

Submission to Royal Commission into Auckland Local & Regional Governance
Prepared by Joel Cayford – Independent Auckland Regional Councillor
Ph: 445 2763 Cell: 0274 978 123 Email: joel.cayford@arc.govt.nz
Dated 7th April 2008



1 Introduction

I take a keen interest in Auckland's local governance, and have been an elected representative for the past 10 years - including 6 years as a North Shore City Councillor from 1998-2004 (serving on Devonport Community Board concurrently), and 4 years as an Auckland Regional Councillor from 2004-2008. Selected articles, conference papers and presentations prepared by me about city development, and transport and water industries, can be found at: www.joelcayford.com

This submission is supported by case studies with which I am very familiar, and explanations of important procedures I believe should become central to Auckland planning such as Master Planning; the use of Development Agencies; and The Regional Development Plan. It also includes a couple of cautionary notes.

The basis of my submission may be summarised as:

- ◆ implementation of the compact city region strategic vision is failing
- ◆ Auckland development needs to change direction if it is to become more sustainable, and more economically efficient
- ◆ regional planning needs to be strengthened, relevant infrastructure management centralised, and integrated implementation made more certain
- ◆ planning and implementation of urban regeneration projects requires a regional Urban Development Authority, and project specific Development Agencies to coordinate master-planning and delivery
- ◆ achieving publicly agreed service outcomes should be the priority for service entities with mechanisms to avoid political extraction of profit from one service to cross-subsidise another
- ◆ community expectations and diversity need to be recognised through local involvement in local planning and local infrastructure projects
- ◆ the 1989 amalgamation delivered benefits which should be retained - if it ain't broke don't fix it
- ◆ bench-marking, accountability and transparency risk being lost through excessive amalgamation of entities and integration of services
- ◆ ratepayers should receive one bill for their rates – prepared centrally

2 Background

Auckland is not alone in re-assessing its future and wondering how to get there. Our urban region shares many of the same problems now being confronted around the world by Western cities whose development over the past forty years has largely been shaped by the automobile and by consensus support for that. This period and process of city development coincides with mass-production of consumer goods, mass-consumption, wide-ranging belief in the infallibility of science, and strong middle-class support for traditional family values. This broad consensus and associated prosperity encouraged central and regional governments to intervene strongly with supportive investment programs for infrastructure such as roading, water and energy projects.

The Auckland Regional Authority (ARA) was a key part of this period in Auckland. It is said that: “the ARA built Auckland”. In fact the ARA built the airport, the modern port, and major water infrastructure, while the Ministry of Works built most of the motorway network. Throughout this period Auckland expanded like there was no tomorrow. Its CBD was entirely reshaped by motorways. Greenfield development accelerated. The combination of urban expressways and urban sprawl made the car indispensable.

While the 1973 oil crisis had an impact in Auckland, we quickly recovered from it, continuing as if it were business as usual. But it did mark the start of changing times. Sex, drugs and rock ‘n’ roll may have played a part, so might the Vietnam war – who knows – but this was a time when discontent began growing around the standardisation of products and lifestyles, questions began to be asked about whether progress was always a good thing, was the Western way of life the only way? did science truly legitimise infrastructure projects? and was serious environmental damage being done in the name of progress?

Here at home in Auckland, change over the last fifteen years has been marked by the availability of the best coffee in the world, world-beating local wines and cheeses, internationally recognised restaurants, cultural diversity that goes way beyond simple Maori/Pakeha bi-culturalism, Hollywood-class local cinema production, and lauded innovation in sports and internet science. But there have been barely any changes in Auckland’s

Case Study - AMETI

I sat for three years as ARC’s representative on the consultative group tasked with implementing the Auckland Manukau Eastern Transport Initiative. After a year I pointed out that there was no plan to coordinate re-zoning of adjacent land (by Auckland & Manukau City Councils) to permit the greater densities and greater economic activity that would be enabled by the increased transport corridor capacities proposed. Project Director Grant Kirby took up this point and the initiative began to embrace the link between transport and land use. My experience of City of Perth’s approach to master-planning implemented through a development agency, indicates that such a process would have been beneficial for AMETI, saving time by bringing forward all the issues together deliberately – rather than by circumstance. Toward the end of 2007, the AMETI project team began preparing a list of transport projects, prioritised for funding and detailed design. I was advised that the top priority projects were mainly traditional arterial road-widening projects for general traffic (ie mainly cars) that had been on the drawing board for years and were “ready to go”, despite stated objectives and expectations about the need to improve passenger transport and pedestrian amenity in areas affected. Traffic engineers and planners around the table had in previous years invested heavily of their time in designing roading projects. Their commitment to and ownership of these projects is understandable. However this institutional momentum and inertia needs to be challenged and confronted if anything is to change. The AMETI project is a microcosm of the underlying direction of Auckland’s development today, and an indication of the scale of the problem that must be addressed.

Manukau Rail Spur

When I described this short section of rail to transport planners in Perth they laughed: “don’t build spur lines – they are inefficient – build loops.” This project is a vanity line. It was conceived long ago and needs a rethink, just as the roading projects of yester-year need a rethink. New work on the AMETI project has identified the need for a Southern Busway connecting Panmure with Botany Downs, Pakuranga, through to Manukau CBD, interconnecting with Puhinui Railway Station, and then on to Auckland International Airport. At one end it would connect with rail – at Panmure – at the other end it would connect with either rail from Onehunga or bus from Britomart. The Southern Busway – like the Northern Busway – can be upgraded to rail. In the meantime it’s cheaper to build and buses can “leave the rails” and go anywhere. Again, South Auckland needs a strong hand to change direction from the congested out-of-control urban development mess it has become. ARC’s ARTA and Urban Development Authority will be needed in concert to deal with this, with Government support. It has gone well beyond entrusting the development of these networks to the local mayor and councillor enthusiasts.

Case Study - North Shore Busway

I sat for 8 years, some of those years as Chair, at the Northern Corridor Steering Group planning this project with Transit, North Shore City Council, Auckland City Council, and ARC and ARTA representatives. The busway began as a pure transport project – the corridor was primarily located in land designated for state highways and would be 100% state funded, while its stations were planned for vacant land and it was hoped these would be almost 100% funded by Infrastructure Auckland. I argued long and hard for the project to be better integrated into the North Shore street network, its bus services and its bus shelters and town centre stations (such as Takapuna, Glenfield, Browns Bay etc). I wanted better integration between transport planning and landuse planning, and finally this matter was recognised to an extent by Transfund (the Government funding agency), which required all parties to the project to sign up to an agreement that the Northern Busway was an “integrated project” which included station facilities at Britomart, buslanes along Fanshaw Street, the Busway dedicated corridor itself, the stations, and bus priority lanes along named North Shore arterials, proper downtown stations within North Shore town centres, and a reasonable provision of weather-proof bus shelters in North Shore streets. This agreement has not been strong enough to prevent North Shore City Council dragging its heels in providing arterial buslanes expeditiously – which puts the whole bus service at risk. The Smales Farm busway station connection off Taharoto and Shakespeare Roads – close to schools with thousands of pupils - has been built to enable bus access at speed, threatening local pedestrian amenity. An unfortunate example of single mode thinking. On the other hand, Auckland City completed its commitments promptly along Fanshawe Street which has retained a reasonable degree of pedestrian friendliness. The Busway Project is another example of an urban development project that would have benefitted from a Perth style Master Plan approach where all details of all parts of the project were firmly agreed in advance of commencement, budget lines in place, and dates for delivery committed to by all parties.

urban form and patterns of development.

Auckland’s urban progress is increasingly out of step with its cultural progress, and is inconsistent with growing popular demands for a clean environment and a smaller ecological footprint. There is growing scepticism towards large-scale infrastructure projects – such as State Highway 20 – which also reflects the rise of environmentalism. At the same time we see the unravelling of the consensus that underpinned the construction of Auckland’s urban form today – with its motorway-oriented and pedestrian-unfriendly character, and its casual destruction of older villages, heritage buildings and human scale urban landscapes.

Instead there is an explosion of diversity, of conflicting interest groups who increasingly criticise the progress once thought so necessary, and who today can be relied upon to challenge any and all projects – no matter what. They demand to be heard and insist their views be taken into account.

These groups do not universally call for cyclelanes and public transport – there are many supporters for the completion of SH20. Nor is there universal support for the compact city ideal which is a key objective of urban change – leaky buildings and poor examples of medium and high density housing have been a major setback. And despite today’s fragile consensus among Auckland’s local authorities that the region does need to move toward a more compact urban form, much of the development we actually see on the ground continues to entrench the car’s domination and forces more low-density development.

Auckland’s destructive preoccupation with real estate speculation is currently on hold, but the lure of short term profit-taking from greenfield subdivision still persists. Strong and consistent leadership and appropriate incentives will be needed to encourage a more long-term approach to Auckland’s urban economic development.

Another key change today is that there is less public money to deliver everything the public might want.

Case Study - Panmure

During 2004-2007 Auckland City Council, consistent with the general direction of the Growth Strategy, rolled out plan changes that would deliver greater densities in several town centres. One of these was Panmure. However local interest groups captured newspaper headlines: “We won’t live in dog boxes”, and while the Auckland City Council administration tried to respond with information clarifying its intentions and the likely future of Panmure, the then Deputy Mayor of Auckland City was overwhelmed by the backlash at a well-attended public meeting and promised to withdraw key elements of the plan change. This sort of well-intentioned backdown needs to be avoided in future if Auckland is to change direction. The proposed ARC Urban Development Authority should be resourced to win public support for plan changes. This Authority will need to be pro-active in its public relations, and to support urban regeneration Development Agencies as they go about the business of planning change, and involving local community groups and community boards in the process.

Case Study - Ports of Auckland Limited

Since being transformed into a limited company a decade ago, in preparation for sale, POAL has reduced its sphere of influence, concentrating on what it deems to be core business which is primarily container traffic. 8 years ago it deemed the wharves and infrastructure needed for Auckland's ferry services: not core business. These assets – which I am sure will prove to be liabilities – were passed to ARTNL and to North Shore City Council. The ARTNL wharf assets have since been transferred to ARTA. Their maintenance and upgrade costs will be covered by ARC, from rates and from ARH revenues which include a revenue stream from POAL. ARTA will need to establish an Auckland wharf maintenance function – duplicating or perhaps sub-contracting to POAL that function. Funding for that activity will pass through many hands from POAL and eventually to ARTA. It is my submission that POAL needs to be taken from ARH, transformed into Ports of Auckland Authority, with its own Board of Directors, and placed under the control of ARC. Its roles & responsibilities need to be expanded from pure containerisation to include ferry wharves, other public wharf structures (such as those at TankFarm), and cruise ship wharves (such as Princes Wharf and the proposed Queens Wharf terminal). Auckland needs one Harbour & Port Authority - not a proliferation of entities.

Current funding sources include rates, development levies, and Government funding – especially for transport projects. If any entity is guilty of continuing to force road-driven urbanism onto Auckland, it is Central Government. Its steadfast 100% funding commitment to state highway construction, alongside its relatively feeble support for other modes and other forms of economic development intervention, is the single most potent incentive to maintain the status quo. Government needs to become a fully signed up partner to delivering compact city economic development outcomes in Auckland.

Various ad-hoc restructurings in the past two decades have left Auckland with a legacy of piece-meal institutional design which needs repair. Ports of Auckland Ltd has been allowed to narrow its activities down to being a high volume container port and become a cash cow for public transport projects while ferry terminals and other port activities decay under inconsistent management and control. Watercare Services Ltd, while exhibiting exemplary and determined behaviour in delivering core business outcomes, is being keenly eyed by shareholders wanting access to its cash-rich balance sheet. These are examples of incomplete reform which intended these services should be subject to market discipline – either through privatisation or competition.

My submission proposes concrete changes so that Auckland's governance is a central, regional, district and community partnership that: delivers a more sustainable and economically efficient urban form; functions effectively and transparently within Auckland's changing environment; reliably delivers development projects that are consistent with and increase

Case Study - Sea and City – TankFarm Development

Since the passage of the Local Government Auckland Amendment Act 2004, the ARC, through its entity Auckland Regional Holdings, has taken control of about 18 ha of land at Tank Farm which was deemed surplus to requirements by the Ports of Auckland Ltd (POAL). Title to this land has been transferred to ARH, and a management company known as Sea & City Ltd has been established to manage its development. In 2006, ARC determined among its objectives for the Tank Farm land - based on plans for high density residential, hotel and office development prepared by POAL - that revenues from this development "be optimised". ARH long term funding plans presently anticipate a net revenue stream from the complete development of at least \$30m/annum from leases, rents and licences when proposed apartment and commercial developments are complete. While there has been public communication in regard to Tank Farm development, no formal public consultation has been carried out by the ARC in respect to the above development decision – which will alienate some 14ha of publicly owned urban fringe land. Revenues from TankFarm development are to be used by ARC to contribute to the operating costs of Auckland's passenger transport systems. Auckland's waterfront development will be a cash cow to fund train, ferry and bus operations – rather than optimised for public amenity. This puts at risk Auckland's economic development, public amenity and tourism potential. In 2007, the ARC decided narrowly to pay \$23.5 million from ARH cash reserves to own outright the 4ha Wynyard Point headland set aside for park – despite the fact that Auckland City Council had agreed to use development levies to pay for that park. Another example of the confused roles that exist for this important urban regeneration project. A cruise ship terminal at Queens Wharf adds to the need to get the development process right. Auckland's waterfront development is an urban regeneration project that should be delivered by a Development Agency – with Government, Regional Government and Auckland City Government representatives at the table at least. Auckland City Council should lead it, guided by ARC's Urban Development Authority. Public support should be a pre-requisite for agreeing a Master Plan clearly stating all economic, social, environmental and cultural objectives, and spelling out any trade-offs that might be proposed.

Case Study - Water and Wastewater - Watercare

During my time as North Shore City Councillor I served as a Shareholder Representative on the Watercare SRG, and was Chair of NSCC's Works Cttee responsible for the Rosedale Wastewater Treatment plant upgrade, for the rehabilitation of NSCC's leaky sewer network, and for driving plan changes to regulate the management of stormwater. As part of my interest in 1999, I established an internationally subscribed website: www.watermagazine.com which showcased water management innovation. At the time I spoke at most annual NZWWA conferences. By this means I established contacts around the world. In particular I learned that Melbourne Water is structured rather like Auckland's – having one bulk wholesaler of water and wastewater services and 3 retailers. This enables political management through benchmarking and comparing the performance of the 3 retailers. This practice is now routinely carried out annually across the Auckland region. Performance measures including: sale price of water/cubic metre; the customer contract; leakage % from the retailer network; number of wet weather overflows from sewage network; grade of water supply at the tap; etc, are presented in tabular form enabling useful comparisons to be made across the region. While these separations might be retained immediately post a possible vertical integration, my understanding is that a rapid blurring of detail follows and the integrated operation becomes a black box making informed governance difficult. I am acquainted with Mr Mark Pascoe who was General Manager of Brisbane's integrated water and waste operation. He was required to create an artificial funder/provider split inside the operation to provide transparency. He advises me that the cost of that split was huge – more staff, more systems. I am of the view that public control is lost through integration. In the same way, there may be some appeal in horizontal integration between North Shore's Rosedale WWTP, Watercare's Mangere WWTP and the two trunk sewer networks. But my experience has been that having two bulk wastewater operations in the region enabled me, and others, to note differences in performance and operations, to identify innovation, and generally to observe the competition that exists between these two operations to "be the best". This incentive – for dynamic economic efficiency - would be lost with horizontal integration. However, I think reform is needed to the various Drainage Acts so that NSCC's Rosedale WWTP can take and treat wastewater from Waitakere and Rodney. That would be sensible.

confidence in the compact urban form idea; and that materially recognises the changing demands for local involvement and participation arising from the emergence of Auckland civil society and its diversity of expectations.

3 Broad Thrust of This Submission

The essence of my submissions for change are under these themes:

- ◆ That the ARC (renamed or otherwise) be strengthened through: ownership of Watercare Services Ltd; ownership of Auckland Consumer Electricity Trust;
- ◆ That the ARC be required to prepare a 50 year Regional Development Strategy ("One Plan") which maps the economic development demographics of the region (eg residential density/ha; housing mix/ha; GDP/ha; energy & water consumption/ha; employment/ha; transport demand/ha), and charts the staged progress in these demographics (the decision process for this would include Govt representation);

Case Study - Manukau Harbour Crossing & Gloucester Rd Interchange

I led the ARC's submission at the hearing of Transit's RMA application to build a bridge and widen SH20 over the Manukau Harbour and to build a new SH interchange at Gloucester Rd which would connect into Neilson Street which is the mainstreet of Onehunga Town Centre. Clearly, this project had major urban development implications, not least of which was the potential SH impact on a planned rail link from Onehunga across the harbour to the airport. However the application dealt with such matters sparsely, while Auckland City Council submissions all but ignored the impacts on Onehunga Town Centre. Transit, the ARC, Auckland City Council and Manukau City Council are all signatories to the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol. That document defines urban design as being: "concerned with the design of the buildings, places, spaces and networks that make up our towns and cities, and ways people use them..." It states that the protocol: "...will be implemented through the actions of its signatories, through leadership by government, and through raising wider awareness of the value of quality urban design. By endorsing the Protocol, signatories are indicating their commitment to the pursuit of quality urban design that will result in benefits both to the signatory and the wider community." In fact, Transit's plan was an affront to good urban design and a threat to future public transport. Commissioners rightly rejected Transit's Gloucester Rd interchange application. An appeal by Campaign for Better Public Transport was needed to ensure the widened motorway would leave enough room for rail. This example is a classic case where a multi-party Development Agency approach should have been a pre-requisite.

Case Study - Newmarket Station

This railway station is being upgraded. Good links have been designed with local bus services, with local streets, and with the Newmarket retail centre. But the planning for this project was put in jeopardy on two occasions because there was no integrated planning agency which would have allowed different ideas to be considered in a coordinated way. Ontrack and ARTA advised in 2006 there needed to be 3 platforms to replace the existing 2, and that the heritage station building should be moved. The ARC took a different view because some councillors firmly believed there should only be 2 platforms. This uninformed opinion almost derailed the 3 platform plan. However, Ontrack and ARTA's plan prevailed. Next an Auckland City plan for a busway across the top of the rail station was unearthed. This also threatened to derail the station project. A more managed approach would have been the Perth Master Plan exemplar, where key players including Newmarket Business Association, Auckland City Council, the local Community Board, ARC, Ontrack, ARTA and an appropriate heritage protection agency, would have been represented on a Development Agency, responsible for the preparation of an integrated Master Plan. It would include land use zone changes, pedestrian access plans, cycle parking provision, planting, station building design, rail network service plans for next 50 years, noise issues, local economic development, funding, staging of development, and deal with transitional matters such as public transport service provision during construction.

Case Study - New Lynn Station

This project is modelled on the classic Subiaco undergrounding project in Perth run by a regionally established Development Agency through an urban regeneration Master Plan process which included such things as a requirement on developers to provide a certain percentage of affordable housing. The New Lynn project relied upon state funding in excess of \$100 million for the "below track" works – ie trenching and most of the station construction. This project is probably the best recent example in the region of a master planned approach to urban regeneration. Interestingly, consent for a supermarket/mall development that was applied for within the zone, and which was granted by Waitakere City Council, was appealed by ARC because it did not provide the sort of pedestrian friendly frontage that had been promised for the zone. I understand this was settled to the ARC's satisfaction out of court. Criticism of the project includes that it provides too much capacity for general traffic which can now run above the station. However the project is an achievement, and included very considerable efforts managed and led by Waitakere City Council and the relevant Community Board to involve the local business community and landowners, and the wider community in the planning process. Waitakere City Council has established what amounts to a local development agency to engage with developers and to deal with planning matters in an integrated way. The ARC's Urban Development Authority needs to guarantee such approaches are routine in other parts of the region, and to give Government confidence to participate and pay its share of urban regeneration projects.

- ◆ That, to deliver the Regional Development Strategy, the ARC be lead authority to prioritise, sequence and high-level plan: all regional transport projects including the function of all arterial roads; all port related projects; all regional water and wastewater projects; all regional urban development and regeneration projects; undergrounding of electricity services;
- ◆ That regionally owned and provided services including water, ports, electricity reticulation and public transport be provided by ARC owned Authorities which will be non-profit distributing and each have their own appointed professional Boards;
- ◆ That the ARC be required to establish a Regional Urban Development Authority responsible for managing staged implementation of the Regional Development Strategy, mainly by means of coordinating the establishment, and monitoring the performance, of Urban Project Development Agencies (as in Australia);
- ◆ That the ARC issue the rates demands for regional, city & district, and water rates for all ratepayers in the region, for itself, and on behalf of the TLAs;
- ◆ That the existing North Shore, Manukau, Waitakere, Auckland City Councils and District Councils be retained, but that they be required to give effect to the Regional Development Strategy, and to recognise, cooperate and deliver regional transport projects within their jurisdictions in accordance with regional plans – including regional specifications and requirements for the function of arterial roads which will remain their assets – while being granted discretion over timing and implementation detail;

Case Study - Devonport Community Board

Devonport Community Board came into being after the amalgamation of Devonport Borough Council into North Shore City Council in 1989. Locals fought for Independent Devonport for years afterward. Nevertheless, Devonport Community Board (DCB) has been blessed with the energy, commitment and participation of high calibre community board members ever since. It is my observation, that while DCB has access to very limited discretionary finance, it has exerted considerable influence on NSCC decisions relating to: sewer rehabilitation through the city (because Devonport was fixed first); ferry services; heritage building policies; and more recently the establishment of the Lake Road cycleway. In my opinion, without the “ears and eyes” and the determination of the DCB: the cycle path might not have been built (NSCC needed the support of DCB locally); more heritage buildings would have been demolished; it would have cost more and taken longer to get the best approach to cleaning up North Shore City’s leaking waste water network. I also note that it was DCB’s initiative to prepare a Master Plan for Devonport. NSCC needs to prepare its plan of works, by community board area, setting out works needed to implement local master plans, as well as works needed to ensure integrity of district/city wide networks. I note that Community Boards are currently represented at their District Councils. Good functioning Community Boards play a critical role in paving the way, and winning community support for projects which will be essential to deliver compact urban form and associated economic and community benefits.

- ◆ That North Shore, Waitakere and Manukau City Councils, be renamed “District Councils”, or “Development Councils”, or similar, in recognition of their role as implementation agents of regional plans (existing RMA city plans are already known as “District Plans”);
- ◆ That all City and District Councils, be required to plan and report annual expenditure and projects, by Community Board area, to enable accountability and transparency at community area level for projects, services and expenditure;
- ◆ That City and District Councils, be required to coordinate and lead the activities of Urban Project Development Agencies established in their jurisdictions by the Regional Urban Development Authority, including preparation of Master Plan documentation, the involvement of the relevant Community Board and other public engagement, and implementation;
- ◆ That existing Community Boards be retained, and that Councils be required to identify and resource a specific planner and project engineer responsible for liaison, communication, and project coordination between Community Board and Council;
- ◆ That Community Boards be empowered to have greater involvement in the timing, implementation and delivery of local Council projects in their areas, and that they have the right to request a Master Planning process for their community to be undertaken by the Council.
- ◆ That in recognition of the considerable “eyes and ears of the community” function of Community Board Members, and to attract better representation, that the pay scale for Community Board Members be revised upward.

4 Toward Improved Processes & Structures

A number of basic planning processes and procedures need to be enabled or required through changes to Auckland governance. These are summarised here.

4.1 Regional Planning

The Auckland Regional Council (ARC) was rendered relatively powerless in 1992. Its Regional Policy Statement (RPS) – required by the RMA – has amounted to a plan to avoid, remedy and mitigate adverse environmental effects. It has been a plan for what Auckland does not want. What has been needed for some time is a regional plan for what Auckland does want, and a process for ensuring that plan is implemented. While the LGAAA (2004) required the RPS be changed “to give effect to the Growth Strategy” (ie compact city development), it provided little guidance about how to do that. City Councils could still proceed pretty much as if it was business as usual.

The present Regional Land Transport Strategy 2005 was prevented by legislation from prioritising projects, though I understand the LTMA Amendment Bill - when enacted - is likely to fix that in future, and to enable the RLTS to prioritise regionally located State Highway projects also. This will be an improvement, however there remains an apparent gap between the rather soft, effects-based spatial planning embodied in the RPS, and the harder edge of specific transport projects that might be listed in the RLTS. The gap widens when the matter of achieving economic development objectives is added, and expands further when it is noted that regional water and energy infrastructure planning is presently carried out elsewhere. (I note for completeness that Government planning regarding the location of education, law enforcement, health and other services needed by an expanding and changing population, is also rather disintegrated from regional planning.)

The need to protect Auckland's natural environment remains paramount, and the RPS must not be undermined as the region's main environmental protection and regulation tool. However I am of the view that having a Regional Land Transport Strategy – which includes projects – but which is separate from planning for land use, water and energy infrastructure, embeds a transport-centred culture at the heart of the region's planning. A specific and separate regional transport strategy runs counter to the objective of integrating land use with infrastructure development. So, to inspire and deliver change, I believe the RLTS needs to be expanded to include: regional land use, water, and energy planning, and be known as the Regional Development Strategy. It would be the Auckland Region's "One Plan". It could be decided by a regional committee of the ARC, with much the same representation as the present Regional Sustainable Development Forum. It does, however, need to be controlled by ARC - to avoid the Auckland disease.

Caution - Big City Mayor Elect?

Auckland lacks the maturity and stability to have a Greater Auckland Mayor along the lines of London – who has considerable executive powers. That said it may be appropriate for Auckland Regional Council (Greater Auckland Council) to have an elected "face of Auckland", whose job is to front for the region, and for its policies. This would be a civic leadership position, rather than an executive leadership position. Mayors of Auckland's District Councils would need to concentrate on the urban regeneration and development of their districts – in much the same way as Mayor Bob Harvey has led and nursed the New Lynn urban development project in Waitakere. Ensuring different districts conduct urban development projects – assessed according to regionally set development and economic performance measures – provides for an appropriate level of civic competition between districts. This is healthy and useful and plays a part in inculcating civic pride.

4.2 Economic Development Measures

When roading lobbyists speak of economic development benefits, they emphasise the benefits for the construction industry economy and anticipated economic benefits from congestion reduction. These are short term benefits. When the Property Council and Real Estate Industry speak of economic development benefits, they emphasise the benefits for the building and property development industry – especially the gains when greenfield land is transformed to urban. These are medium term benefits. But it is rare to hear in Auckland of the long term economic development benefits that accrue from efficient development of land and infrastructure – measures such as: GDP/hectare, employees/hectare, investment/hectare by area, income/capita by area, energy & water consumption/hectare, transport mode split by area, commute trip length/capita by area, and similar, assess this. These are the sorts of measures used in cities interested in the relationship between compact urban form, economic efficiency, sustainability, and city productivity in the long term.

Greater sophistication in these measures is helpful when making the connection between the "Creative City" idea and such things as green space provision, quality public space provision in downtown areas, cultural amenity, active amenity, and transport mode split for access to such provision. Most Councils already have GIS systems that can map and represent measures such as these. They can be deployed accordingly.

Auckland needs to move from its present "get rich quick" attraction to mega infrastructure projects and green field real estate, toward more concentrated, enriched, and enriching redevelopment of its urban hinterlands. It needs planning and implementation which is measured accordingly.

4.3 The Regional Development Strategy

The Regional Development Strategy recently adopted by the State of Queensland Australia is a good example of a regional "one plan" whose key elements can be represented on a sheet of A3. We need one for Greater Auckland. ARC has recently completed the Auckland Sustainability Framework. This, along with the Compact

City emphasis of the current Growth Strategy, can serve to underpin the preparation of a regionally agreed 50 year Regional Development Strategy which needs to contain:

- ◆ Timing and staging for rezoning and redevelopment of Auckland's 40+ town centres (such as Takapuna, Browns Bay, Avondale, Onehunga, Henderson, Manurewa, Glen Innes, Botany Downs), development corridors (Dominion Road, Te Irirangi Drive, Taharoto Rd), and commercial areas (such as Wairau Valley, East Tamaki);
- ◆ Timing and staging for major amenity projects (stadium, cultural centre, convention centre, public waterfront development);
- ◆ Timing and staging for regionally significant transport projects and corridors;
- ◆ Timing and staging for regional water, wastewater projects including WWTPs, wet weather overflow storage facilities, trunk sewer upgrades ;
- ◆ Power line undergrounding and high tension power supply upgrades;

It is clear there needs to be an integrated approach to the planned delivery of the development elements summarised above, and coordinated implementation.

4.4 What is a Development Agency? And what is a Master Plan?

Auckland currently relies upon the “structure plan” or “comprehensive development plan” or “precinct plan” approaches derived from RMA thinking. These do not constitute master planning. Ministry of Environment's Urban Design Protocol mentions master planning as a desirable approach to urban planning, and describes in summary detail the features of procedures of master planning. My experiences of effective master planning are drawn from a study tour of Perth which was organised by Waitakere City Council to provide background to their proposed New Lynn urban regeneration project. Study tour participants were given insight into Perth's urban regeneration planning processes by local politicians, economists and planners.

We were shown three projects: East Perth (where a huge gasworks and associated port were converted into a residential enclave); Subiaco (where a run down town centre, old railway station and associated sidings were converted into a mixed use development including affordable housing, employment opportunities, built over an undergrounded railway station); West Midlands (where the planning for redevelopment of a run down town centre, heritage warehouses, station, were in preparation).

In brief, the process for each project was as follows:

- ◆ The Urban Development department of State Government established a local development agency (LDA), with kick start funding;
- ◆ Its controlling board was appointed with representatives from the local city council; state government; transport authorities; other utility operators as appropriate; major private property owners; heritage interests;
- ◆ The LDA was staffed with Chief Exec and about half a dozen dedicated staff (including planners), located in an office at the centre of the project area;
- ◆ In each case, Master Planning took about 2 years, and included design competitions, public displays as plans and ideas evolved, public workshops and charrettes;
- ◆ Master Plan documents show street layout and design; built form and uses for all land areas; heritage zones; public space designs; public transport services; walking and cycling linkages; and more.
- ◆ The services of highly skilled planners and community oriented facilitators were used to actively engage the community in the planning process which was unhurried. There was clear commitment to public involvement. It takes as long as it takes.
- ◆ At the end of the process, all agencies are required to formally sign off the Master Plan,

Caution - Tearing Apart

One of my responsibilities in the past three years has been political oversight of the transfer of assets to ARTA, following the breakup of the LATE Auckland Regional Transport Network Limited (ARTNL). This is still not complete. Ferry terminals and small railway stations have been transferred, but the railway station at Britomart – essentially a lease and built infrastructure – remains in ARTNL. Some staff have made the move. This legislatively required change was relatively small in local government terms – involving assets worth around \$200 million, 20 or so staff, a board of directors, and an office – but I would estimate that the cost of the transition to date including expert consideration of liabilities and risks from ARTA's point of view and other such matters, to be in excess of \$1million. And it's still not complete. I note that the local government change recommendations of the recent Sydney Royal Commission, and the Brisbane Royal Commission 80 years ago, amounted to complete amalgamation of existing complete entities. It did not involve breaking up existing organisations and the extraction and transfer of different asset classes, or the breaking apart along geographic lines of organisations. My experience suggests that any recommendation that requires the breakup of a Council and the re-distribution or re-allocation of its assets, staff and services to other institutions would be a nightmare scenario for Auckland. I also note the crisis that has beset Toronto's local government ever since commencement of a major amalgamation and re-organisation initiative there around three years ago. Auckland regional and local government needs reform, but years of transitional crisis should be avoided.

which also includes the staging and timing of all elements (such as precinct by precinct release of land for development), the responsible agencies, budget commitment to the delivery of all key elements.

- ◆ The LDA oversees the plan preparation, and then coordinates its implementation, which begins with the formal process of Town Plan re-zoning.

My general observation of Perth urban development projects was the smooth implementation that followed this careful and comprehensive master planning process. Of note was the lack of re-litigation from participating agencies – development commenced when all agencies had signed off the Master Plan.

5 Conclusion

The changes forshadowed in this submission are significant and will be a challenge to implement. However in my view they are readily achievable and will enable regional and local governance which is linked to central government, which can lead change in Auckland's development patterns and provide for Auckland's diverse communities and their needs and hopes, so that the region matures in a more sustainable manner and is more economically efficient and productive as the future unfolds.

End