

SUPPLEMENTARY SUBMISSION

TO

EAST WEST LINK

This submission is presented by fellow resident Maria Mortimer on behalf of:

**Ms Carol-Anne Armitage
Resident**

[REDACTED]

**Mangere Bridge
Auckland 2022**

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Submission number 126385

General History

Onehunga and Mangere Bridge have a shared history that spans well over a century. During this time there has been a vital connection to the Onehunga business area for the people of Mangere Bridge and they are high users of the transport corridor through and beyond Onehunga to access; retail shops, health and other services plus recreational and other pursuits. Both communities are also part of the national Coastal Walk and Cycleway.

Photo A

This photo gives a clear view of the width of the Mangere Inlet in 1910. As this photo demonstrates, due to reclamations over the years, the upper harbour is now considerably less in area.

Photo B

In this picture of Onehunga the only thing that separates that community from their harbour is a local road.

Photo C

The bridge has been a vital connection between our two communities. Prior to this wooden bridge a man transported people across in his rowing boat. There have been three reincarnations of this bridge to what we now have.

From Original Submission re Coastal Environment

1. ***This area has cultural, aesthetic and recreational value to the communities of Onehunga and Mangere Bridge and the proposed development would have an unacceptable negative impact. The proposal fails to recognise this and does not provide adequate protection to the cultural, aesthetic and recreational value of our shared coastal environment.***
2. ***There will be significant negative impact on current and future open space, community identity and place-making. The proposed project will have negative impacts on the sense of place created by the Taumanu Reserve, historic Port of Onehunga, community groups (e.g. Aotea Sea Scouts), built environment (e.g. 19th century Manukau Tavern) and the surrounding coastal landscape and topography.***
3. ***The proposal in its current form will also adversely affect the community at Mangere Bridge who are high users of this transport corridor to access shopping, health services and recreation including the Aotea Sea Scouts, the new Taumanu Reserve and recently opened Waikōwhai Boardwalk.***
4. ***The project has not succeeded in minimising its footprint within the coastal environment around the Gloucester Park Interchange. Protection and enhancement of this part of the coastline could contribute significantly to the local community and for Tāmaki Makaurau.***

The Auckland Regional Policy states: “The preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment and its protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development” is a matter of national importance (section 6(a)). In the context of the Auckland Region, the coastal environment ranges from areas which are predominantly in their natural state, characterised by high natural character, to areas which due to human modification have some remaining elements of natural character. Accordingly, preserving areas of high natural character and the remaining elements present in modified areas, and protecting them from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, requires different provisions to ensure the promotion of sustainable management. The Auckland Region also has a number of areas with ecological and landform values of international, national and Regional significance. Other areas have landscape or spiritual and cultural values which contribute to the Region’s own unique identity. Also, the majority of cultural heritage resources are found within the coastal environment. These areas also require protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development to ensure that their values and character are maintained. **(Appendix A)**

ONEHUNGA - POWER POINT

PHOTO 1: What you see looks like a pleasant and serene environment

PHOTO 1a: This is the widest buffer zone between the lagoon and SH20

VIDEO for photos 1 and 1a: This is what you actually hear

PHOTO 2: Sitting in the shade overlooking the lagoon looks peaceful enough you might think

VIDEO 2: But this is what you hear

PHOTO 3: This is the view that the Onehunga residents have of the Manukau Harbour looking towards the Manukau Heads

VIDEO 3: But sadly, this is what is between them and their foreshore and what they hear 24/7

When you compare these images to Photos A and B you can see how much this area has already lost due to “development” over the years.

Under today's protections I doubt that Hugh Watt Drive would have been given the go-ahead in its current form. The "compensation" then to the Onehunga Community, for the loss of direct access to their foreshore, was the lagoon area. A poor substitute, in my opinion especially given the fact that SH20 has been widened several times since that area was established thereby substantially reducing the buffer zone between the ever increasing volumes of traffic and the lagoon area.

From Original Submission re Social Impacts - Onehunga

1. *The proposal fails to recognise significance in the value of the Onehunga Port and waterfront area to the people of Onehunga, Mangere Bridge and surrounding communities;*
2. *The proposal does not offer **adequate provision for public access** to the coastal environment;*
3. *It does not adequately **enable use of the coastal environment** to support the community, particularly given the close proximity of the proposed Gloucester Park Interchange to the coast;*
4. *It does not provide adequate **walking and cycling transport connection** between Onehunga township, Mangere Bridge and the Port area*
5. *The proposal will have a **negative impact on the Onehunga coastline as a place of recreation**, given the proximity of the proposed interchange and associated land modifications*

Social Impacts – Mangere Bridge

Let's now look directly across the harbour to Mangere Bridge where there is direct access to their foreshore, the only division being a local road:

MANGERE BRIDGE POWER POINT

PHOTO 1: Cyclists with jet skis in the distance and beyond that a view towards the port and One Tree Hill.

The Gloucester Park Interchange flyover will be right in the middle of this stunning view. The design has an unacceptable **negative visual impact** on this area of the coastline due to the nature and large scale of the project.

PHOTO 2: Walking along the foreshore, the only traffic noise is minor from this local road.

PHOTO 3: Regular Waka Ama and other water sports have direct access to the foreshore. You can see to the right just how close this is to where the proposed EWL would go through under SH20

PHOTO 4: Regular community events, groups and residents have direct access for the full length of the waterfront

PHOTO 5: This part of the foreshore on the south of the Mangere Inlet is very close to the northern bank and will be severely impacted by the East West Link. Visual and traffic noise and air pollutants, in addition to that already experienced in Mangere Bridge from SH20, will have a severe impact on this recreational space

PHOTO 6: The Mangere Bridge community's view up the harbour towards the Manukau Heads

VIDEO 1: This is what WE hear.....Wind, waves and seagulls

PHOTO 7: Another view towards the port

VIDEO 2: This is still what we hear – all along our waterfront

PHOTO 8: What we see

VIDEO 3: What it sounds like.....Wind, waves and birds

CONCLUSION

Due to the implementation of the Unitary Plan the areas of Mangere Bridge and especially Onehunga are already experiencing an increase in density of residential dwellings, including apartment blocks, resulting in a larger community and increased demand and need for open public spaces with high amenity value and access. In light of this, the proposed project needs to balance economic needs with negative impacts on the local communities. It is my view that the proposed design does not achieve this as it will have **unacceptable negative social impacts**. The proposed Gloucester Park Interchange design will **negatively impact on the quality and nature of the future form of open spaces** and recreational sites in the Onehunga Port and its waterfront and by extension that of Mangere Bridge.

There will be a **loss of access to Gloucester Park** which is the biggest area of open public space in Onehunga. In addition the alignment of the East West Link severs Onehunga from the Mangere Inlet and increases isolation of the Manukau Harbour foreshore, Te Hopua Tuff Ring and Onehunga Wharf area which are of historical significance.

The proposal in its current form will also **adversely affect** the community at Mangere Bridge who are high users of this area to access shopping, health services and recreation including the Aotea Sea Scouts and the new Taumanu Reserve and recently opened Waikōwhai Boardwalk. Both the Onehunga and Mangere Bridge waterfronts are part of the national Coastal Walk and Cycleway.

The Manukau Harbour, the second largest in New Zealand, is a greatly under-used resource. It has long been the desire of our two communities to enjoy redevelopment of the port. Due to Mangere Bridge's close proximity to Auckland Airport and many local hotels and motels, the area attracts a lot of tourists. Many are astounded to hear that they cannot take a harbour cruise. The potential for the port area is huge. The proposal **fails to recognise the significance of, and aspirations for**, the Onehunga Port and surrounding waterfront to the Onehunga and Mangere Bridge communities and the tourism opportunities these areas offer. Adequate provision should be provided to ensure public access to this coastal environment.

The proposal increases the severance between Onehunga Town Centre and the Onehunga foreshore and Onehunga Port area, a route which is currently widely used by the Mangere Bridge community. The trench area in front of The Landing historic building is **a serious pinch point**. A major accident there could bring both north and southbound traffic to a standstill, **especially to the airport**. It does not make sense to have all our eggs in one basket in this vital transport corridor. Therefore it makes good sense to separate north and southbound traffic which this proposal fails to do.

The proposal has unacceptable negative impacts on the **historic relationship** of the Onehunga township, the Port of Onehunga, the Mangere Bridge waterfront and Ambury Regional Park. **The connection of the local communities to their coastline will be significantly impacted** by the proposed design which runs within a narrow corridor of the coastline and is of a size and nature that will negatively impact the communities' access to the harbour for generations.

The proposal has unacceptable negative impacts on **historic volcanic features** at both the Gloucester Park Interchange and along the Māngere Inlet foreshore which is contrary to the Auckland Regional Policy Statement. **(APPENDIX 1)**

The proposed design will **worsen the community severance** caused by the historic design of SH20 as it simply increases the height, width and scale of the existing Gloucester Park Interchange. The proposed interchange design **does not represent sustainable resource management** and it **fails to acknowledge, and provide for, the social and cultural wellbeing of past, present and future people of Onehunga, Mangere Bridge and surrounding communities.**

One hundred and nineteen submitters (44.7%) raised concerns with regard to the consideration of alternatives to the proposal. NZTA has not given appropriate consideration to the fact that their design is seriously flawed. The desired traffic impacts could be achieved with a design that does not require a highway along the coast. *[Other groups have already presented their options to the panel].*

Taking Victoria Park viaduct as an example, rather than build an unsightly second viaduct across that park in the city NZTA split the traffic with northbound traffic going through a tunnel and southbound using the existing viaduct. NZTA has looked at the EWL project with blinkered vision and stubbornly refuse to consider that there might actually be a better way than decimating the Mangere Inlet, foreshore and Gloucester Park.

The higher traffic volumes will lead to increased exposure to noise and motor vehicle pollutants which will adversely affect the local people of Onehunga and Mangere Bridge and the coastal environment. Additional noise is anticipated as the proposal will encourage more heavy vehicles to use State Highway 20 to add to the visual pollution of the power pylons *[a separate issue which others have presented to the panel].*

With regards to the freight industry, at a meeting for Key Stakeholders last year one of their representatives stated quite categorically that their drivers will continue to use **the most direct route**, namely Neilson Street, which defeats the purpose of the whole exercise. If you are a truck driver going south, why would you choose to take the most circuitous route which the Gloucester Park Interchange design most certainly is, regardless of the steps that NZTA have proposed to avoid this from happening.

A representative from a different arm of the freight industry was genuinely shocked to hear about the serious concerns that the local communities have about the project. He said that they had been led to believe, by NZTA, that local issues had been addressed. I was likewise shocked to hear this as that is far from the truth, as the panel will have heard.

In addition it has been reported that the project has a weak business case. It's basically for the freight industry whose members are just passing through the area. However residents will be here for many years and the communities of Mangere Bridge and Onehunga will have to live with the outcome of this project for decades as we and our families go about our daily business.

It has been reported that TOES chairperson Jim Jackson supports the project but he says it needs to be done in a manner which does not compromise the Onehunga [and by extension Mangere Bridge] community for the next 100 years.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The EPA should require NZTA to go back to the drawing board and in consultation with the local communities of Onehunga and Mangere Bridge come up with another design, especially for the Gloucester Park Interchange, which will have better outcomes for those communities.

I call on the Board of Inquiry to instruct NZTA to properly engage and take feedback from the local communities of Onehunga and Mangere Bridge to address the social and environmental issues raised by submitters. As part of the delivery of the East West Link project I would like a positive outcome for our communities and a community-lead design of the Gloucester Park Interchange could achieve this. Therefore I ask that the panel require NZTA to reconsider and redesign the Gloucester Park Interchange using alternative designs **and construction methods** to better avoid, remedy and mitigate the adverse effects of the proposed project.

I also ask the Board of Inquiry to instruct NZTA to alter the proposed design to appropriately restore the previously lost natural coastal environment along the Onehunga foreshore between Taumanu Reserve and the Port of Onehunga.

As the EWL is predominantly for the benefit of the freight industry the EPA should require them to contribute financially to this project thereby allowing NZTA to look at a better and more acceptable, but perhaps more expensive, alternative to what is proposed.

Let's not rush this process, it is too important to the future well-being of the harbour, foreshore and its historic features and for future generations. Protection of these areas should be foremost in any planning.

Carol-Anne Armitage

APPENDIX A

Auckland Regional Policy Statement - Coastal Management Area

7.3 Objectives

1. To preserve the natural character of the coastal environment and to protect it from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.
2. To protect outstanding natural features and landscapes, areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, and significant historic and cultural places and areas in the coastal environment.
3. To enable appropriate subdivision, use and development to be undertaken in the coastal environment.
4. To enable the use of the coastal environment for appropriate port purposes, other water-related industrial and commercial activities and network utilities.
5. To reduce the risk of environmental damage from subdivision, use and development within the coastal environment arising from uncertainty or lack of knowledge about coastal processes.
6. To maintain and enhance public access to and along the CMA and to publicly-owned land in the coastal environment.
7. To enable an appropriate range of recreational opportunities to be undertaken in the coastal environment.
8. To ensure that the disposal of dredged material, or other solid matter likely to cause significant adverse effects on the natural and physical resources of the coastal environment, occurs in a way which avoids, remedies, or mitigates those significant adverse effects on the natural and physical resources of the coastal environment, and meets the social, economic and cultural aspirations of the community.
9. To recognise and provide for the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu and other taonga of the coastal environment.