

**BEFORE A BOARD OF INQUIRY  
NORTHERN CORRIDOR PROPOSAL**

**UNDER** of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of notices of requirement for designation and resource consent applications by the New Zealand Transport Agency for the Northern Corridor Proposal (the **Proposal**)

---

**SUMMARY OF PLANNING EVIDENCE (DESIGNATIONS) OF JOANNA HART  
10 August 2017**

---



**Simpson Grierson**

Barristers & Solicitors

G C Lanning / W M Bangma / D W Simpson

Telephone: +64-9-358 2222

Facsimile: +64-9-307 0331

Email: [gerald.lanning@simpsongrierson.com](mailto:gerald.lanning@simpsongrierson.com)

DX CX10921

Private Bag 92518

Auckland

1. My name is Joanna Hart. I am a Principal Planner in the Planning North West and Islands Unit, Plans and Places at Auckland Council (**AC**). My background and experience is set out in section 1 of my evidence.
2. In summary, the key conclusions set out in section 3.3 of my evidence in chief (**EIC**) are:
  - 2.1 The proposal is consistent with the relevant objectives and policies of the relevant policy and planning documents including the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in part (**AUPOiP**);
  - 2.2 There has been adequate consideration of alternatives;
  - 2.3 The works and designations are reasonably necessary to achieve the New Zealand Transport Agency's (**NZTA**) objectives for the Proposal including facilitating interregional travel between Auckland and Northland by completing the Western Ring Route; improving the capacity and connectivity of SH1 and SH18; extending the Northern Busway; and to provide safe walking and cycling facilities adjacent to SH1 and SH18 and connections to local transport networks;
  - 2.4 In relation to the Alexandra Stream underpass, Mr Bray acknowledged in questioning that whilst the objective to provide safe walking and cycling connections to the existing local walking and cycling network would not be met in this location, the objective would be met overall by the Proposal. I agree with this statement;
  - 2.5 Amendments to the designation conditions as lodged were proposed where I agreed with the relevant specialist witnesses for Council that the adverse effects of the Proposal were not appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated. This included new conditions in relation to the Hockey facility, mitigation for the loss of sports fields at Constellation Reserve, approvals under Section 176 of the RMA and the establishment of a Community Liaison Group. Amendments to proposed conditions related to the Rook Reserve reinstatement plan and for upgraded connections to SUPs to be provided;
  - 2.6 I did not agree with the proposed approach of the separation of conditions where all of the construction conditions are attached to the regional resource

consents and only the operational conditions are attached to the designations. I also considered that there needed to be more clarity around which conditions applied to which designation and/or which regional resource consent;

- 2.7** The Proposal, subject to recommended amendments to conditions, is consistent with Part 2 of the RMA.

### **Changes to evidence as a result of conferencing**

- 3.** I attended the expert conferencing on planning and signed the joint witnessing statements (JWS: Planning, 30 June/3-6 July 2017 and JWS: Additional Planning, 18-19 July 2017). I have read the relevant planning evidence, rebuttal evidence and other JWS joint witnessing statements. There is nothing in these documents that changes the views I have expressed in my EIC or the JWS.
- 4.** In respect of 2.4 above, agreement was reached on the wording of the conditions for both the designations and the regional resource consents. This included the removal of conditions relating to the future sports fields at Constellation Reserve, as agreed by the expert witnesses in the JWS for Recreation and Reserves, (dated 22 June 2017). Agreement was also reached on the removal of the Section 176 approvals as there are other conditions (NU.9, NU.10 and SW.7) which sufficiently secure Healthy Water's (Auckland Council) access to existing and replacement stormwater assets.
- 5.** Agreement was reached that Mr McGahan and Mr Burns would provide a table to the Board which showed the separation of the conditions and how they applied to each designation and regional resource consent. However, agreement was not reached on the approach taken to attach all of the construction conditions to the regional resource consents and only the operational conditions to the designations. My view remains as set out in paragraphs 10.16 to 10.21 of my EIC.
- 6.** In respect of the establishment of a Community Liaison Group (CLG), Conditions SCP.3 (c)(vii) was amended and SCP.6 added prior to the planning expert conferencing as attached to the rebuttal evidence of Mr Burns and Mr McGahan (dated 15 June 2017). These amendments were in response to my concern that a different approach was being undertaken in this Proposal to others such as the East West Link Project. I considered that the conditions as lodged did not provide clarity on the type of input required by the various stakeholders, including Auckland Council, how the information received by NZTA would be used, or provide adequate provision for feedback loops. I also considered that there needed to be an ongoing commitment by NZTA for at least 6

months after the completion of the Proposal in line with similar requirements of CLG conditions on other NZTA projects.

7. Further amendments to Condition SCP.3(c)(vii) and the addition of SCP.3(c)(viii) were made during the planning expert conferencing to address my ongoing concerns in relation to a feedback loop that was missing on the report required to be undertaken by the Requiring Authority after each consultation event. I consider that all of the amendments to the SCP conditions have the same intent as the Community Liaison Group condition proposed in my EIC.

## **Updates**

8. In relation to the upgraded connections to the Shared Use Paths, I understand that additional connections have been agreed to and are subject to a side agreement between NZTA and AT. I rely on the evidence of Ms King and Mr Tindall that whilst the additional connections are not required to mitigate an effect they will improve the connectivity of the SUPs to the existing cycle and pedestrian network.
9. Further discussion, in relation to the designation and regional resource consent conditions, has been undertaken by the planners and their respective legal counsel on 26 July and 27 July 2017, with the inclusion of the noise experts on 27 July 2017. Agreement, between the parties present at those discussions, was reached as to the wording of the conditions.
10. Subsequent communication between the parties has taken place between 27 July 2017 and 3 August 2017. Further minor amendments to the wording of conditions have been agreed to. Agreement has also been reached on the additional management plan conditions to be attached to the designations (rather than to the regional resource consents), these being Construction Noise and Vibration (CNV.1 to CNV.9) and Construction Traffic Management (CTMP.1 to CTMP.6D) including the Public Transport Traffic Management Plan (CTMP.5 to CTMP5.D). It should be noted that an earlier version of the Stakeholder and Communication Plan conditions was included in the designation conditions prior to the planning expert conferencing.
11. I consider that these conditions do not need be duplicated within the regional resource consent conditions. Whilst the AUPOiP has both regional and district plan provisions in one plan, noise, vibration and traffic provisions are classified as district plan land use matters and should therefore only apply to the designations. Any construction works for the Proposal, undertaken within the various designation boundaries, would be required

to comply with both the designation conditions and the conditions of the regional resource consents.

12. It is my understanding that a copy of the updated conditions was lodged with the Board on 4 August 2017 attached to the supplementary evidence of Mr McGahan.

**Dated** at Auckland this 10<sup>th</sup> day of August 2017



---

Joanna Hart  
On behalf of Auckland Council