice for the management of surface water runoff.

There should be no discharge of untreated surface water from urban areas.

Customary activities are protected and recognised, for example the sustainable harvesting of kaimoana, waka launching and marae activities.

New development should incorporate the use of sustainable (low impact) design practice for the management of surface water runoff.

There should be no discharge of untreated surface water from urban areas.

The proposal accords with the desired objectives in the management plan of a modal shift from private vehicles to public transport, integrating transport to achieve compact urban development and maintaining water quality. The proposal supports integrated public transport through the provision of enhanced ferry services in close proximity to rail, bus and cycle transport services and networks. It also supports the further intensification of the City Centre and compact city objectives of the Unitary Plan by integrating land use and transport activities.

### 8.10.9 Regional Land Transport Plan 2018-2028

The Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) sets out the region’s land transport objectives, priorities and measures for at least 10 years and is prepared in accordance with the Land Transport Management Act 2003. It includes a 10-year programme of activities to support the achievement of these objectives. The plan objective is that Aucklanders will be more easily able to get to where they want to go, and will have choices about how they get around. The programme of works contained in the RLTP seeks to take advantage of future growth, while at the same time enabling the creation of an accessible, well-connected, safe and sustainable region.

The RLTP supports a move away from a city where the dominant mode of travel is by single-occupant private vehicles, to a greater focus on other modes of transport such as light rail, cycleways, bus, rail and ferry services.

The RLTP highlight that ferries currently play an important role in Auckland’s public transport system. Ferries carried 6.1 million public transport passengers in the year to December 2017, making up 6.8 per cent of total public transport patronage. While the share of total patronage is relatively small, ferry services provide a key alternative to the private car for communities such as Devonport, Bayswater, Gulf Harbour and Half Moon Bay. Ferries also provide the only practical link for Waiheke residents to access Auckland city, and freight and passenger ferries are critical for Waiheke and Great Barrier Island.
The RLTP recognises that ferries have the potential to play a significantly increased role during the next decade, to assist with addressing Auckland’s growth and improving the resilience of the transport system. Specific activities in the transport programme include:

- Completion of the Future Ferry Strategy for Auckland to identify future demand, infrastructure and fleet requirements, and an implementation pathway.
- Downtown Ferry Terminal – redevelopment and construction of a new terminal.
- Replacement of piers 3 and 4 to Queen’s Wharf West in time for the America’s Cup.
- Matiatia (Waiheke) park-and-ride – replacement and expansion of existing facilities to cater for increased demand.

This project directly implements a number or the priorities identified in the programme of works for the improvement of ferry services in Auckland.

**8.10.10 Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan 2015**

The Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan (ARPTP) describes the public transport network that AT proposes for the region and identifies the services that are integral to that network over the next 10 years. The Plan states that the transport system is crucial to achieving the vision for Auckland as being the world’s most liveable city by 2040. The transport system also plays a key role in facilitating and supporting national economic growth and productivity.

The ARPTP identifies the need for a transformational shift in public transport and identifies number of challenging targets including:

- Doubling public transport trips from 70 million to 140 million by 2022.
- Increasing non-car (walking, cycling and public transport) mode share in the morning peak from 23 to 45 per cent of all trips by 2040.
- Increasing the proportion of all vehicular trips made by public transport into the city centre during the morning peak from 47% to 70% by 2040.
- Increasing the number of annual public transport trips per person from 44 to 100 by 2040.

The ARPTP highlights investment in ferry infrastructure as having a key role to play in meeting this challenge. The proposal accord with the ARPTP by providing upgraded ferry infrastructure necessary to meet the strategic public transport targets included in the plan. The upgrade also consolidated ferry services in Downtown Auckland and supports the integration of transport infrastructure close to other transport modes.
8.10.11 Auckland Council Navigation Safety Bylaw 2014 and Controls (Ture ā-Rohe Urungu Āhuru 2014)

Part 33 of the Maritime Transport Act 1994 gives the Harbourmaster powers to manage the safety of maritime activities. Auckland has appointed a harbourmaster for the harbour and other waters in the region. The harbourmaster not only sets local rules for maritime safety but also enforces those rules. Local rules set by the Harbourmaster are found in the Auckland Council Navigation Safety Bylaw 2014 and Controls (Auckland Council 2014).

The Navigation Safety Bylaw regulates navigational safety in the Auckland region, including regulating and controlling the use or management of vessels, reserving the use of any waters for specified persons or vessels, and prescribing vessel traffic separation and management schemes. In addition the harbourmaster has authority to give directions to masters of vessels for maritime safety purposes and has powers to directly enforce those directions if masters do not comply. Those directions can be specific, applying to a particular vessel, or generic, applying to all vessels of a defined class. Generic directions given by the Harbourmaster are found in Harbourmaster Directions issued by Auckland Harbourmaster (1-16, 2-16, 4-16). Harbourmaster’s Direction 1-16 covers the Downtown Ferry Terminal Basin (Auckland Transport Harbourmaster). This Direction includes a restriction on movements of vessels over 500 gross tonnage between the weekday hours of 7:30am to 9:00am and 4:30pm to 6:00 pm (no vessels greater than 500 gross tonnage shall manoeuvre within the downtown ferry terminal basin or operate any propulsion or manoeuvring equipment).

This requirement effectively prohibits the movement of any cruise ships or bunkering barges in the basin during the specified curfew periods. There are Navigation Safety Operating Requirements for the basin area. Vessels are to:

- Proceed at a safe speed
- Travel in an anti-clockwise direction
- Be mindful of wake and aware of propeller wash.

A Maritime Safety Management Plan is proposed to address the navigational safety issues during construction, with a draft condition included in Attachment O.

8.11 Consultation

Auckland Transport has undertaken general consultation with a wide range of stakeholders on the proposed layout and location of the ferry infrastructure on Queen Wharf West. This has included hui, workshops, briefings, meetings, open days and letter drops. In addition, the applicant has notified the applicants for
customary marine title applicable to the Waitematā Harbour under the MACA Act of the proposal, and sought feedback from these parties. Care has been taken to ensure that key stakeholders have been consulted on the proposal. Consultation with these and other parties will continue throughout the project.

Public notification is being sought for this application. It is anticipated that further consultation will occur with stakeholders following the lodgement and public notification of the application.

8.11.1 General Consultation

General consultation and engagement at a programme level has occurred with the general public, Local Boards, surrounding property owners and tenants, and other groups. This has included the following consultation and engagement.

- A general Waterfront Programme briefing was held for key stakeholders on 19 December 2017 to provide information on AC36 and the Downtown Programme, including the Ferry Redevelopment project.
- Two public drop in events were held, on the 27 March 2018 for neighbouring property owners and occupiers to gain information on the Downtown Programme including the Ferry Redevelopment Project and discuss the potential impacts of the projects.
- Heart of the City and the Auckland City Centre Advisory Board have been briefed on the Downtown Waterfront Programme.
- Local Boards have received regular updates on the programme of works including the Waitematā, Ōrākei, Devonport and Waiheke Local Boards.

8.11.2 Waterspace Users Group

AT has sought to engage with existing users of the ferry basin at an early stage in the concept planning process. The early concepts for the redevelopment of the Ferry Basin contemplated ferry services being consolidated on Queens Wharf West in a perpendicular berthing arrangement. Technical analysis and feedback from ferry operators highlighted the operational challenges that this configuration presented and resulted in AT reconsidering the proposed location and layout of the proposed berths.

A series of collective workshops has occurred over a six month period with primary waterspace users Fullers and Ports of Auckland (noting that Ports of Auckland were not able to attend all of the workshops). The workshops have been conducted to identify and assess options for the relocation of Piers 3 and 4 to Queens Wharf West in addition to options for the redevelopment of Piers 1 and 2 which would form Stage 2 of the overall Downtown Ferry Redevelopment project. The workshops were supported with technical assistance.
from T&T, Isthmus and Navigatus and some were attended by the Harbormaster. Draft layout options and the results of navigational simulations have been shared with the users group as part of the option investigations and analysis.

Meetings were also held with the wider waterspace users group to present the project design and obtain feedback. Meeting invitee’s include Fullers, Belaire, Sealink, NZ Police, Department of Conservation, Decked out Yachting, Stewart Menzies Boat Co, Amanda Marine, Auckland Adventure Jet and POAL.

### 8.11.3 Fullers

A series of meeting and discussions has been held with Fullers, in addition to the workshops. AT has shared preliminary plans with Fullers including the marine infrastructure and terminal upgrades. Fullers has raised a broad range of issues concerning their current ferry and tourism operations, the seasonality of visitors and the daily pressure of commuter peaks, the impact of construction on ferry operations both on the water and within the terminal, vehicle access and conflict on Queens Wharf impacts on ‘back of house’ operations including freight, ticketing, offices and storage. AT has responded to the main issues raised by Fullers and is continuing to meet with them as the design develops.

### 8.11.4 Sealink

In addition to the Waterspace Users workshops, AT has met with Sealink and provided them with preliminary plans of the proposed marine infrastructure layout for their comment and feedback. Sealink have advised AT that they are supportive of the proposal. Specific details regarding the pontoon heights and gangway ramps has been provided to Sealink in response to queries they had regarding freeboard height for the 24 and 35 m berths. AT will continue to engage with Sealink throughout the duration of the projects.

### 8.11.5 Belaire

In addition to the Waterspace Users workshops, AT has met with Belaire and provided them with preliminary plans of the proposed marine infrastructure layout for their comment and feedback. Belaire has advised AT that they are supportive of the proposal. They have provided feedback regarding the angle of the berths, the pontoon loading heights and passenger shelter. AT has responded to the issues raised by Belaire and will continue to engage with them throughout the duration of the projects.

### 8.11.6 Mana Whenua

Engagement with mana whenua has been undertaken through the AT Mana Whenua engagement framework and via individual hui with the following iwi:

- Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki
AT has sought to engage with mana whenua at both a programme and project level. Mana whenua were invited to prepare a CVA for the Downtown Waterfront Programme at an individual project level. As discussed in section 7.12 above, CVA’s for the ferry redevelopment project were received from a number of iwi and these have informed the concept design process. The following engagements sessions have been held with mana whenua in relation to the ferry redevelopment project:

- AT Monthly Kaitiaki forum - 14 February 2018 - Initial hui for project.
- AT Monthly Kaitiaki forum - 14 March 2018 - Update on project and issues report back.
- AT Monthly Kaitiaki forum - 13 June 2018 - First overarching DIDP hui
- Hui with Ngati Whatua Ora - 15 June 2018 - Initial hui for project.
- AT Monthly Kaitiaki forum - 10 July 2018 - Programme hui including ferry project.
- Site walk over - 11 July 2018.
- AT Monthly Kaitiaki forum - 14 August 2018 - Update on project.
- Workshop 14 August 2018 - Discuss concept design issues.
- Hui with Ngati Whatua Ora - 21 August 2018 - Update on project
- Workshop - 4 September 2018 - Discuss concept design issues.
- Workshop session and AT Monthly Kaitiaki forum - 11 September 2018 – Discuss concept design issues.

The issues raised by mana whenua through consultation and engagement to date include participation and engagement, water quality, sedimentation and flushing, impacts on marine ecology, environmental
improvements, monitoring, sullage, cultural expression through design, signage and wayfinding, and the use of te reo in signage.

The identification of these issues has informed the concept design process as detailed in the Urban Design Report (2.12 Ferry Infrastructure Redevelopment Opportunities Pg 28). This includes improving legibility, access and movement, wayfinding, the use of te reo in signs, water quality and environmental improvements, public amenities and lighting.

Engagement will continue throughout the detailed design phase and during the implementation of the project.

8.11.7 Ports of Auckland

Ports of Auckland has been a participant in the Water Users Group and has provided input and feedback into this process. In addition, discussions have been held with POAL to work through the following issues:

- POAL’s S384A Deemed Coastal Permit.
- The perimeter strip licence, cruise ship licence and coastal occupation permits and licences.
- Cruise ship operations during construction and the operation of ferry facilities.
- The sequencing of construction works so they do no restrict cruise ship operations.
- The operation of Queens Wharf West and traffic management measures to avoid pedestrian vehicle conflicts on the western side of Queens Wharf.

A series of regular meetings have been held with POAL to progress these issues (13/8, 22/8, 27/8, 12/9). In terms of the waterspace occupation and existing licences and agreements, AT is applying for a coastal permit for the proposal in accordance with the obligations contained in the various permits and licences for Queens Wharf that POAL operate under. In respect of Queens Wharf property arrangements, POAL holds a Perimeter Strip Licence and a Cruise Ship Licence issued by The Crown and Auckland Council. Under these arrangements, POAL has rights to occupy the perimeter strips, 7m from the edge of Queens wharf and Shed 10, to run cruise ship operations. These agreements contemplate expansion of the ferry terminal along the western boundary of Queens Wharf and a reduction in POAL’s obligations to maintain the wharf and berthing assets.

In terms of potential pedestrian/traffic conflict, measures to mitigate any safety concerns are detailed and addressed in the ITA and these have been provided to POAL. Construction effects, including construction programming, staging sequencing and traffic management are able to be addressed in the various management plans that will be prepared for the construction phase of the development. AT has given an undertaking to ensure that the western side of Queens Wharf is made available for coach and service traffic.
during cruise ship operations, unless alternative access arrangements can be agreed with POAL. Discussions regarding the ability to use the central accessway during the constriction period are being progressed with POAL.

Discussion with POAL will continue post lodgement of the application and throughout the project. These discussions will continue post lodgement of the application.

8.11.8 Regional Facilities Auckland

RFA operates the Cloud for events and functions throughout the year. AT has held a series of meetings (13/8, 27/8) with RFA to work through the impact of construction on the operation of The Cloud and have reached agreement on the construction sequencing and phasing, particularly as it related to the marine works in the waterspace adjacent to Queens Wharf West. There are a number of confirmed bookings in the Cloud that AT has agreed to accommodate within the construction programme. RFA has agreed to restrict booking during the construction period, except for Saturday nights and Sundays when construction activity will be minimal and the level of disruption on events held in the Cloud manageable. While the western side of Queens Wharf, between The Cloud and the edge of the wharf will be utilised as a construction compound area, this area will be made available as required when events are held in the Cloud during the construction period, unless alternative arrangements can be agreed. Discussions will continue with RFA as the final construction methodology is determined and the suite of construction management plans finalised.

8.11.9 Panuku

Panuku Development Auckland is the joint owner of Queens Wharf, with the Crown. Panuku has lodged a resource consent application for a mooring dolphin to the north of Queens Wharf. Panuku are working on a master plan for the future development of the wharf as a cruise facility and enhanced public space. Discussion have been held with Panuku regarding the location of the proposed ferry services, the demarcation of pedestrian and vehicle areas along the western side of Queens Wharf, the proposed changes to the landscaped area to the east of the ferry terminal building and the integration of construction sequencing and programming.

Discussions with Panuku will continue as the final construction methodology is determined and the suite of construction management plans finalised.
8.11.10 Crown (Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment)

AT has contacted MBIE regarding the proposal to locate ferry services on the western side of Queens Wharf, as a joint owner of the wharf. As outlined above, in respect of Queens Wharf property arrangements, the Crown and Auckland Council have issued rights to POAL in respect of cruise operations on the wharf. These agreements contemplate expansion of the ferry terminal along the western boundary of Queens Wharf and a reduction in POAL’s obligations to maintain the wharf and berthing assets. As AT are not a party to these agreements they have advised the Crown, via MBIE of its intention to locate ferry services to western side of the wharf and seeks its support for the proposal.

8.11.11 Auckland Council

A number of pre-application meetings have been held with Auckland Council to and understand the Council’s information requirements for the lodgement of the application. In addition, a full briefing of the proposal to Council’s planners and specialist’s was held and a site visit conducted. Issues raised by Council’s experts have been received and addressed in the various technical reports submitted in support of the application.

8.11.12 Heritage New Zealand

A series of regular meeting has been conducted with representatives of Heritage New Zealand (with Auckland Council’s heritage specialists in attendance) to present information and discuss the potential impacts of the proposal on heritage items. The main issues discussed have primarily related to the modifications to Queens Wharf and the historic ferry shelter and the placement of the new breakwater on the western side Queens Wharf. Only minor interventions or modifications of historic heritage is proposed and these matters have been comprehensively addressed in the HIA submitted in support of the application and proposed draft conditions of resource consent.

8.11.13 Tournament

AT has met with Tournament relating to the Downtown programme of works, the seawall upgrades and the ferry redevelopment projects. Tournament has been briefed on the Ferry Redevelopment project and been advised of AT’s plans to remove the East Annexe building as part of the terminal upgrade works. The discussions with Tournament has also focused on construction management issues including hoardings for the Downtown Programme works, the programme for services relocation works. In terms of the East Annex removal AT has confirmed the requirements to maintain power services to the Ferry Building and maintain toilets in the area. Consultation and engagement with Tournament will continue throughout the project.
8.11.14 Princes Wharf

AT has met with the Princes Wharf representatives to discuss the proposed ferry redevelopment works. The issues raised primarily relate to construction vibration and noise during construction as well as construction hours. Mitigation measures are proposed through the CNVMP to minimise construction related noise effects. In particular, it is proposed that noisy works (impact piling, vibro piling, concrete cutting and concrete breaking) are limited to the AUP daytime noise hours.

8.11.15 Downtown and Waterfront Development Response

AT has developed a Development Response programme to provide a planned and coordinated response during the construction phase of the individual projects to mitigate the impacts construction on people/businesses/groups located in the vicinity of the works. The programme includes the following elements:

Wayfinding
- The provision of clear, temporary wayfinding with a focus on pedestrian wayfinding and universal access.
- Supporting the needs of ferry passengers and visitors arriving by cruise ship during construction associated with the Ferry Basin Redevelopment.
- Locate multi lingual ambassadors around the Ferry Building and Quay Street during summer to assist with guiding ferry passengers and cruise ship visitors, in particular.

Site Operations
- A code of conduct will be incorporated within the construction contracts to encourage a high standard of behaviour in and around construction zones.
- A site monitoring framework will be established to ensure the construction zone is operating with as little impact on neighbours as possible.
- Sight-lines will be maintained as much as possible to businesses, transport hubs and the waterfront.
- Construction activity will be scaled back for the duration of scheduled events on Queens Wharf, as agreed with Regional Facilities Auckland.

Stakeholder Engagement
- Accurate and timely information on construction activity will be provided to water space operators.
- Regular updates to neighbouring stakeholders will be provided through a range of channels including working groups ie. Ferry Building tenants, door knocking individual businesses and residents, regular newsletters and project boards.
Business Support

- Maintaining clear points for the delivery of goods and collection of waste.
- Business support packages will be available for all ground floor tenants to help them prepare for the changes and opportunities. The pack offers free business support, advice and tools to help keep businesses thriving, including social media training, business mentors, Auckland Chamber of Commerce membership and Restaurant Association workshops.

8.11.16 Communication and Consultation Plan

The proposed draft conditions of consent includes the preparation and implementation of a Communication and Consultation Plan (CCP). In particular, the CCP will include, as a minimum, a communications framework, contact details for the Communication and Consultation Manager, methods for identifying and communicating with stakeholders, and a procedure for dealing with queries and complaints. The preparation and implementation of CCP will help to ensure that consultation and engagement will continue throughout the construction process.
9  CONCLUSION

This application sets out the relevant assessment required for resource consent applications under the RMA. The plans and technical assessments submitted with the application have been provided in support of the application and in relation to the relevant criteria.

In terms of the RMA, all appropriate matters in section 104 are considered to have been addressed including the:

- Actual and potential effects;
- The relevant provisions of any plan of proposed plan; and
- Any other matters

It is concluded that the proposal satisfies these matters and is in accordance with the relevant provisions of the statutory documents. Therefore, in accordance with section 104B, I support the grant of consent to this application for a discretionary activity.

Mark Vinall
Planning Consultant
Tattico Limited