



Future Proof Implementation Committee
c/o Ken Tremaine
Future Proof Implementation Advisor
1601/18 Beach Road
Auckland Central
Auckland 1010

28 February 2014

Unitary Plan Submission Team
Auckland Council
Freepost Authority 237170
Private Bag 92300
Auckland 1142

Email: unitaryplan@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Future Proof Submission on the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan

This is a submission by the Future Proof Implementation Committee on the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan (PAUP) which was publicly notified on 30 September 2013.

Future Proof is the sub-regional growth management strategy which covers the Waikato and Waipa districts and Hamilton City. The Future Proof Strategy is implemented by the 'partners' Waikato and Waipa District Councils, Hamilton City Council, Waikato Regional Council and Tāngata Whenua, the community, developers and key stakeholders including the New Zealand Transport Agency.

Firstly, Future Proof wishes to commend the Auckland Council for the development and release of the PAUP which is clearly the culmination of a large amount of work in a relatively short time frame. Future Proof appreciates the opportunity to submit on this document insofar as it may affect the Waikato region.

This submission has been sectioned on the basis of themes to assist Auckland Council's consideration.

Please also note that consequential changes to the PAUP content may also be required to satisfy all relief listed in this submission. Future Proof would therefore appreciate the opportunity to be involved in such process prior to commencement of the hearing as this is considered to be an efficient way of developing a robust Unitary Plan built on a spirit of collaboration between regional neighbours.

Future Proof appreciates the opportunity to submit on the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan and confirms that a representative will speak to this submission at the hearing. If others make a similar submission, we will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.



Ken Tremaine

Implementation Advisor

(on behalf of Future Proof Implementation Committee)

Address for Service:

Future Proof Implementation Committee
c/o Ken Tremaine
Future Proof Implementation Advisor
1601/18 Beach Road
Auckland Central
Auckland 1010

Email: ken@kentremaine.co.nz

Phone: 09 309 2515

Mobile: 027 476 8300

Notes to person making submission:

If you make your submission by electronic means, the email address from which you send the submission will be treated as an address for service.

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6 (4) of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

I could ~~could~~ not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission please complete the following:

I am / am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of this submission that:

- (a) adversely affects the environment; and
- (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

Submission Contents

Theme 1: Identification of Cross-Boundary Issues	4
Theme 2: The Need for a Collaborative Approach to Managing Cross- Boundary Issues	6
Theme 3: Transport Linkages and Economic Development	7
Theme 4: Population Growth	8
Theme 5: Management of Inter-Regional Population Growth	11
The Rural-Urban Boundary (RUB)	12
‘Overspill’ Growth	12
Resource Demand	13
Primary Production from High Class Soils	15
Water Allocation	16
Sustainable Management and Maximising Energy Efficiency	16
Theme 6: The Waikato-Tainui Raupatu Claims (Waikato River) Settlement Act 2010 and Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River	17
Theme 7: Waste Management	18
Theme 9: Natural Hazards	21
Theme 10: Subdivision Rule to Prohibit the Transfer of Development Rights Lot Transfers across Jurisdictional Boundaries	22
Appendix I: Proposed Amendments to the PAUP	24

Theme 1: Identification of Cross-Boundary Issues

The PAUP discusses four cross-boundary issues in the Regional Policy Statement section (Part I Chapter B, section 11 on page B146) – these being population growth, transport linkages, economic development and the natural environment.

Future Proof considers this particular theme as being the most important to the success of the AUP, yet only one page has been written and a significant number of other cross-boundary issues and related objectives and policies appear to have been omitted. These concerns were noted in Waikato Regional Council's comments on the Draft Auckland Unitary Plan (dated 30 May 2013) but not all recommendations appear to have been incorporated into the PAUP. For completeness of Future Proof's submission, these other cross-boundary issues have been drawn from those earlier comments and are discussed as follows.

The discussion on Page B146 appears to be restricted to the RMA requirement to state the process that will be used for resolving cross-boundary issues. It is noted that the various background sections of the Regional Policy Statement in Chapter B do recognise the reliance that the Auckland region has on the Future Proof sub-region and the wider Waikato Region for strategic resources, minerals and aggregates, transport links, energy and water.

Given the strong interrelationship between the Auckland and Waikato regions, Future Proof considers that the AUP would benefit from:

1. reflecting the broader range of cross-boundary issues that exist (or at least not limiting it to the four that have been identified), and stakeholders involved;
2. articulating various sections in a way which identifies a proactive and collaborative process for developing a vision for the south Auckland and north Waikato area to better enable issue identification and response;
3. strengthening the strategic framework in Section 3 of the document by identifying all cross-boundary issues in Part I, Chapter A: Introduction, therefore providing an improved and more regional context for plan users; and
4. providing appropriate methods in the rules section of the document that give effect to the objectives and policies that concern cross-boundary matters.

Future Proof considers that the PAUP is a vehicle for further collaborative opportunities and imbedding strategic vision and directions, for the mutual benefit of both the Auckland and Waikato regions.

Future Proof therefore requests that the discussion of the cross-boundary issues in section 11 on page B146 be expanded to note the following (specific drafting is included in Appendix I to this submission):

- a) Support for the Upper North Island regions and cities working together on strategic matters including those described in the Upper North Island Strategic Alliance (UNISA);

- b) Acknowledgement of various growth strategies within the upper North Island (including the Future Proof Growth Strategy, Bay of Plenty's Smart Growth and Coromandel's Blueprint) and the need to ensure consistency in planning for growth based on shared evidence within this comprehensive area;
- c) Recognition of the need for on-going alignment of transport planning based on shared evidence across the upper North Island (strategic priorities and optimising network development and investment);
- d) Recognition of the inter-relationships between the Waikato region's economy (particularly the primary production sector) and the Auckland economy, and the benefits of having coordinated strategies between the these two regions;
- e) Support for coordination of freight movement and related facilities across the upper North Island, including the strategic development of inland ports;
- f) Recognition of the importance of the Waikato region's mineral/aggregate industry for Auckland and the implications of this on transport and freight systems;
- g) Recognition of the role that the Waikato region plays in providing locations and facilities for tourism and recreation for Auckland's population (such as regional parks and holiday homes), and the need to strategically plan for increasing demand on such areas/resources as Auckland's population grows;
- h) Recognition of the range of infrastructure in the Waikato region and beyond, which supports Auckland, including road and rail infrastructure, electricity transmission infrastructure, the Waikato River water treatment plant and pipeline, and the Natural Gas Corporation pipeline;
- i) Recognition of the need to align key infrastructure policy between the Auckland and Waikato regions and the future possibility of shared infrastructure corridors;
- j) Recognition of the facilities in the Waikato region which service Auckland (such as the Hampton Downs Landfill, the Hampton Downs racetrack and Springhill Prison) and the need for appropriate forward planning of other services and facilities in the Waikato region which may need to service Auckland (particularly those that require extensive land areas and sufficient buffers from neighbours);
- k) Recognition of the need for a consistent and collaborative planning regime for future rural-residential development across the Auckland/Waikato regional boundary, to ensure that controls in one region will not lead to unforeseen development in the other. This is because the influence of Auckland's countryside living development extends considerably into the northern Waikato and vice versa);
- l) Recognition of the need for strategic integrated planning discussions about future urban form and the ultimate urban footprint for residential, business, industrial and other land use development on either side of the Auckland/Waikato regional boundary to ensure that there are no unintended cross-boundary effects on regional/district land use planning. The Future Proof partnership wishes to achieve an alignment between long term land use, infrastructure and funding given the proximity of significant

amounts of future development adjacent to the boundary of the Auckland Council and the northern Waikato;

- m) Recognition of the need for natural hazard and civil defence emergency management to be aligned across regional boundaries;
- n) Encouragement of common/consistent approaches to the management of the Hauraki Gulf and Manukau Harbour, such as those relating to navigation safety and aquaculture. Specific recognition of the proposal for Auckland Council and Waikato Regional Council to jointly develop a marine strategy for the Hauraki Gulf, and the potential relationships between this and the Auckland Plan; and
- o) Recognition of the need to coordinate pest management across the regional boundary, acknowledging that if pest control on one side of the boundary is not consistent with that on the other side, pest control activities could be less efficient than otherwise would be the case.

Relief Sought

Future Proof supports the inclusion of section 11 in Part 1, Chapter B headed 'Cross-boundary Issues' commencing on page B146 in the Auckland Unitary Plan but requests that the suggested additions to this section attached as Appendix I also be incorporated into section 11.

Future Proof requests that the strategic framework of the Auckland Unitary Plan be strengthened by summarising the key strategic cross-boundary issues (from Chapter B, Section 11) in Part 1, Chapter A: Introduction, therefore providing an improved and more regional context for plan users.

Future Proof requests that all identified cross-boundary issues be incorporated into other sections of the Auckland Unitary Plan to which each issue most appropriately relates through specific objectives, policies, methods and rules.

Future Proof requests the incorporation of appropriate methods in the rules section of the document that give effect to the objectives and policies that concern cross-boundary matters.

Theme 2: The Need for a Collaborative Approach to Managing Cross-Boundary Issues

Integrated management requires a holistic view that looks beyond organisational, spatial and administrative boundaries. For integrated management to be effective and efficient, a coherent and consistent approach by agencies or organisations involved in resource management work is required. This is because there is overlap in the functions in local authorities and also resources and issues tend to cross jurisdictional boundaries.

In this regard, it is noted that there are a number of properties, including productive rural properties, that straddle the boundary between the Auckland, Northland and Waikato

regions. Various productive farming businesses rely on using the whole of their properties in a seamless way where such properties may only be divided by virtue of a jurisdictional split. Furthermore, 'whole' natural features (such as the Hunua Ranges) which are shared by Auckland and the Waikato also need to be managed in an integrated manner for the benefit of these features themselves as well as for the public benefits that are enjoyed mutually across the regions.

Future Proof seeks to establish and build upon working relationships with resource management stakeholders and considers the Auckland Council to be a key agency. The desired outcome is that as new and shared issues between the regions emerge, effective and efficient collaborative processes based on shared evidence are established.

It is also important that section 11 in Part 1, Chapter B recognises that it is not just local authorities that have an interest in cross-boundary issues. For example, iwi have not been mentioned and these often have rohe that do not align with local authority boundaries.

Relief Sought

Future Proof requests that the Auckland Unitary Plan includes a specific statement in Part 1, Chapter B section 11 that all cross-boundary issues will be addressed through a process of proactive collaboration with neighbouring local authorities and other affected stakeholders. Suggested amendments are included in Appendix I.

Future Proof requests recognition in Part 1, Chapter B section 11 of the Auckland Unitary Plan that a broad range of stakeholders may need to be consulted to identify and resolve cross-boundary issues and that these include, but are not limited to, iwi, energy providers, infrastructure providers, landowners and industry organisations. Suggested amendments are included in Appendix I.

Theme 3: Transport Linkages and Economic Development

The second bullet-pointed issue in section 11 is headed 'Transport Linkages' and the discussion recognises and facilitates the different transport linkages between Auckland, Northland and Waikato "*in terms of people and freight movement, the use and expansion of the roading and passenger transport network and maintaining accessibility to Auckland International Airport and Ports of Auckland as multi-regional transport nodes.*"

While the UNISA is recognised as a process tool to address cross-boundary issues, the PAUP does not specifically recognise the vital importance of the Upper North Island strategic transport connections for facilitating the social and economic development outcomes that Auckland is aiming to achieve. Inter-regional strategic transport corridors are critical to supporting economic development across a wider spatial scale than just Auckland's administrative boundaries. The recently completed upper North Island Freight Story (sponsored by UNISA) which involved the Auckland Council is a good example of the benefits to Auckland and other regions which accrue from working collaboratively to identify and address critical issues that impact on the cost of doing business in New Zealand through an upper North Island lens.

Future Proof recommends that section 11 of the AUP be strengthened by recognising the importance of the inter-regional transport linkages in the upper North Island, particularly

the inter-regional freight movements through the Waikato region connecting the import and export ports of Auckland and Tauranga in the Bay of Plenty region and the strategic importance of inter-regional transport linkages for national and international tourism movements.

Recognising the importance of inter-regional transport linkages would also assist with integration between the PAUP and the Land Transport Management Act (2003). Section 16 of this Act requires that activities having inter-regional significance must be identified in Regional Land Transport Plans.

Relief Sought

Future Proof requests that the second and third bullet-points in section 11 headed 'Transport Linkages' and 'Economic Development' be strengthened by stating the strategic importance of the inter-regional transport linkages in the upper North Island. In particular, inter-regional freight movements through the Waikato region, including inland ports, need to be specifically stated as these connect the import and export ports of Auckland and Tauranga in the Bay of Plenty region and provide vital transport linkages for national and international tourism movements. Suggested amendments are included in Appendix I.

Theme 4: Population Growth

The first bullet-point in section 11 headed 'Population Growth' highlights the importance of aligning regional and local growth management strategies between the Auckland, Northland and Waikato regions to provide an integrated approach to accommodating future population growth in cities, towns and settlements.

Future Proof understands that Auckland Council has undertaken some modelling work to gauge the issues and risks associated with any extension to the RUB and the proposed residential intensification in the Southern Opportunity Area as these will affect land use, settlement patterns, transport movements and infrastructure provision. However, this modelling work has had to rely on the indicative land use outline in the Auckland Spatial Plan as the detail relating to land use and supporting transport infrastructure and services for greenfield areas has not yet been developed.

At this stage, the water needs and associated infrastructure for the large amounts of growth proposed are not fully understood. Recently, Watercare submitted an application to the Waikato Regional Council for a new water take on the Waikato River. Although the water consent application will be processed under the provisions of the Waikato regional policies and rules, it is the growth predicted by the Auckland Unitary Plan that underpins some of the need for this application. A robust set of assumptions as to what quantum, type and location of growth would be useful as a starting point to understand the impacts of growth.

Future Proof further understands that the model results indicate a significant growth in travel demand because of the scale of proposed growth and corresponding capacity issues with the current road network and potential issues with the safe, efficient and resilient function of State Highway 1. Because of its constraints, this modelling work does not forecast what effects might impact on the strategic transport network when additional travel demand is generated from greenfield developments. Therefore, it is difficult to determine how the PAUP would impact on land use and transport needs in the Waikato region.

The completion of the Waikato Expressway has been confirmed in the Waikato Regional Land Transport Programme 2012-2015 (WRLTP) as the most important package of strategic corridor projects. This is supported by the Government's declaration of the Waikato Expressway as a Road of National Significance, and its commitment to completing this expressway within 10 years. The Waikato Expressway project will improve safety and reliability and reduce travel times and congestion on State Highway 1 by delivering a four-lane highway from the Bombay Hills to south of Cambridge. This expressway will improve economic growth and productivity for Auckland, Waikato and the Bay of Plenty through more efficient movement of people and freight. Therefore, Future Proof considers that the maintenance of expressway efficiency is in the best economic and social interests for the Auckland and Waikato regions.

With increased settlement in southern Auckland (future residential, business and industrial growth in the southern greenfield area and an expanded Pukekohe) and corresponding residential and industrial development in the North Waikato, it will be critical to ensure that investment in inter-regional strategic corridors that include State Highways 1 and 2 and the Waikato Expressway is optimised. As the settlement patterns and potential commuter movements to labour markets across the regions become known and better understood, it will also be important to consider a sufficiently broad range of responses to manage increasing demand. Such responses could include (where appropriate) bus, rail and other modes, alongside responses that minimise the need for travel, such as appropriate provision of employment opportunities alongside residential development.

Future Proof notes that initial modelling work has indicated a substantial demand for the use of passenger rail services at Pukekohe. In addition, Waikato District Council has made financial provision for development of the Tuakau Station to facilitate a rail service, as part of the first stage of a commuter connection to Hamilton. The post hearing report for the Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan noted that most trips from Tuakau are north-bound and towards Auckland and that a significant number of existing rail users from Pukekohe actually originate from Tuakau and elsewhere in the Waikato district. It is therefore important for Auckland Transport to work collaboratively with Auckland Council and other partners (including Waikato Regional Council and Waikato District Council) to explore the most cost effective and equitable method to provide future public transport services to Tuakau. In this respect, it is likely that many existing and future residents of northern Waikato work, or will work, in the existing and anticipated industrial growth areas at both Drury and Pukekohe.

The hearing panel for the Auckland Regional Public Transport Plan also noted that an extension of the train services to Tuakau would need to be justified through an appropriate business case and that this would need to take into account the potential electrification of the line to Pukekohe and the feasibility and costs of extending the train turn-around location as sought by submitters. The hearing panel's conclusion was that Auckland Transport should continue to work with the Waikato District and Waikato Regional Councils to consider the most appropriate public transport arrangements for inter-regional services, together with the development of an agreement on how they might be funded.

A local Franklin magazine entitled 'elocal' recently reported in its February 2014 issue the following statistics sourced from Auckland Transport:

- In 2003, the number of passengers boarding a train at Pukekohe averaged 40 a week. By 2010 the number had increased more than ten-fold – to 460 a week.
- By 2009, the number of passenger movements (departures and arrivals) had reached 636 each (presumably week) day.
- In 2013, that number of 636 had doubled to 1202 and it is not unreasonable to presume that Pukekohe Rail Station, in the past ten years, has grown from serving about eight passengers to 600 passengers a day.

These statistics demonstrate the increasing demand for rail services across the regional boundary and the corresponding need for the authorities to cater for the ever increasing numbers of train users.

Future Proof therefore considers it necessary for Auckland Council and Waikato Regional Council to jointly model the inter-regional transport and land use effects of residential and industrial settlement patterns that are envisaged under the AUP and in the North Waikato as more information becomes available. For example, the Upper North Island Freight Story highlights the significant quantities of industrial land within the Waikato region and the PAUP emphasises the lack of industrial land as one of the problems for the Auckland region. Using such information from studies that already exist, in addition to future joint modelling, will enable industries that are highly dependent on the land resource to be planned for outside of the Auckland region, whilst enabling land within the Auckland region to be used for housing and other employment that are not so dependent on extensive land areas.

This joint modelling exercise is critical because the outcomes must be relied upon to justify Council decisions as to the location and timing of future developments within the regions. While it is presumably the timing of the PAUP release that has postponed this joint modelling exercise between the regions, it remains important for informed decisions to rely upon current statistics so that robust forward planning can occur. This is a sensible approach and far more desirable than finding out too late (through future monitoring for example) that “the big picture has already been smudged” by incremental, ad hoc and poorly serviced development.

The need for this joint modelling to occur as soon as possible does not take away the importance of future monitoring between these regional councils to understand and manage the cross-boundary effects of land use and transport planning over time and this should be incorporated into the monitoring programme requirements set out in section 13 of the PAUP.

Future Proof also supports collaboration in respect to inter-regional cycling and walking trails, road safety projects and their associated modelling, and the future location of upper North Island stock truck effluent sites.

Relief Sought

Future Proof supports on-going collaboration and joint planning based on shared evidence between Auckland Council and Waikato Regional Council for strategic public transport corridors (including public transport).

Future Proof requests that section 1.2 in Chapter B of the Auckland Unitary Plan headed ‘Enabling economic well-being’ specifically notes the importance of inter-regional collaboration on integrated planning to enhance economic outcomes for the Auckland region and the upper North Island. Suggested amendments are included in Appendix I.

Future Proof requests that Auckland Council and Waikato Regional Council jointly model the inter-regional transport, infrastructure (including water) and land use effects of both residential and industrial settlement patterns envisaged under the Auckland Unitary Plan and throughout the Waikato region and include provisions in the PAUP that allow for the outcomes of that modelling to be considered as part of any future development location, staging and timing. Suggested amendments to the non-regulatory methods in section 2.3 of Chapter B are included in Appendix I.

Future Proof requests that Auckland Council and Waikato Regional Council jointly monitor the cross-boundary effects of land and transport over time and that this be reflected in section 13 of the Auckland Unitary Plan as part of the monitoring programme requirements. Suggested amendments are included in Appendix I.

Theme 5: Management of Inter-Regional Population Growth

The way in which Auckland develops will have strong cross-boundary influences on the Waikato region. These key growth influences will include:

- The Auckland Rural Urban Boundary (RUB) – promoting a more compact urban form may intensify growth, however allowing significant growth towards the south of Auckland is likely to have a flow on effect into the Waikato region in terms of ‘overspill’ growth. This is because people currently have an average travel budget of well over an hour, which places most areas of northern Waikato within an hour’s commute of employment areas in southern Auckland;
- Greenfield investigations suggest that Auckland will have a large amount of population and business/industrial growth occurring in the south. The Waikato region has population and business land growth to the north. This is reducing the distance between the business areas of Auckland and Waikato and may change the way in which businesses operate and/or locate;
- There are indications that some of Auckland’s businesses and industries are moving into the Waikato region (most notably in Pokeno – such as Hynds Pipes, plus new investment with the Yashili dairy factory) but also expressed interests in Tuakau and Hampton Downs);
- Significant subdivision pressures in the northern part of the Waikato region (particularly Waikato and Thames Coromandel districts) where high class soils, high natural character and significant aggregate resources exist;
- Significant transport links between Auckland and the Waikato, which include the Waikato Expressway. Travel times between Auckland and Hamilton are shorter and the completion of the Waikato Expressway will further reduce these;
- Increased pressure on the high class soils straddling the Auckland and Waikato boundary, both in terms of built development, and the need to provide food to sustain the increasing population;
- Ports of Auckland as a significant destination point for freight from the Waikato; and
- The constraints on land use coupled with the significant growth of the two largest towns in the Auckland region (Pukekohe and Waiuku) will create pressure for countryside living and affect the natural and physical resources within the Waikato region.

Future Proof therefore considers that it is a fundamental necessity for the three regions of Auckland, Waikato and the Bay of Plenty to collaboratively plan together based on shared evidence to maximise benefits for the regions, upper North Island and wider New Zealand. Because the urban footprint and intensification of existing urban areas within Auckland is

subject to change and differing rates of change, as is growth in the Waikato and Bay of Plenty regions, it is critical that a collaborative management approach is adopted by these regions.

Given the bullet-pointed key growth influences noted above, Future Proof wishes to engage and collaborate with Auckland in respect to the following matters:

The Rural-Urban Boundary (RUB)

Future Proof supports the incorporation of a RUB in the AUP in that it will promote a more compact urban form and improve integration of land use with infrastructure and will thus allow for more cost effect and efficient servicing. It will also ensure that rural areas are retained and maintained for primary productive purposes.

The definition of the RUB (which is understood to be the outcome of a three staged process set out in the Addendum to the Draft Unitary Plan) is of most interest to Future Proof in respect to the areas surrounding Pukekohe and Buckland. This is because of the proximity of this proposed major urban centre to the regional boundary, key transport corridors, highly productive soils and the growing towns in north Waikato, particularly Tuakau and Pokeno.

While Future Proof generally supports the process that has determined the RUB in the vicinity of Pukekohe/Buckland, it is critical that structure planning in this vicinity takes into account the cross-boundary effects and compatibility of land uses with the Waikato district and wider region. Also that the intended future settlement areas have the capacity to accommodate the growth allocated to them in order not to pressure the RUB at some future date. Therefore, the PAUP's requirement for structure planning to consider integration with the surrounding area and sub-region (criterion 2. a) in Part 5, Appendix 1) may be improved by explicitly incorporating the term 'cross-boundary compatibility and integration'. This criterion will only be satisfied through a collaborative process involving Auckland Council, Future Proof and other stakeholders (including landowners within Waikato district whose properties immediately abut the RUB).

Relief Sought

Future Proof supports the use of the Rural Urban Boundary (RUB) as a tool to achieve compact form but requests that the structure plan requirements set out in Part 5, Appendix 1.1 of the Auckland Unitary Plan be expanded to make explicit reference to urban growth capacity and cross-boundary effects, the need to achieve compatibility and integration of land use and infrastructure with adjoining regions and the need to collaborate with neighbouring authorities and other stakeholders (including landowners whose properties immediately sit outside the RUB). Suggested amendments are included in Appendix 1.

'Overspill' Growth

The restriction of urban growth in Auckland may result in a 'displacement' of growth into the Waikato region. For example, increased employment opportunities in the south of Auckland may result in subdivision pressures in the Waikato region (particularly just south of the Bombay Hills), including pressures for rural-residential living which, in turn, puts development pressure on (particularly highly productive) land.

Transport corridors between Auckland and Hamilton, and their ability to operate efficiently, will also have a significant effect on where and how development occurs in the Waikato region and vice versa.

The rate at which this ‘overspill’ growth may occur is likely to be significantly influenced by staging and sequencing of land for development in Auckland. It is noted that the staged release of new urban land is not within the scope of the RUB identification, but will be determined at a future date and aligned with funding and work programmes to deliver necessary infrastructure. The efficient integration of land use with infrastructure is supported, however the timing and process for determining the stage of land release remains unclear. The RUB addendum indicates that specific parts of the future urban zone will be identified for structure planning and that these will be released in a “*staged and sequential manner*”. This process requires clarification as Future Proof expects that this land release would be based on an overall growth strategy for Auckland which is supported by robust modelling data that is developed based on shared evidence with Future Proof.

In addition, structure planning exercises in Waikato (such as that currently underway with Tuakau) will be significantly influenced by the availability of transport and services and capacity provisions. Tuakau shares services with Pukekohe and those that are being developed in Pokeno. If Pukekohe uses availability in an uncoordinated manner, this may undermine opportunities for compact and contained growth in these northern Waikato established settlements.

Relief Sought

Future Proof requests collaboration between the Auckland and Waikato regions in respect to the development of shared evidence based modelling and analysis of urban growth capacity, staging and timing and infrastructure demands within Auckland and, in particular, the expected influences on the Waikato region.

Resource Demand

Future Proof supports the PAUP’s desire to make Auckland more self-sufficient in terms of resource use. However, given the growth pressures that Auckland is likely to experience over the next 30 year period and the need to consider competing demands for resources, it is expected that Auckland will still need to source considerable volumes of key resources outside of its region.

An example of this is Auckland’s need for an accessible supply of minerals, although the Waikato region is the largest inter-regional ‘exporter’ of economic aggregate and industrial minerals for roading material. Auckland ‘imports’ almost 25% of these resources from Waikato region and it is expected that Auckland’s annual mineral demand will increase to 15 million tonnes by the year 2041.

The use of many of Auckland Council’s valuable resources have been compromised as a result of countryside living and even though the PAUP contains policies that seek to protect these remaining resources, it would appear that none are identified through text or maps. It is therefore considered important to have these locations specifically identified to provide clarity and strength to these policies.

A prime example of a site requiring collaborative engagement is the Holcim Quarry site at Bombay which operates as an integrated whole but is split by jurisdictional

boundaries. Part of the operation is located in Auckland Council's jurisdiction with the remaining part located under the jurisdiction of Waikato District Council and the Waikato Regional Council.

It is noted that the PAUP zones the Auckland part of the Holcim Quarry as 'Special Purpose Quarry Zone' and there is a corresponding 'Quarry Proximity Area' map notation. The WDC submission on the PAUP supports this quarry zoning as this was always intended to occur once the quarry was well established rather than relying on various resource consents that date back to 1993. By 'spot' zoning extraction sites, this provides certainty for the quarry operator and the community as to how the activity is allowed to be conducted and how adverse effects are to be managed. Holcim has previously stated that the site has been managed as an Aggregate Extraction and Processing Zone (as provided by the former Franklin District Plan) since the quarry's establishment and it has continued to rely on the integrity of the provisions in that particular zone to manage the effects of quarrying activities.

Future Proof also supports the certainty that will be afforded through a 'Special Purpose Quarry Zone'. Such zoning will further confirm the importance of this operation to both the Auckland and Waikato regions, particularly given the site's strategic location immediately beside the Waikato Expressway which enables an efficient and cost effective distribution of the basalt resource. Demand for this resource from the recently operational Jones Pit is likely to increase given the development pressures within both the Auckland and Waikato regions and, in particular, the faster than expected growth rates of Pokeno and Tuakau.

The WDC submission notes the consideration of applying a similar 'Quarry' zone to that part of Holcim's property that is within the Waikato District when the Franklin Section becomes integrated with the now fully operative Waikato District Plan. While the timing of any WDC rezoning has not been able to align with the PAUP, a 'Special Purpose Quarry Zone' applying to at least part of the land which contains the operational Jones Block pit will have significant benefits to the regions. Like WDC, Future Proof is keen to follow progress with the development of the objectives, policies and rules for this quarry as there may be value in mirroring these for the Waikato portion of this property. A collaborative approach between the authorities is therefore essential before confirming the district and regional provisions for this special zone.

The same principles apply to the generation and distribution of (particularly renewable) energy. The Waikato region generates more electricity than any other region in New Zealand, has almost 40% of installed generation capacity and 'exports' approximately 75% of generated electricity to other regions, predominantly Auckland. Almost 60% of electricity produced in the Waikato region is from renewable sources.

Relief Sought

Future Proof requests that the Auckland Unitary Plan lists the need for collaborative engagements between the Auckland and Waikato regions to address the regional and national benefits resulting from the sustainable management of aggregate resources and the generation and distribution of energy. Suggested amendments to Part I, Chapter B, Section II to give effect to this request are included in Appendix I.

Future Proof requests that both the text and maps in the Auckland Unitary Plan specifically identify the location of mineral resources to improve the workability of the policies that seek to protect this valuable resource and

enable prudent transport and growth planning for the benefit of both the Auckland and Waikato regions.

Primary Production from High Class Soils

The areas surrounding Pukekohe and Tuakau contain a high proportion of high class soils (Class I to III) which support food production and this soil resource straddles the Auckland/Waikato boundary. A significant portion of rural produce is processed in packhouses that are in, or in close proximity to, Pukekohe where this produce originates from north Waikato.

With an increasing population, more food is required from a finite land resource. The current global food market is dependent on trade, often over considerable distances, which means that costs and an accessible food supply are susceptible to disruptions arising from trade barriers or disputes, fuel prices and potential climate change. The threat of 'peak oil' may also affect the ability to exchange food at a reasonable cost in the future.

It is therefore important for communities to be resilient in order to minimise risk and to also protect and maintain the versatility of high class soils for food production. The PAUP's requirement for a minimum lot size of 150 hectares is therefore supported. In order to consistently manage this valuable soil resource across the regional boundary, it is recommended that the PAUP includes specific objectives and policies that align with the provisions in the PWRPS and the recently settled Rural Plan Change 14 provisions in the Waikato District Plan (Franklin Section) that deal with these elite soils.

Relief Sought

Future Proof supports the minimum lot size of 150 hectares in the Rural Production Zone and requests that the Auckland Unitary Plan includes specific objectives and policies that align with the provisions in the Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement and the recently settled Rural Plan Change 14 provisions in the Waikato District Plan (Franklin Section) that deal with elite soils in order to achieve consistent management of this resource across the regional boundary.

Future Proof requests that there be specific objectives, policies and methods, or rules which reflect:

- **The effects on the Waikato of the future use of productive rural land for urban purposes within the Auckland Council area, especially in locations close to the Rural Urban Boundary.**
- **The effects on the Waikato of future Auckland urban growth displacing the current Auckland food basket.**
- **Reverse sensitivity on existing and future Waikato rural land uses from future Auckland urban growth.**

Water Allocation

The PAUP's provisions that promote more efficient water use are supported. This is particularly important for the Waikato region as Auckland currently sources part of its municipal water supply from the Waikato River. Substantial groundwater aquifers also straddle the regional boundary.

Notably, WDC's current work on a structure plan for Tuakau and Pokeno, which is currently experiencing rates of residential and industrial growth that are much higher than expected, will be influenced by decisions on water take and allocation. For both these settlements, current water sources and supply infrastructure will not be adequate to meet future water demands. Poor decisions on water allocation will likely have serious implications for the success of these two northern Waikato towns and the ability for mutual benefits to be realised between the regions.

The rate and way in which water is drawn upon or allocated for irrigation is a key matter of interest for the Waikato region. More efficient use of water is encouraged before consents are sought for increasing water takes. This is particularly pertinent if Auckland intends to proceed with priority allocation for municipal supply as identified in Part 2, Chapter C, section 5.15.2 of the PAUP.

Relief Sought

Future Proof supports the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan's prioritising of municipal water supplies and the objectives and policies dealing with water quantity, allocation and use as set out in Part 2, Chapter C, section 5.15.2 of the PAUP and requests on-going collaboration between the Auckland and Waikato regions in respect to the appropriate use of the water resource. This is of particular importance to the Waikato region given the actual and anticipated growth. Suggested amendments to Part I, Chapter B, Section 11 to give effect to this request are included in Appendix I.

Sustainable Management and Maximising Energy Efficiency

Future Proof supports the PAUP's text in Part I, Chapter A section 3.3 headed 'Sustainable management' as there is considerable scope throughout this document to require sustainable development practices that maximise energy efficiency (such as siting dwellings to assist with passive solar heating) and to minimise resource use (such as water harvesting, grey water recycling) and minimise waste resulting from urban construction. The employment of such saving measures at every individual property level will have a significant overall effect and reduce the demand for resources outside of the Auckland region.

Relief Sought

Future Proof requests that the Auckland Unitary Plan notes sustainable development practices as being central to urban development in that these will result in more effective and efficient use of resources, less construction and demolition waste and lower demands for energy.

Theme 6: The Waikato-Tainui Raupatu Claims (Waikato River) Settlement Act 2010 and Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River

The Waikato-Tainui Raupatu Claims (Waikato River) Settlement Act 2010 (Waikato River Settlement Act) heralded a new era of co-management arrangements for the Waikato River. Schedule 2 of this Act contains the Vision and Strategy which is the primary driver for restoring and protecting the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River. The Act also requires that a district plan gives effect to the Vision and Strategy. The Vision and Strategy is already deemed operative in the PWRPS and Waikato District Council has already responded to the requirements of the Waikato River Settlement Act by incorporating provisions into its district plan that have been operative since 8 July 2013.

There are several areas of land within the Waikato River catchment that now fall under the Auckland Council's jurisdiction – including in the vicinities of Pukekohe/Buckland, Paparata and south of Bombay and Waiuku township. Some development proposals in these areas may require consideration by iwi, Auckland Council, Waikato Regional Council and Waikato District Council and it is therefore important that the PAUP includes a discussion on this matter and a procedure for considering possible cross-boundary effects, which is a mandatory requirement of the Waikato River Settlement Act.

In addition, growth in the demand for water supply from urban development in Auckland (from both future urban zones and intensification of existing urban areas) means that there is a direct effect on the mauri of the Waikato River. Where a water supply for structure plan areas comes directly from the Waikato River, significant attention needs to be given to the sustainable and efficient use of that resource as well as the statutory responsibilities set out in the Waikato River Settlement Act.

Relief Sought

Future Proof requests that the Auckland Unitary Plan:

- **Includes a discussion on the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (see Appendix I for suggested amendments to Part I, Chapter B, Section 1.5);**
- **Identifies the areas within the Waikato River catchment that are within Auckland Council's jurisdiction;**
- **Sets out objectives, policies and rules for these identified areas that accord with the Waikato-Tainui Raupatu Claims (Waikato River) Settlement Act 2010; and**
- **Sets out the process methods that will be implemented when dealing with developments within this catchment that may have cross-boundary effects;**
- **Specifically notes the need to sustainably use the water resource within the Waikato River and consider any cross-boundary effects where any development areas within the Auckland region are to rely on that particular resource (see Appendix I for suggested amendments to Part I, Chapter B, Section 1.5).**

Theme 7: Waste Management

It is apparent that given the pressure for housing development in Auckland, construction and demolition activities will make a significant contribution to the national waste stream (estimated at 25%) with the majority of this currently ending up in landfill.

The Waikato Regional has a net in-flow of waste with the Auckland region generating a considerable portion of this. Significant gains are therefore to be made in minimising and disposing of construction waste that will occur within the 30 year time frame being addressed by the AUP.

Relief Sought

Future Proof requests that section 11 of the Auckland Unitary Plan which deals with cross-boundary issues specifically notes waste management as a discussion topic between Auckland Council and Waikato Regional Council and the need to minimise, re-use or divert waste generated by activities within the Auckland Council area to reduce impact on the national waste stream. Suggested amendments to Part 1, Chapter B, Section 11 to give effect to this request are included in Appendix I.

Theme 8: Biodiversity

Achieving cross-boundary integrated management can pose special challenges in relation to biodiversity. This is because of the high level of interconnection between ecosystems and the often delayed or long-distanced impacts of the use or development of resources.

Integrated management also implies coordinating the planning and management processes under the different legislation that applies to a particular resource. For biodiversity, this could include the Fisheries Act 1996, the Biosecurity Act 1993 and the Conservation Act 1987 amongst others.

The Auckland and Waikato regions share, or have an effect on, a number of significant areas of biological diversity including the Hunua Ranges, Port Waikato, the coastal environment and various ecological corridors. A number of conservancy areas and ecological areas cross the regional boundaries. Management efforts across jurisdictional boundaries must be coordinated to ensure that they are as consistent and effective as possible, and that they appropriately address the biodiversity issues that arise.

The Proposed Waikato Regional Policy Statement (PWRPS) approach to indigenous biodiversity 'nests' policy direction to protect significant natural areas within a broader policy framework to achieve continued function of ecosystems, reflecting that the maintenance of biodiversity is much broader than just protecting significant sites as part of s6(c) of the RMA.

Policies in the PWRPS respond to two key objectives – one which recognises ecosystems for their intrinsic values, and the other which recognises that ecosystems provide us with many products and services upon which we depend.

Within this broad policy framework the identification and protection of areas of significant biodiversity is still an important direction. Areas of significant biodiversity are identified using the criteria in Table 11-1 of the PWRPS. Only one of the 11 criteria needs to be triggered to confer significance on a particular site.

Waikato Regional Council is undertaking the identification of areas of significant biodiversity at a regional scale for each of the 11 territorial authorities within its region to support the implementation of this policy direction. Future Proof understands that Auckland Council has undertaken similar work, though at a refined scale and with additional ground-truthing of data.

The other key policy direction is collaborative management which recognises the importance of engaging others in seeking positive biodiversity outcomes. This policy direction extends to coordinated biodiversity management across boundaries with adjoining councils and the management of biodiversity under other relevant legislation such as the Wildlife Act 1953, the Fisheries Act 1966, the Biodiversity Act 1993, the Conservation Act 1987 and others.

The PAUP appears to lack any policy direction on collaborative or coordinate indigenous biodiversity management, consistent with the PWRPS. The addition of a policy direction covering integrated management of biodiversity resources that cross local authority/regional council boundaries or public/private land boundaries and effectively integrates biodiversity management under other legislation would improve alignment between the AUP and the PWRPS and assist in such coordinated/integrated management.

Relief Sought

Future Proof requests that the Auckland Unitary Plan include a policy that addresses the management of biodiversity resources that cross local authority/regional council boundaries or public/private land boundaries and effectively integrates biodiversity management under other legislation.

The objectives for biodiversity set out in section 4.3.4 have a focus on areas of significant indigenous biodiversity and the natural heritage features of the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area. The maintenance of biodiversity (as required by sections 30 and 31 of the RMA) is much broader than just protecting significant sites as part of s6(c) of the RMA. It would appear that the PAUP objectives are focussed on areas of significance rather than broader ecosystems (for intrinsic and human values) and there seems to be a gap at the RPS biodiversity objective level.

The addition of objectives covering the continued functioning of ecosystems, other areas with biodiversity values that do not meet the criteria for significance, and the provision of ecosystem services would be helpful to plug this gap and improve consistency with the PWRPS.

The addition of such objectives would also provide the necessary link for the PAUP biodiversity policies listed as 2 and 7 which clearly highlight the importance of other areas of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Relief Sought

Future Proof requests that objectives be added in section 4.3.4 headed 'Biodiversity' which address the continued functioning of ecosystems and other

areas with biodiversity values that do not meet the criteria for significance, and the provision of ecosystem services and their maintenance and enhancement.

The policies for biodiversity that are set out in section 4.3.4 (starting on page B78) appear to align well with the policies and methods of the PWRPS and provide for effective integrated management across boundaries. For example, Policy I which identifies criteria to determine significance is largely consistent with the PWRPS significance criteria contained in Table 11-1. This provides for a good degree of alignment for identification and protection of Significant Natural Areas (SNAs)/Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) across boundaries.

However, elements of the wording of criterion a) under Policy I may be inconsistent with the PWRPS in that the current wording implies that 'representativeness' is limited to large examples of ecosystem types. Furthermore, this criterion is tied to 'vegetation' rather than habitat and therefore assumes that habitats and ecosystems are all vegetated. This could unnecessarily exclude non-vegetated habitat such as mud flats, streams or lakes. It is therefore recommended that this criterion be reworded to overcome this problem and improve consistency with the PWRPS criteria.

Relief Sought

Future Proof supports the policy approach to identifying and protecting Significant Ecological Areas but requests an amendment to Policy I.a. so that it reads as follows:

'Policy I.a. representativeness: The area is important for the indigenous habitats and/or ecosystems it supports because they are ecologically representative of the habitats (including mature and successional stages of the ~~vegetation~~ vegetated habitats) of each ecological district in Auckland and provide cumulatively for at least 10 per cent of the natural extent of each ecosystem type.'

The combination of the PAUP biodiversity policies 6, 7 and 8 provide the framework for subsequent regulatory control of activities that may adversely affect biodiversity in SEAs (to achieve no net loss) and other biodiversity. This accords a good degree of alignment with the PWRPS biodiversity policies and methods.

The implementation of this policy approach in the PAUP is through the Auckland-wide rules in Part 3 (Chapter H) and the Overlay Rules in in Part 3 (Chapter J), largely through the use of RD, D and NC activity status for activities that will potentially adversely impact on biodiversity within SEAs.

Within this regulatory framework, it is not clear how some of the provisions will achieve the directions of Policy 6. For example, having controlled activities (300m²) without any requirements for appropriate remediation or mitigation may lead to potential cumulative adverse effects on SEAs, unless the number of sites with no practicable alternative location for dwellings outside of SEAs is relatively limited.

It is also unclear how the impacts on biodiversity outside of SEAs are to be avoided, remedied or mitigated and so there does not seem to be an appropriate rule framework to implement the directions of Policy 7.

Relief Sought

Future Proof requests clarity as to where and how the Auckland Unitary Plan will manage the impacts on biodiversity outside of Significant Ecological Areas in order to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects and implement the directions of Policy 7.

Future Proof requests the addition of appropriate mitigation measures for the loss of indigenous vegetation within Significant Ecological Areas, such as restoration planting and/or through other active management measures (such as pest control).

The framework for mangrove management assumes that any mangrove younger than 17 years cannot have significant ecological values. While that could generally be the case, it may not apply universally and should be used as the basis for a permitted activity rule. Within section 5.1.6 (headed 'Vegetation: mangrove management') Objective 4 and Policy 4 are therefore in conflict with Objective 1 and Policy 1 and with the requirements of NZCPS Policy 11(b)(i).

Policy 1 requires a case-by-case assessment as to whether the specific stand of mangroves (a) have significant or important ecological values, or significant natural values; (b) provide a buffer against erosion; or (c) grow in sediments with high levels of contamination. As these assessments cannot be carried out by a lay person using the plan, a permitted activity status does not appear to be appropriate. Policy 6 requires an adaptive management approach which cannot be implemented through a permitted activity.

Conditions on a permitted activity rule must be clear and certain, and not require any further approval from the council. The proposed conditions on the permitted activity do not appear to meet these criteria. Most plan users implementing the permitted activity rule would not be able to determine whether the mangroves are mitigating erosion, know when roosting and breeding seasons are, or identify salt marsh and seagrass.

Condition (g) requires the lodging of evidence to confirm the 1996 extent of mangroves. It is unclear why this is required as council cannot decline permission for the clearance. In the absence of historic aerial photos, council is likely to receive anecdotal evidence. If it is the intention of the council to confirm that the 1996 extent has been accurately identified, then the activity status should be at least controlled to allow Council to retain control over the areas to be cleared.

Relief Sought

Future Proof requests that at least a controlled activity status be conferred for mangrove removal in order for the council to retain control over the areas to be cleared and to monitor these habitats and the effects of the rules.

Theme 9: Natural Hazards

Section 6.7 in Chapter B (commencing on Page B118) identified the objectives and policies for managing natural hazards. Future Proof considers it important that there is consistency in the way in which the regions managed hazards, as there is a significant potential for hazards to occur cross-boundary.

The two objectives in 6.7 are supported, however there needs to be a greater emphasis on avoidance, rather than remediation and mitigation.

Policies that seek to undertake hazard identification and risk assessment for subdivisions also need to address the cumulative effects on each other as well as on surrounding developments.

Relief Sought

Future Proof request that Objective 1 in 6.7 Natural hazards be amended to read as follows:

- 1. Avoid risk to people, property and infrastructure by identifying the areas at highest risk from natural hazards.**

Future Proof supports the non-regulatory methods of increasing public awareness of the causes and potential effects of natural hazard events.

Future Proof requests that Policy 2 in 6.7 Natural hazards be amended to read as follows:

- 2. Undertake hazard identification and risk assessment for subdivision and the cumulative effects of subdivision, use and development using the best available and up-to-date hazard information.**

Theme 10: Subdivision Rule to Prohibit the Transfer of Development Rights Lot Transfers across Jurisdictional Boundaries

As at the date of preparing this submission, there was no decision made by Auckland Council and Waikato District Council on the submissions received to Variation 13 to Franklin's Rural Plan Change 14 (V13 to PC14). It is understood that a joint hearing could be scheduled in March 2014 but the date is yet to be confirmed. This variation seeks to prohibit the transfer of rural development rights lots across the territorial boundaries of Auckland Council and Waikato District Council where the subject geographical area was located wholly within the former Franklin District.

It is noted that the PAUP already categorises any rural subdivision not provided for in Table 5 (Chapter H: Auckland-wide rules – Section 5 Subdivision) or in the rural zones subdivision rules as a prohibited activity. However, this does not completely address the issue raised here by Future Proof as these proposed provisions do not explicitly prohibit the transfer of any development rights across the territorial boundaries of the Auckland Council, irrespective of zones. Therefore, while V13 to PC14 deals specifically with the transfer of rural development rights, it is expected that the hearing will address the more fundamental issue as to whether it is legal to transfer any development rights across territorial boundaries.

Until V13 to PC14 has completed its statutory process, it is considered appropriate for Auckland Council to ensure a continuity of stance by including a rule in the AUP that prohibits the transfer of any development rights lots across its territorial boundaries. The final decision on V13 to PC14 is expected to be known well before the Unitary Plan Hearings Panel considers submissions, but this submission which requests the inclusion of

this prohibited subdivision rule is a safe 'placeholder' until the complex legal issues on transferable development rights are resolved. The recommended text to be added in Activity Table 1 (Section 5 Subdivision) is set out in Appendix 1 to this submission.

Relief Sought

Future Proof requests that a subdivision rule be included in the Auckland Unitary Plan to prohibit the transfer of any development rights across the jurisdictional boundaries of Auckland Council. Suggested drafting to give effect to this relief is provided in Appendix 1 of this submission.

Appendix I: Proposed Amendments to the PAUP

Additions are shown in italics and underline and any deletions are in strike-through.

Part I, Chapter B, Section I.2

Future Proof requests that the following paragraph be inserted into the economic well-being issues explanation in Part I, Chapter B, Section I.2.

Inter-regional Linkages

Auckland's linkages with neighbouring regions are important in terms of enhancing economic outcomes for both Auckland and the wider Upper North Island. Inter-regional collaboration on integrated planning will help to deliver key economic well-being outcomes.

Part I, Chapter B, Section I.5

I.5 Sustainably manage our natural resources

...

Water allocation

As Auckland grows we will need more water. Growth and constraints on water supply will impact on water supply costs, the resilience of the network and the environment.

The public water supply accounts for 85 per cent of the water take in Auckland. This comes primarily from the Waitākere and Hunua ranges catchment areas, with additional water imported from the Waikato River to meet demand.

The Waikato River is of significance to both Auckland and the Waikato. On 17 December 2009 Waikato-Tainui and the Crown signed the Deed of Settlement in relation to the Waikato River. The overarching purpose of the settlement is to restore and protect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River for future generations. The Waikato-Tainui Raupatu Claims (Waikato River) Settlement Act 2010 heralded a new era of co-management arrangements for the Waikato River.

The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato and River is intended to be the primary direction-setting document for the Waikato River and activities within its catchment. The Vision and Strategy responds to four fundamental issues:

- *The degradation of the Waikato River and the ability of Waikato River iwi to exercise kaitiakitanga or conduct their tikanga and kawa;*
- *The relationships and aspirations of communities with the Waikato River;*
- *The cumulative effects of physical intervention, land use and subsurface hydrological changes on the natural processes of the Waikato River;*
- *The time and commitment required to restore and protect the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River.*

It is important that the water resource within the Waikato River is used sustainably and that any cross-boundary effects are considered.

Potential availability and suitability of water for specific uses can be reduced by climatic and land use factors. Discharges into fresh water (surface and groundwater) can degrade water quality and affect the amount available for specific purposes. Increases in the frequency and duration of low flows can also reduce the amount of water available, reduce contaminant assimilation capacity, and affect water quality and in-stream biotic health. The long-term effect of climate change on water availability is uncertain.

Part I, Chapter B, Section 2.3 (Development Capacity and Supply of Land for Urban Development)

Methods

...

Non-regulatory

- A sub-regional analysis will be prepared by the council in conjunction with infrastructure providers, iwi, landowners, developers, central government and other stakeholders to integrate and prioritise land delivery and investment in infrastructure to support the development of brownfield and greenfield land.
- Review the council's rating and development contributions policy.
- Investigate funding mechanisms to support urban development and the provision of infrastructure.
- Undertake joint modelling with the Waikato Region in order to analyse the cross-boundary effects on inter-regional transport, infrastructure (including water) and land use of both residential and industrial settlement patterns envisaged under the Auckland Unitary Plan and throughout the Waikato region.

Part I, Chapter B, Section 4.3 (Natural Heritage)

Section 4.3.4

Policy 1.a. representativeness: The area is important for the indigenous habitats and/or ecosystems it supports because they are ecologically representative of the habitats (including mature and successional stages of the ~~vegetation~~ vegetated habitats) of each ecological district in Auckland and provide cumulatively for at least 10 per cent of the natural extent of each ecosystem type.

Part I, Chapter B, Section 6.7 (Natural Hazards)

Objective 1:

1. ~~Reduce~~ *Avoid* risk to people, property and infrastructure ~~from~~ by identifying the areas at highest risk from natural hazards ~~while minimising any adverse effects on the environment.~~

Policy 2:

2. Undertake hazard identification and risk assessments for subdivision and the cumulative effects of subdivision, use and development using the best available and up-to-date hazard information.

Part I, Chapter B, Section 11

Future Proof requests that the following amendments and additions be made to the cross-boundary issues in Part I, Chapter B, Section 11 on page B146. Additions are shown in italics and underline and any deletions are in strike-through.

Population Growth *and Development*

The alignment of regional and local growth management strategies within the upper north island, in particular between Auckland, Northland and Waikato to provide an integrated approach to accommodating future population growth among the cities, towns and settlements in these areas. *This includes achieving alignment between the Auckland Plan, the Future Proof Growth Strategy, the western Bay of Plenty's SmartGrowth Strategy, Coromandel Peninsula Blueprint and any regional spatial planning work to emerge out of Northland, the Waikato and the Bay of Plenty. It is important to ensure consistency in planning for growth based on shared evidence within the Upper North Island area.*

Recognising the need for a consistent and collaborative planning regime for future rural-residential development across the Auckland/Waikato regional boundary, to ensure that controls in one region will not lead to unforeseen development in the other.

The need for strategic integrated planning agreements about future urban form and the ultimate urban footprint for residential, business, industrial and other land use development on either side of the Auckland/Waikato regional boundary to ensure that there are no unintended cross-boundary effects on regional/district land use planning. The focus should be on achieving an alignment between long term land use, infrastructure and funding given the proximity of significant amounts of future development adjacent to the boundary of the Auckland Council and the Waikato.

Upper North Island Partnership

Supporting the Upper North Island regions, cities and districts working together on strategic matters including those described in the Upper North Island Strategic Alliance (UNISA).

Transport Linkages

The alignment of transport planning across the upper north island. This includes recognising and facilitating the different transport linkages between Auckland, Northland and Waikato. This is in terms of people and freight movement, the use and expansion of the roading and passenger transport network and maintaining accessibility to Auckland International Airport and Ports of Auckland as multi-regional transport nodes. *The coordination of freight movement and related facilities across the upper North Island, including the strategic development of inland ports needs to be supported on an inter-regional basis.*

Inter-regional transport linkages, in particular freight movements, are of strategic importance to all four Upper North Island regions. These provide important connections for the import and export ports of Auckland and Tauranga as well as inland ports. They also provide vital transport linkages for national and international tourism movements.

Recognising the importance of the Waikato region's mineral/aggregate industry for Auckland and the implications of this on transport and freight systems.

There is a need to better understand the impacts on the inter-regional transport network of land use, particularly new residential and industrial developments. There is the potential for the land use pattern to compromise the effectiveness and efficiency of inter-regional transport corridors if not well managed.

It is also important that there is on-going alignment of transport planning based on shared evidence across the upper North Island (strategic priorities and optimising network development and investment).

Economic Development

Supporting economic development in both urban and rural parts of the three regions and facilitating the movement of goods, services and employees across Auckland's administrative

boundaries. This includes the role of the Waikato region's infrastructure and mineral/aggregate industry for supporting the growth of Auckland.

Recognising the inter-relationships between the Auckland economy and the Waikato region's economy (particularly the primary production sector), and the benefits of having coordinated strategies between these two regions.

Transport and other infrastructure linkages also play an important role in facilitating economic development. Land use and transport planning needs to be effectively coordinated between Auckland and its surrounding regions to ensure that efficient access and mobility is maintained and enhanced.

Recreation

Recognising the inter-relationship between Auckland and surrounding regions in terms of the role that each plays in providing locations and facilities for tourism and recreation (such as regional parks and holiday homes), and the need to strategically plan for increasing demand on such areas/resources as Auckland's population grows.

Infrastructure

Recognising the range of infrastructure in the Waikato region and beyond, which supports Auckland, including road and rail infrastructure, electricity transmission infrastructure, the Waikato River water treatment plant and pipeline, and the Natural Gas Corporation pipeline.

The need to align key infrastructure policy between the Auckland and Waikato regions and the future possibility of shared infrastructure corridors.

Natural Environment

The natural environment does not recognise local government administrative boundaries. Consistent cross boundary approaches are important for the management of natural resources such as the coastal environment, particularly the Kaipara Harbour and the Hauraki Gulf, indigenous biodiversity and weed and pest control and management of water takes from aquifers and streams that flow between regions.

Natural hazard and civil defence emergency management should also be aligned across regional boundaries.

The need to coordinate pest management across Auckland's regional boundary, acknowledging that if pest control on one side of the boundary is not consistent with that on the other side, pest control activities could be less efficient than otherwise would be the case.

Marine Environment

Encouraging common/consistent approaches to the management of the Hauraki Gulf and Manukau Harbour, such as those relating to navigation safety and aquaculture. Other important initiatives include the proposal for Auckland Council and Waikato Regional Council to jointly develop a marine strategy for the Hauraki Gulf, and the potential relationships between this and the Auckland Plan.

Aggregates and Energy

Collaborating with the Waikato region to address the regional and national benefits resulting from the sustainable management of aggregate resources and the generation and distribution of energy.

Water

On-going collaboration between the Auckland and Waikato regions on the appropriate use of the water resource, including water quantity, quality, allocation and use. This is particularly important in terms of the Waikato River. The water resource within the Waikato River needs to be used sustainably and any cross-boundary effects where any development areas within the Auckland region are to rely on that particular resource, are considered. Auckland and the Waikato regions need to collaborate to protect the Waikato River from further over-allocation by ensuring thorough investigation and testing prior to seeking additional supply from the Waikato River.

Waste Management

The need to minimise, re-use or divert waste generated by activities within Auckland to reduce the impact on the national waste stream. Waste management needs to be an ongoing discussion topic between Auckland Council and Waikato Regional Council.

Processes for dealing with cross boundary issues

The council will use a number of processes to manage or resolve cross-boundary issues. Many of these processes operate outside the statutory framework of the RMA, but provide opportunities for both political and technical discussion of important issues and the development of agreed outcomes, which can be subsequently reflected in RMA documents. These processes also reflect that there are a broad range of stakeholders that will need to be involved in resolving cross boundary issues. All cross-boundary issues will be addressed through a process of proactive collaboration with neighbouring local authorities and other affected stakeholders. It is acknowledged that there are a broad range of stakeholders that may need to be consulted to identify and resolve cross-boundary issues. These include, but are not limited to, iwi, energy providers, infrastructure providers, landowners and industry organisations.

The specific processes for addressing cross boundary issues include:

1. Strategies, policies and processes set out in the Auckland Plan.
2. Participation in the following bodies to address the management of cross boundary issues:
 - a. the Hauraki Gulf Forum
 - b. integrated Kaipara Harbour Management Group
 - c. joint Kaipara Harbour Political Working Party
 - d. Upper North Island Strategic Alliance Agreement
 - e. the regional planners' forum.
3. Consultation requirements of the RMA Schedule 1, relating to the preparation and change of policy statements and plans by local authorities.
4. Participation in joint policy and research projects eg Hauraki Gulf and Kaipara Harbour Marine Spatial Plans.
5. Technical co-operation on research and monitoring projects and the development of environmental indicators.

6. The Memorandum of Understanding between the Auckland Council and the Waikato District Council.
7. Where appropriate, observing, participating or conducting joint meetings with the Waikato region, for example the Future Proof Implementation Committee, the Waikato River Authority
8. Cross boundary notification of significant plan changes or resource consent applications and participation in joint hearing processes.

Part I, Chapter B, Section I3

Monitoring and Review Procedures

...

Monitoring takes place across Auckland on the built environment, economics, transport, natural environment, heritage, and hazards. This data provides information on trends, opportunities and constraints within Auckland. It is used to help develop strategies, policies and plans and support decision-making.

Auckland and the Waikato will also jointly monitor the cross-boundary effects of land use, transport and other infrastructure, particularly water, and resource use over time.

Part 3, Chapter H: Auckland-wide rules, Section 5 Subdivision

Activity table I - General	
Activity	Activity Status
Lease in excess of 35 years of a building or part of a building where a cross-lease, company lease, or unit title subdivision is not involved	P
Conversion of a cross-lease to a fee simple title, except in any rural zone	C
Amendments to a cross-lease, including additions and alterations to <u>buildings, accessory buildings</u> and areas for exclusive use by an owner or owners, except in any rural zone	C
Cross lease, company lease, unit title and strata-title subdivision except in any rural zone	C
Subdivision of a <u>site</u> with two zones or subdivision along an undefined boundary	RD
Subdivision establishing esplanade reserves and esplanade strips	RD
Subdivision of land within the 1 percent <u>AEP floodplain</u> , other than in any rural zone	RD
<u>Subdivision of land involving the transfer of development rights across the territorial boundaries of the Auckland Council</u>	Pr

Part 5, Appendix I.1

Appendix I.1 Structure plan requirements for future urban zoned greenfield land and brownfield land

1. Structure planning is to be used to:

...

g. involve key stakeholders, infrastructure providers and landowners in the development of the structure plan area, including collaborating with neighbouring territorial local authorities and regional councils and other stakeholders if there are potential cross-boundary issues

2. Structure planning must consider the following:

...

m. where relevant any cross boundary effects on neighbouring regions, including the need to achieve compatibility and integration of land use and infrastructure with adjoining regions