

Submission Form

Date Created: 13/12/2013
SUBMISSION105776

04:13:26 p.m.

Incomplete Submission



Ara Tūhono – Pūhoi to Wellsford Road of National Significance: Pūhoi to Warkworth Section

Proposal Name: Ara Tūhono – Pūhoi to Wellsford Road of National Significance: Pūhoi to Warkworth Section

Applicant: New Zealand Transport Agency

Notification Date: Saturday 16 November 2013

Submissions Close: 5:00pm, Friday 13 December 2013

Further Information: www.epa.govt.nz/Resource-management/Puhoi

The New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) has lodged with the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) two notices of requirement and an application for fifteen resource consent applications for the Ara Tūhono – Pūhoi to Wellsford Road of National Significance: Pūhoi to Warkworth Section proposal (the proposal). This is, in short, referred to as the Ara Tūhono: Pūhoi to Warkworth proposal.

The proposal involves the construction, operation and maintenance of a new and alternative alignment to the existing State Highway 1 route between the end of the Northern Gateway Toll Road at the Johnstone's Hill tunnels, south of Pūhoi, and State Highway 1 just south of the Kaipara Flats Road intersection with State Highway 1, north of Warkworth.

Part A

This part provides the EPA with information about you as a submitter

1. Submitter Details

Please provide your name and as much contact information as possible. We may need to contact you during our outside of normal business hours. Please advise us if any of your contact details change.

Name of Organisation (if relevant):

Title: Mr Mrs Miss Ms Dr Other: (Please tick the appropriate title)

First name: Last name:

Please enter at least one contact number

Home Phone:

Work Phone:

Cell:

Fax:

Email: Please provide your email address:

Please confirm your email address:

Postal Address:

Address Line 1:

Address Line 2:

Address Line 3:

Suburb:

City:

Postal Code:

Country:

Physical

Address:

Use Postal Address

Address Line 1:

Address Line 2:

Address Line 3:

Suburb:

City:

Postal Code:

Country:

2. Alternative Contact Person Details (optional)

You may wish to choose a friend, relative, lawyer, professional advisor or any other person to be your point of contact. Please provide their details below.

Relationship of contact person to submitter: (e.g. legal counsel, professional advisor, other)

Name of Organisation (if relevant):

Title: Mr Mrs Miss Ms Dr Other:

(Please tick the appropriate title)

First name of contact person:

Last name of contact person:

Please enter at least one contact number

Home Phone:

Work Phone:

Cell:

Fax:

Email: Please provide your contact person's email address:

Please confirm your contact person's email address:

Physical Address of Contact Person:

Address Line 1:

Address Line 2:

Address Line 3:

Suburb:

City:

Postal Code:

Country:

Postal Address of Contact Person: Use Physical Address

Address Line 1:

Address Line 2:

Address Line 3:

Suburb:

City:

Postal Code:

Country:

3. Are you a trade competitor?

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission and/or are a trade competitor of the applicant then there may be restrictions on your ability to make a submission. In this event you may only make a submission if you are directly affected by an effect of the proposal or directly affected by an adverse effect on the environment from the proposal and that adverse effect does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition. If you think these restrictions may apply to you, we recommend that you seek independent legal advice.

Please select the appropriate box:

- I am / we **arenot** a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

- I am / we **are** a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission and I am / we are directly affected by an effect of the change that adversely affects the environment; and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

4. Privacy statement

Your personal information included in Part A of this form, will be held by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), 215 Lambton Quay, Wellington. Other than your name and organisation (if applicable), your personal contact information in Part A of this form will not be published on the EPA website. All information held by the EPA is subject to the Official Information Act 1982. It will be used by the EPA for the administration of the Board of

Inquiry process. Copies of your full submission, including all personal information in Part A will be provided to the Board of Inquiry, the applicant, and submitters, and may also be provided to other parties in the process. You have the right to access and correct personal information held by the EPA.

Your name, organisation (if applicable), the information in Parts B and C of this form, and any attached information will be published on the EPA website and made available to members of the Board of Inquiry, the applicants, the submitters and the public for use in the processing and consideration of the proposal.

Note: If the submitter is a company, full business contact details will be publicly available.

Part B

This part asks for your position on the proposal

5. What is your position on the proposal?

You can state your position on the proposal as a whole, or any part of it. If you have opinions on different aspects of the proposal then you can be specific about these in the space provided below.

Please note that copying and pasting from a Word document will remove any formatting and may affect some punctuation. It is recommended that you attach these pages using the attachment button near the end of the form. If you require more space, please attach additional pages as necessary.

Please indicate your position on the proposal:

- Support in full
- Support in part
- Neutral
- Oppose in part
- Oppose in full
- Range of views

Reason including any suggested conditions

Oppose project. Please see attached word document for submission.

6. What decision would you like the Board to make?

Please indicate below what decision you would like the Board of Inquiry to make about this proposal and provide reasons. If you would like to suggest changes to the proposal and/or make any suggest conditions if it were to be approved then you can detail these.

Please note that copying and pasting from a Word document will remove any formatting and may affect some punctuation. It is recommended that you attach these pages using the attachment button near the end of the form. If you require more space, please attach additional pages as necessary.

- Grant
- Decline
- Grant with conditions (please describe the changes or conditions you would like below)
- No view
- Other (please describe the decision you would like below)

Reason including any suggested conditions

Decline project. Please see attached word document for submission.

7. What is your position on the planning matters?

The applicant is seeking approvals under the Resource Management Act 1991 for two notices of requirement for a designation and alteration to a designation and an application for fifteen resource consents. These are referred to as the 'matters'.

If you have a position or opinion on these matters please indicate your position on them and give reasons for that position below.

Please note that copying and pasting from a Word document will remove any formatting and may affect some punctuation. It is recommended that you attach these pages using the attachment button near the end of the form. If you require more space, please attach additional pages as necessary.

Notices of requirement and resource consents applied for under Auckland Council jurisdiction

Notices of Requirement

- NSP 33/001 A designation for a project being the construction, operation and maintenance of a State highway, being the Ara Tūhono Pūhoi to Wellsford Road of National Significance – Pūhoi to Warkworth Section.
- NSP 33/002 An alteration to a designation (Auckland Council District Plan – Operative Rodney Section 2011 Designation 401) for a project being the construction, operation and maintenance of a State highway, being the Ara Tūhono Pūhoi to Wellsford Road of National Significance – Pūhoi to Warkworth Section.

Resource consents

- | | | |
|------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| NSP 33/003 | Land use consent | The use of land for land disturbing activities, including earthworks, roading, tracking and trenching |
| NSP 33/004 | Discharge permit | The discharge of stormwater to water as a result of activities undertaken by a highway network operator within the Pūhoi catchment |
| NSP 33/005 | Land use consent and water permit | Use, placement and erection of structures in, on, under, or over the bed of the Pūhoi River and its tributaries for the purposes of a river crossing(s), pipe culverts, bridges and associated erosion control structures and stormwater outlet structures and any associated diversion of water |
| NSP 33/006 | Water Permit | Diversion of groundwater |
| NSP 33/007 | Discharge Permit | The discharge of stormwater to water as a result of activities undertaken by a highway network operator within the Mahurangi catchment |
| NSP 33/008 | Land use consent and water permit | Use, placement and erection of structures in, on, under, or over the bed of the Mahurangi River and its tributaries for the purposes of a river crossing(s), pipe culverts, bridges and associated erosion control structures and stormwater outlet structures, and any associated diversion of water |
| NSP 33/009 | Coastal permit | Erection, placement, alteration, extension, removal or demolition of structures or any part of a structure that is fixed in, on, under or over the foreshore or seabed within the coastal marine area |
| NSP 33/010 | Coastal permit | Undertake an activity, being the operation of the State highway |
| NSP 33/011 | Coastal permit | Occupation of part of the coastal marine area |
| NSP 33/012 | Coastal permit | Disturbance including removal of mangroves in the CPA1 and use of motor vehicles in CPA1 |
| NSP 33/013 | Water permit and discharge permit | Augmenting existing culverts draining road side drains under State highway 1 in vicinity of Hungry Creek |
| NSP 33/014 | Water permit and discharge permit | Widening of Moirs Hill Road and increasing impervious surface by between 5,000m ² and 10,000m ² |
| NSP 33/015 | Water permit and discharge permit | Discharge from construction access through 1509 State Highway 1 (Lot 1 DP321568) from State Highway 1 just south of Perry Road into the alignment |
| NSP 33/016 | Discharge permit | Discharge of contaminants to land and/or water from an industrial or trade premises being a precast concrete yard |
| NSP 33/017 | Discharge permit | Discharge of contaminants to air from a mobile rock crusher |

Set out the matter (listed above), your comments and any changes sought and/or suggested conditions.

Part C

This part provides the EPA with information to assist with administration of the hearing

8. How would you like to receive correspondence?

Formal service of documents will be by way of the EPA website at www.epa.govt.nz.

For efficiency, as well as environmental and cost reasons, the EPA sends out its correspondence via email. We usually provide links to documents on our website rather than emailing documents. This saves people the trouble of downloading large files that they may not want.

*We will send all information and correspondence including copies of the draft and final reports to the email address that is provided in Part A of the Submission Form, **unless** you state an alternative preference below.*

If for any reason you cannot receive documents by email please indicate this by ticking the box below. This will ensure that, where possible, paper copies of all information will be sent to you.

If you choose to receive paper copies and wish to speak at the hearing, a lot of information such as evidence, hearing schedules, board directions and reports will need to be posted to you. However it may not always be feasible for paper copies to be made available to you in a timely manner (for example, the hearing schedule may change daily during the hearing).

In some instances, when there is a large volume of information, we may refer you to a location where this documentation is publicly available for inspection, such as a library, even if you indicate a preference for receiving paper copies.

If you prefer to receive hard copies of all the information please tick the box below.

- I / we wish to receive correspondence via email.
- I / we wish to receive **paper** copies of documents where possible.
- I / we wish to receive **paper** copies of only the draft and final decisions (all other documents will be electronically provided).
- I / we **do not** wish to receive **any** documentation.
 - Other than **paper** copies of the draft and final decisions.
 - Other than **electronic** copies of the draft and final decisions.

9. Do you wish to speak at the hearing?

As a submitter you may speak to your submission (and any evidence you may provide - see Section 10 below) at the hearing. To assist us with planning, please advise us below if you intend to speak at the hearing.

*If you indicate on your submission that you **do not** want to speak at the hearing, you will not receive further correspondence from us until the draft decision report is sent to you. You can still access all information via our website.*

*If you indicate you **do** wish to speak at the hearing we will contact you prior to the hearing to confirm your intention and how long you will need for your presentation to the Board.*

Many submitters speak on similar topics and issues. If this applies to one or more of your topics of interest then you may consider presenting a joint case at the hearing. If you wish to do this, please indicate this by ticking the box. The Friend of Submitter will be able to assist submitters who are prepared to make joint cases – please refer to the [EPA Website](#) for details on how to contact the Friend of Submitter.

I / we **do not wish to speak** (Please go to section 11)

I / we **wish to speak** about my / our submission

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

I / we wish to present in Maori / Te Reo

I / we wish to present in New Zealand Sign Language

I / we intend on having legal representation.

10. Do you intend to provide expert witnesses?

This section only relates to people who want to speak at the Board of Inquiry hearing.

An expert witness is a person who through training or experience is a skilled practitioner in a particular subject and is able to give professional evidence on that particular subject. All experts are expected to comply with Environment Court Practice Note 2011 (available at www.justice.govt.nz/courts/environment-court/legislation-and-resources/practice-notes/practice-notes), and be prepared to be cross-examined.

If you consider yourself to be an expert or you intend to provide evidence from expert witnesses please tick the box below.

No, I / we **do not have** expert witnesses

No, I / we **do not have** expert witnesses, but I consider I have expertise to be considered an expert (please fill in the table below)

Yes, I / we **do have** expert witnesses (please fill in the table below)

If you know the areas of expertise of your expert witnesses and their names the please provide these. This information is for provisional planning purposes only - final confirmation of expert witnesses will not occur until the evidence of the submitters is lodged with the Board.

Name Of Witness	Area Of Expertise	Phone Number	Email Address
TBA	Economic/Traffic		

11. If you would like to attach any supporting documents please do so below.



PuhoiWarkworthsubmission.docx
Microsoft Word Document
118 KB

Only **ONE** PDF or Word document with a maximum size limit of 15MB can be attached to this submission form.

Please forward larger files or file types other than PDF or Word, or multiple documents directly to the EPA on a CD or DVD or USB stick.

Email Address

I wish to receive a copy of my completed submission via email.

Forward my submission form to Applicant

*A copy of your submission **must** be sent to the New Zealand Transport Agency. If you unselect this box you **must** deliver your submission to New Zealand Transport Agency as soon as possible*

To send in your submission, please press the Submit button.

This confirms you have the authority to act for all persons named on the submission form.

If you do **not** wish to send in your submission, or you do **not** have authority to act for all stated parties in this matter, please do **not** press the Submit button.

When you click on the submit button, a copy of your submission will be sent to the Environmental Protection Authority and a copy will also be forwarded to your email address. Your submission may take some time to submit please allow time for the form to submit. When your form has been successful submitted a message will appear below this text.

Introduction

About Generation Zero

1. Generation Zero is a national network of young New Zealanders formed in 2011 to address the lack of action on climate change by formulating and implementing a vision for rapid movement to a zero carbon future.
2. Generation Zero has no formal membership requirements. However, we estimate that Generation Zero has more than 500 active volunteers and 10,000 supporters nationwide.
3. Generation Zero believes that we have entered a new era in which resource constraints and environmental limits will truly bite. Climate change is more than just a reality; the more we learn through science, the more we discover how serious the problem is and how little time we have to act. The consequences will define our lives and span centuries.
4. In New Zealand, we currently have no credible plan to kick the fossil fuel habit and cut our greenhouse gas emissions. As young people, we are set to pick up the tab for this stunning lack of action.
5. In relation to transport projects, Generation Zero supports those projects that take the issue of climate change seriously and consider the risks associated with taking a “business as usual” approach to transportation.
6. Our submission will be based around 4 main areas of contention with the proposal which are Project Justification, Economic, Traffic and Ecological effects. This will be supported by 2 chapters about where we believe this conflicts with the Resource Management Act 1991 and the relevant planning documents.
7. We also share some concerns with several others groups, and would like to support the submissions of the Campaign for Better Transport and Mahurangi Action Incorporated.

Chapters

1. Project Justification and Alternatives
2. Project Economics
3. Ecological Effects
4. City and Regional Planning Documents
5. Resource Management Act

1. Project Justification and Alternatives

Overall we believe the project justification section (Chapter 2) is very weak, and does not reach the threshold giving sufficient justification, especially noting the serious ecological effects we will discuss later.

The submission is misleading in regards to the suggested outcomes of the 'SH1/16 Auckland to Wellsford Strategic Study' from March 2008. I recommend the Board obtain the full document to review this strategy. This project actions Option 2 from this study. However the study recommends an Option 1 which is an upgrade of the existing road, rather than the full motorway NZTA have chose. The quote from the report is interesting

“Option 2 would be the optimal solution in terms of functionality. However, given such a route would have very high construction costs, would be difficult to stage and implement as a number of smaller construction projects, and full benefits would not be realised until completion.”

Interestingly Option 1 and 2 score the same on 'Assists Safety and Personal Security', and Option 1 scores better on 'Environmental Sustainability'.

In the Traffic Chapter of the application NZTA dismiss something similar to Option 1 without sufficient investigation. We believe an offline upgrade could deliver safety upgrades to the most dangerous areas of the route, notably Schedewys Hill. Wire median barriers have proved a very effective, very cheap and quick solution to traffic safety issues on Centennial Highway in the Wellington region, and should have been investigated. Note that for the proposed motorway option we will have to wait 5 years to see any safety benefits, and construction traffic will cause safety issues in the existing road during that time. We believe that therefore the actual safety benefits to the project are minor, and do not contribute towards the overall case of the project.

The traffic modelling is not specific enough to sections of the route, or times of the year. It is well known that there are traffic issues on this road during peak summer holiday periods, however this is common network wide in holiday spots. It is not economically feasible to justify upgrades nationwide to ensure holiday traffic can flow freely.

The NZTA State Highway Traffic Volumes count for 2012 shows that there is an AADT of 17,471 using the Pohuehue Viaduct. However immediately past Warkworth at Kaipara Flats Road the AADT is only 11,809. This creates several issues for the proposed motorway route that does not contain exits to the south of Warkworth. Looking at the traffic volume this shows a significant portion of traffic is not bound for Northland, but for Warkworth and beach settlements around Matakana. This also hints that the traffic issues are caused by cars leaving at Warkworth. By building a bypass of traffic around Warkworth to a local road standard, this may well solve the traffic issues. However NZTA have not given sufficient consideration to this.

NZTA also need to take into the account the Warkworth intersection improvements that are programmed for construction in the next couple of years. This will provide some traffic relief at peak periods, and the modelling should be done with this upgrade as a given.

The lack of a southern access to Warkworth also creates issues for the traffic modelling in other ways. Those bound for Warkworth and the Eastern beaches will need to backtrack and face a longer journey than they do at the moment.

This does not appear to have been taken into account when calculating the time savings, as this assumes traffic is bound for the proposed intersection north of Warkworth, rather than their actual destinations.

The report claims that time taken to drive the project in the afternoon peak in 2026 will go down from 26.5 minutes, to 10 minutes. Considering the project is 18.5km that would require motorists travelling at 111km/h. This is clearly a flaw with the traffic modelling. Also as this is a regional highway rather than a strongly commuter focussed highway the afternoon peak is only a minor consideration. Also this figure of 26.5 minutes is heavily dependent on major residential growth in Warkworth, which is still very uncertain. Again we believe more quantification of the modelling is required, to show what percentage of the traffic achieves the stated time savings benefits.

In regards to network resilience State Highway 16 actually provides a comparatively good alternative route compared to large areas of the State Highway Network. Most of the State Highway network does not have an alternative route that is only 20km longer, and for occasional events 20km is not an especially bad detour. While SH16 is not the same standard as SH1, upgrading this route is likely to be very cheap. Therefore issues of network resilience have been overstated in the report.

In the 'Efficient Movement of Freight' section there are some poor assumptions and incorrect statements of fact made in regards to freight flows. The dependence of certain industries on efficient freight movement between Northland and Auckland is seriously overstated. Two major examples are oil and logs. Logs are overwhelmingly logged in the Northland region, and exported through Marsden Point, or used by local processors. Only an insignificant minority travel along the SH1 between Warkworth and Puhoi. Similar issues arise for oil. There is an oil pipeline between Marsden Point and Auckland (Wiri) and this handles the domestic oil transport along the route. So neither of these industries benefit from the proposed highway. Kiwirail handle much of Fonterra's export product between Kauri, Maungaturoto and Auckland's Port, so dairy will only have a tiny benefit from this product. The statement in the report saying the Rail and Coastal Shipping 'are unlikely to increase in the future' is not backed by any evidence. Increasing congestion in the Auckland urban area may well see more freight choosing to use rail and shipping.

We are also concerned about the claims about increased amenity to walkers and cyclists in the area. The existing SH1 will still be used by a reasonably high number of vehicles. Therefore the existing road will still be very unsafe for walkers and cyclists. We urge NZTA to either provide a substantially improved walking/cycling path along the existing SH1 as part of this project, or a new walking/cycling path along the proposed motorway alignment.

2. Project Economics

The Economic aspects of the projects are addressed by both the Justification Chapter, as well as in Appendix C. The quality of the economic analysis is very weak. There are no numbers included to quantify the economic benefits whatsoever, and the only economic assessment is at a very high level, much of which is not project specific. This is not acceptable for a project of this scale.

I am aware of previous business cases, such as the December 2009 SAHA report that put the Benefit Cost Ratio for this project at 0.4. The applicant needs to provide the board with copies of these business cases to show the road provides sufficient benefits.

The 'SH1/16 Auckland to Wellsford Strategic Study' (SKM, March 2008) referred to above also totally contradicts the view in the Project Justification.

5.9.1 Regional Economic Impacts

Within the initial evaluation framework, the relative effects of strategy options for the state highway network were considered. Further work was undertaken to assess the potential magnitude of implementing the strategy on the regional economy. The key conclusions that arose from this assessment were:

- The economy of Northland is relatively weak with low regional GDP per capita and a low historic growth rate.
- The economy also has a relatively high concentration of activities in the agriculture and natural resources sectors, areas where key demand may lie overseas rather than elsewhere in New Zealand. For this traffic, interactions with Auckland may decline with the development of port facilities at Marsden Point and the construction of a connecting rail link.
- The key centre in the Northland is Whangarei, which is at a considerable distance from the main centres in the Auckland region. The areas south of Whangarei are relatively lightly developed containing about 10-15 per cent of total regional employment, and the scope for substantial economic growth with the upgrading of SH1 is limited.
- The activity most likely to benefit from the improvement of SH1 to Wellsford is tourism. However, this is relatively small scale in the areas in the south of Northland with a contribution to GDP of about \$30-50 million. Even a significant increase in this contribution would be modest when set against the likely costs of road upgrading.

Therefore, regional economic issues are unlikely to make a significant contribution to the viability for implementing the strategy. However, it is clear that the strategy would make an overall positive contribution to the region.

I urge the Board of Enquiry to require a full review of the Economic Business Case for the project. Ideally this should follow the Treasury Business Case Guidelines, and the recently updated NZTA Economic Evaluation Manual.

There should also be a much more quantified assessment of the economic effects of this road on the Northland Region, which is seemingly a primary justification for this project.

The applications will have a major detrimental effect on the local environment, notably sensitive estuaries. The applicant has not proved that this project will have the benefits claimed, so cannot justify the trade-off in terms of environmental effects.

3. Ecology

We are very concerned about the effects of this project on the sensitive environments, as well as the landscapes affected by construction.

The catchment this project drains into is the Mahurangi Catchment. This is a shallow estuarine catchment, and has been identified as an area of concern by the former Auckland Regional Council going back at least 10 years. This led to the introduction of the Mahurangi Action Plan, and also a number of technical studies.

These studies found that sedimentation from the existing farming, and a low level development was already having a detrimental affect on the harbour.

The ecology of Mahurangi harbour is changing, probably as a result of increased sediment loading. Increasing proportions of fine sediment in the upper harbour coincide with decreasing and increasing trends in abundance of species intolerant and tolerant to mud, respectively. The cause has been attributed to catchment disturbance causing erosion and subsequent sediment runoff into the streams draining into the harbour. (TP 299, ARC 2004).

We recommend that the Board of Inquiry review these reports produced for the ARC over the past decade, as they seem to conflict with NZTA's downplaying of the effects of construction sediment produced during construction. They also enable a longer term view of the ecological issues of the Mahurangi Catchment to be taken into account.

We are also concerned about the effects of the motorway on native bush and the outstanding natural landscapes of the area. We bring attention to the Board to a DOC survey of Natural Areas in the surrounding localities. We have not seen enough evidence in terms of how the proposed motorway avoids these areas of native bush identified in this study.

DOC Study -

Natural areas of Rodney Ecological District
(Northland Conservancy)
Reconnaissance survey report for the Protected Natural Areas Programme
2012

<http://www.doc.govt.nz/Documents/conservation/land-and-freshwater/land/natural-areas-of-rodney-ecological-district.pdf>

Auckland Regional Council studies -

Mahurangi Harbour Soft-Sediment Communities: Predicting and Assessing the Effects of Harbour and Catchment Development. April TR 2009/040

http://www.aucklandcity.govt.nz/council/documents/technicalpublications/TR2009_040%20-%20Mahurangi%20Harbour%20Soft-Sediment%20Communities.pdf

<http://www.aucklandcity.govt.nz/council/documents/technicalpublications/TP235.pdf>

http://www.aucklandcity.govt.nz/council/documents/technicalpublications/TR2009_039%20-%20Mahurangi%20Harbour%20Biological%20Monitoring%20Programme.pdf

http://www.aucklandcity.govt.nz/council/documents/technicalpublications/TP270_Mahu_sed_source_a.pdf

http://www.aucklandcity.govt.nz/council/documents/technicalpublications/TP277_Mahurangi_Eco_94_05.pdf

Relating terrigenous sediment deposition in Mahurangi Harbour to specific land use in the catchment: a pilot study August 2004 Technical Publication 299

http://www.aucklandcity.govt.nz/council/documents/technicalpublications/TP299_mahu_sed_tracer_PartA.pdf

4. City and Regional Planning Documents

Regional Policy Statement

This application conflicts the Regional Policy Statement's desire to reduce sprawling development, and produce a more compact urban form. There is also no provision for public transport, walking or cycling in the application so it conflicts the RPS here too.

The RPS also outlines several Outstanding Natural Landscapes that the project affects.

Area 43: West Mahurangi Harbour Area

Area 44: Mahurangi - Waiwera

Area 46: Upper Pūhoi Valley

We are concerned the applicant has not sufficiently considered the affects of the major earthworks and viaducts on the ONL's. The motorway will totally alter the character of these areas forever, and a very wide scale view of the area needs to be taken.

Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan

While the Unitary Plan was not notified when this application was lodged, it was notified several weeks later. Therefore some weight needs to be given to the Objectives and Policies of the Unitary Plan, as well as regard to rules having immediate legal effect on notification. There is no mention of the Unitary Plan in the Assessment of Environmental Effects, and this is a major deficiency in the application. The applicant needs to provide an assessment of the proposal in regards to the relevant parts of the Unitary Plan that have some legal effect. It is not clear to what extent the project affects the SEA's and Outstanding Natural Landscapes identified, so this needs to be clarified.

Auckland Council District Plan (Rodney Section)

This is the relevant District Plan and outlines several areas of interest. These include Significant Natural Area's. We do not believe the applicant has given significant weight to this part of the District Plan, and a more fuller assessment is required. It is not clear to what extent the project affects the SNA's.

Auckland Council Regional Plan (Coastal)

We do not believe the plan has sufficiently addressed the impact of structures in the Coastal Marine Area.

5. Resource Management Act 1991

5 Purpose

- (1)The purpose of this Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.
- (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 well-being 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, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.

The applicant has not justified the route chosen appropriately. There are alternate options which provide for the social, economic, and cultural well-being and health and safety for the communities of Rodney, Auckland and Whangarei. These routes have a much smaller footprint on the environment. These alternate routes would allow the avoidance of many of the serious sedimentation effects on the natural environment.

6 Matters of national importance

- *In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall recognise and provide for the following matters of national importance:*
 - *(a) the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:*
 - *(b) the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:*
 - *(c) the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna:*
 - *(d) the maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes, and rivers:*

Comment - This project does not preserve the natural character of the coastal environment. The applicant has not proved the project is an appropriate development through their justification or economic analysis. The project does affect significant areas of indigenous vegetation, notably Kauri forests. The project does not enhance public access anywhere along the route. The route has several identified Outstanding Natural Landscapes, and there will be a serious negative effect on these from the major earthworks required.

7 Other matters

- In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall have particular regard to—
 - (a) kaitiakitanga:
 - (aa) the ethic of stewardship:
 - (b) the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources:
 - (ba) the efficiency of the end use of energy:
 - (c) the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values:
 - (d) intrinsic values of ecosystems:
 - (e) *[Repealed]*
 - (f) maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment:
 - (g) any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources:

The lack of economic analysis means that the applicant cannot prove that this project is an efficient use of natural and physical resources. This project does not maintain or enhance the quality of the environment, in reality this will have a serious negative effect on the surrounding catchments and ecosystems.