

To: Environment Protection Agency
From: Karl Cook / Pamela Santos – Barker & Associates Limited
Date: 7 April 2026
Re: Downtown Carpark Site Development [FTAA-2512-1158] - Planning Addendum

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This memorandum has been prepared as an addendum to the planning report dated 18 December 2025 and addresses matters arising from engagement with Auckland Council (“Council”) and Millennium & Copthorne Hotels New Zealand Limited (“MCK”) following lodgement of the substantive application under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (“FTAA”). It has been prepared alongside addendum reports by the applicant’s technical expert on other matters raised.
- 1.2 In relation to Council, this memorandum primarily addresses planning matters arising in the ‘Section 67 Request for Information’ table dated 26 March 2026 (included as **Attachment 1**). Where not specifically commented on, matters are either considered to be either sufficiently addressed in the documents filed with the application or are not considered material or relevant.
- 1.3 We note that discussions have included potential changes to the proposed consent conditions in Appendix 24 to the application. It is anticipated that comments provided under section 53 of the FTAA will address the proposed conditions and that these will be updated as part of the applicant’s response to comments under section 55 of the FTAA.

2.0 Consent Matters

Agreed Additional Consent Matters

- 2.1 We agree that the following additional consent matters are required:
 - The proposal includes the provision of five wastewater underground storage tanks (total capacity of 500,000 L) within the level 04 basement to pump to the network at off-peak periods, located within a coastal hazard area. This is a restricted discretionary activity pursuant to rule E36.4.1A(A68) under Proposed Plan Change 120.
 - The proposal includes the construction and use of two new vehicle crossings on Customs Street West to serve the proposed hotel Pick Up and Drop Off (PUDO) area. This requires consent pursuant to rule E27.6.4.1(2) and (3) as a Vehicle Access Restriction applies owing to the arterial road classification and distance to the intersection.

General building height

- 2.2 In relation to the General building height (Standard H8.6.2), we do not agree with Council’s interpretation that this is a consent matter for the following reasons:

- Clause (1) in Standard H8.6.2 states that: “The height of a building must not exceed the limits shown on Map H8.11.3”. As it relates to the Site, Map H8.11.3 General height controls does not identify a height and instead the “Special Height Area” applies.
- Clause (2) in Standard H8.6.2 states that: “Where height limits shown on Map H8.11.3 and Map H8.11.4 overlap, the lowest height limit applies as the first level of control.” The Special height controls that apply to the site in Map H8.11.4 Special height controls comprise the Quay Street Harbour Edge Height Control Plane and St Patricks Square and Freyberg Place Sunlight Admission Control. There are separate standards in the AUP that address these controls, namely Standard H8.6.5 and H8.6.3 respectively.
- As set out in the lodged documents, consent is sought for infringements to the Quay Street Harbour Edge Height Control Plane and St Patricks Square Sunlight Admission Control. It is noted that the Proposal is compliant with the Freyberg Place Sunlight Admission Control. Accordingly, consent is sought and assessments are provided in the application in terms of Standards H8.6.3 and H8.6.5.
- On the basis that no height limit in Standard H8.6.2 is exceeded, no consent is considered to be required for an infringement of this standard.

2.3 Notwithstanding the above, Section 8.1 of the planning report dated 18 December 2025 notes that the application also seeks consent for any matters that are not listed but which are subsequently identified as being necessary through the processing of the application. Accordingly, the infringement to the general building height could be included as a consent matter if determined by the Panel to apply. In this regard, we note that all relevant matters set out in the purpose Standard H8.6.2 are addressed in the Urban Design Addendum prepared by McIndoe Urban included as an appendix to the Memorandum of Counsel.

3.0 Ngāti Whanaunga CVA

3.1 Ngāti Whanaunga provided Precinct with a final version of its Cultural Values Assessment (CVA) dated 19 December. Post-lodgement of the Application, Precinct has been working with its project partner Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei in respect of the contents of the CVA. Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei wishes to address the matters within the CVA through a tikanga approach. Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei has attempted contact with Ngāti Whanaunga, through Ngāti Pāoa but has not had any response to date. Attached to this addendum report as **Attachment 2** is a copy of the final CVA, noting that the matters are still being addressed through a tikanga approach, and Precinct and Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei will provide an update to the Panel once matters have been addressed.

4.0 Shading Diagrams

4.1 We understand that Council’s planning and urban design staff consider comparative shading diagrams to be necessary to understand the effects of the proposal relative to a complying building.

4.2 We are advised that from a legal perspective, the Environment Court has made it clear that comparisons with "compliant" schemes that require resource consent are not relevant or helpful to a decision-maker's consideration of a proposal.

- 4.3 From a planning perspective, the shading diagrams (Appendix 9E) and detailed shading assessment in the McIndoe Urban report (Appendix 11) are considered to appropriately address the application, noting its non-complying activity status under the AUP. Comparative shading diagrams are not appropriate or necessary for the following reasons:
- All new buildings in the City Centre zone require resource consent and therefore there is no appropriate “permitted baseline” that can be applied to the Site. A comparative assessment of shading would have the effects of elevating a building that complied with the standards to permitted activity status.
 - While there are standards in the City Centre Zone that seek to manage the scale of development in order to protect sunlight admission to parks and public spaces and transition in height to the waterfront, consent is sought overall for a non-complying activity such that the matters of discretion and assessment criteria are not directly relevant.
- 4.4 In our view, the shading diagrams and accompanying assessments provided in the lodged documents are conservative as they address all shade from the proposal which inherently considers shade from the relevant infringements. This is addressed further in the Urban Design Addendum prepared by McIndoe Urban included as an appendix to the memorandum of Counsel.

5.0 Plan Change 79 Consent Order Version

- 5.1 The lodged application included an assessment against the decision version of Plan Change 79. A Consent Order was issued by the Environment Court on 6 March 2026 which resolved the appeals on the decision. Accordingly, an updated assessment with respect to the Environment Court Consent Order of PC79 is provided as follows:
- Accessible parking requirements is addressed in the Transport Assessment Addendum prepared by Flow Transportation Specialists included as an appendix to the Memorandum of Counsel. In summary, the accessible parking requirement for residential activity has reduced from 8 spaces to 5 spaces and the accessible parking requirement for office activity has reduced from 40 spaces to 19 spaces.
 - Compliance with the electric vehicle charging standard will be addressed via a condition of consent requiring that detailed plans be provided showing the space identified for future Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment as required by Standard E27.6.7(1) and certified by Council prior to the lodgement of any building consent application.

6.0 Natural Hazards

- 6.1 As part of ongoing discussions with Auckland Transport (AT) following the lodgement of the substantive application it has been confirmed that the overland flow path (OLFP) that travels along the northern side of Customs Street West will be managed within the road reserve. Further modelling will be carried out by AT to confirm that there will be no change to the OLFP that may affect the Site including identifying measures to avoid effects as a result of the Fanshawe Street retaining wall works (led by AT).
- 6.2 With respect to Council’s request of a Flood (and Coastal Inundation) Management Plan as part of the application rather than being conditioned, further discussions with regard to barrier design and

wider flood management measures are being arranged with Council's specialist. These discussions will likely inform the content of a management plan, and related consent condition(s), that would address flooding and coastal inundation matters. An update will be provided as part of the formal response to comments provided to the Panel.

- 6.3 Other matters relating to natural hazards are addressed in the Flooding and Coastal addendum prepared by Tonkin + Taylor included as an appendix to the memorandum of Counsel.

7.0 Watercare

Wastewater

- 7.1 As addressed in the lodged documents, several options for the Project's wastewater disposal have been discussed with Watercare. It was agreed that the resource consenting stage (now under the FTAA) would focus on identifying feasible wastewater management options rather than a finalised design. The final wastewater discharge solution will be confirmed at detailed design stage and with ongoing consultation with Watercare through the Engineering Plan Approval process. Proposed condition 78 will secure this outcome. In this regard, the request for further information regarding Option 4 (pump station and rising main) can be addressed at detailed design stage should this option be pursued as the final wastewater discharge solution.

Water Supply

- 7.2 The request for details regarding on-site water storage tanks and sprinkler demand are not considered to be a resource consent issue and will be provided at detailed design stage.

8.0 Parks Planning

- 8.1 The Urban Room is privately owned land, and the responsibility for its on-going maintenance sits with the consent holder. Public access will be secured via appropriate easements. It is noted that the public laneways within Commercial Bay are also managed by the consent holder in this way. It is therefore not considered necessary to create an entity to manage the Urban Room.

9.0 Economics

- 9.1 The Economics Addendum included as an appendix to the Memorandum of Counsel addresses the query regarding the development duration of the Project. The 5.5 year development timeframe reflects an updated and refined period from a prior 8-year timeframe as assessed in the Economic Impact Assessment included with the application. To the extent any of the other matters raised by Council's economics specialist may be relevant for a substantive application under the FTAA, these are considered to be addressed in the application.

10.0 Noise and Vibration

- 10.1 It is noted in the planning report (Assessment of Environmental Effects and Statutory Analysis) dated 18 December 2025) that Kindercare will vacate their tenancy prior to the start of demolition of the Downtown Carpark Building and as such the acoustic assessment has been prepared on this

basis. To provide certainty of this outcome, a condition of consent will be offered confirming that demolition activities will not commence until Kindercare has ceased operation. As previously noted, the proposed draft conditions of consent will be updated as part of the formal response to comments provided to the Panel.

- 10.2 Other matters relating to noise and vibration are addressed in the Acoustic Assessment addendum prepared by Marshall Day Acoustics included as an appendix to the Memorandum of Counsel.

11.0 Universal Design

- 11.1 The Council request for a lighting plan is considered to be appropriately addressed by proposed Condition 49. This level of lighting plan detail is normally provided at detailed design stage, which we consider appropriate in this case.

- 11.2 In terms of the request for a comprehensive active surveillance plan, we consider that this level of detail is not appropriate at resource consent stage as there are details including specific tenants, opening / closing hours, and tenancy entrances which are yet to be developed. In the lodged CPTED assessment, it was noted that:

"Ongoing management of buildings and spaces within the proposal is expected to be developed in future and will be influenced, in part, but the specific requirements of future tenants. I would expect that this would include detailed security arrangements addressing things like access control (e.g. swipe access), CCTV and monitoring, security lighting and active security presence / patrols."

- 11.3 In this regard, a condition of consent will be offered requiring an active surveillance plan to be prepared and implemented prior to building occupation. As previously noted, the proposed draft conditions of consent will be updated as part of the formal response to comments provided to the Panel.
- 11.4 Other matters relating to universal design are addressed in the addendum memorandum prepared by Warren and Mahoney included as an appendix to the memorandum of Counsel.

Attachment 1

Auckland Council Section 67 Request for Information



Urban & Environmental

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant's Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
Planning			
1	<p>Red flags / key matters:</p> <p>These have been identified in the Memorandum - Auckland Council response to Minute 1 of the Panel Convenor dated 6 March 2026 and remain generally the same, supplemented by the below.</p>		
2	<p>Consent matters not applied for:</p> <p>The below <u>additional consent matters</u> are identified. Please confirm they are applied for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal includes the provision of five wastewater underground storage tanks (total capacity of 500,000 L) within the level 04 basement level to pump to the network at off-peak periods, located within a coastal hazard area. This is a restricted discretionary activity pursuant to rule E36.4.1A(A68) under Proposed Plan Change 120. • The proposal includes the construction and use of two new vehicle crossings on Custom Street West to serve the proposed hotel Pick Up and Drop Off (PUDO) area. This requires consent pursuant to rule E27.6.4.1(2) and (3) as a Vehicle Access Restriction applies owing the arterial road classification and distance to the intersection. • The proposed development including both Tower 1 and Tower 2 do not comply with Standard H8.6.5 Harbour edge height control plane or Standard H8.6.3 Admission of sunlight to public places as shown on map H8.11.4. In accordance with Standard H8.6.2 General building height (2) as the heights on Maps H8.11.3 and H8.11.4 overlap, the <i>'lowest height limit applies as the first level of control'</i>. 		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant's Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	As a result, the proposal does not comply with Standard H8.6.2(2) as the lower control is the harbour edge height control plane for the purpose of this standard and is a restricted discretionary activity pursuant to rule C1.9(2)		
3	S67 Requests for information: The Economic Assessment refers to an 8-year development period (page 11). Can this be clarified please? Other documents including assessing construction noise, vibration and traffic effects refer to a 5.5 year development duration. Whilst it appears one of the 8 years related to pre-planning, that still leaves a further 18months difference that is accruing 'economic benefit' whilst not considering adverse effects for the above matters.		
4	Do you have a final CVA available to share, as referenced in the consultation summary with respect of Ngāti Whanaunga.		
5	Standard H8.6.2 General building height. As previously raised, H8.6.2(2) sets the lowest level of the General building height at the application site with reference of the Harbour Edge Height control plane. The infringement to this standard is not listed as a consent matter, nor is it assessed as such within the AEE, Urban Design Assessment, nor the Landscape Assessment. Please confirm this as a consent matter and provide an assessment against the relevant assessment criteria in the documents noted above.		
6	Shading diagrams:		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant's Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	<p>The applicant is requested to provide shading diagrams that identify the shade cast as a result of bulk and form non-compliances with standards to be shown on the shading studies to address the matters of discretion related to bulk and form non-compliances such as H8.8.1.(6)(a) <i>effects of additional building bulk and scale on neighbouring sites, streets and public open spaces (sunlight and daylight access, dominance, visual amenity, and landscape character)</i>. The provisions in C1.9.(3) require the effects of the infringement of the standard and the cumulative effects of infringement of all standards to also be considered (quoted below for ease of reference).</p> <p>These updated shading diagram(s) and shade attributable to the infringements of bulk and form standards is requested to inform the effects assessment as directed by the plan.</p>		
7	<p>Please provide an updated assessment with respect of the Environment Court Consent Order of PC79 with respect of :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accessible car parking requirements - Electric Vehicle Charging 		
8	<p>Natural Hazards matters:</p> <p>Please refer to the attached 'Development Engineering Discussion Document dated 23 February 2026 for full matters.</p> <p>a) Receiving environment: The Fanshawe Street retaining wall works (to be lodged by Auckland Transport in early March) may alter the route of overland flowpaths, floodplains and levels along Custom Street West. Notably, page 2 to the Downtown Car Park Site Development – Flood hazard and risk assessment, prepared by Tonkin &</p>		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK:

Council ref: BUN60460864 – [The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki](#) (FTAA-2512-1158)

Date: 26 March 2026

Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant's Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	<p>Taylor indicates current flood hazards and these may be altered.</p> <p>b) There appears to be a lack of assessment of coinciding / overlapping hazards (as per item 1 below) for the 1.5m sea level rise coastal inundation event coinciding with flooding. Up to 1m sea level rise appears to have been assessed in the risk assessments. Please can this be assessed with respect of a 1.5m sea level rise?</p> <p>c) A Flood (and Coastal Inundation) Management Plan (FMP) including operation and maintenance plan for the proposed flood barriers is required as part of the application. This is in accordance with the Tonkin and Taylor recommendations (page 15 of the Flood hazard risk assessment) and in accordance with objectives and policies under Chapter E36 for both the AUP(OP) and PC120 and the NPS-Natural Hazards. This must include primary and secondary mitigation proposals including those to avoid residual risk from primary mitigation (flood barrier) failure. Risk is to be managed to be as low as possible with respect of flood and coastal hazard risk.</p> <p>d) The above FMP should also consider the Wastewater storage option (Infrastructure Concept Plan) and ensure that is resilient to up to 1.2m depth of coastal inundation levels filtering to the level 04 basement.</p> <p>e) No assessment against the objectives and policies of Chapter E36 of PC120 has been provided. Please provide this.</p> <p>f) Lack of assessment against the National Planning Policy Statement on Natural Hazards. Please can this be provided?</p>		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK:			
Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158)			
Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant’s Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	g) Please consider and provide a response to the ‘PC120, E36 Provisions’ queries A. to J in the attached Discussion Document.		
Development Engineering / Flooding			
9	S67 Further information requests: Please provide the risk assessment template completed with the proposed mitigatory measures adopted in detail under E36.9 (template provided previously).		
10	Proposed flood barriers with flood management plan needs to be provided in the risk assessment and it needs to be reflected on the plans and details of proposed flood barriers and operation and maintenance of the proposed flood barriers needs to be included in the documentation.		
11	Recommended flood barriers for both flood and coastal inundation of the basement levels and adopted operating level of these mitigatory measures needs to be clearly indicated on the risk assessment and within a Flood Management Plan.		
Geotechnical			
12	<u>S67 Information Requests:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Information requests are set out in the attached ‘Geotechnical Review register – comment summary sheet’. That has an initial review date of 25 February 2026, with reviewer update 24 March 2026. These requests relate to: 		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant's Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Tie back anchors ii. Secant piles iii. Detailed design items – noting the Geotech Engineer consider this should be secured as a condition of consent. iv. Obstruction risk / condition request v. Deformation criteria for buildings vi. Wallap output, deflection and alert levels 		
13	Please can the applicant also confirm that the information provided in response to Geotechnical Queries are to be formally provided to the EPA to form part of the proposal?		
Traffic Engineering			
14	<p>S67 Further information request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ITA states that EV charging (PC79) would be covered by other disciplines, but it does not appear to be addressed. Please provide further details on how the EV charging standard of Consent Order PC79 is to be met. 		
Auckland Transport			
	<p><u>Key Issues / Red Flags</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a number of Key Issues / Red Flags. These are listed in the document titled: 'BUN60460864 / FTAA-2512-1158: The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki – s67 & Red Flags Memorandum' dated 25 March 2026 prepared by Elevate Planning Ltd and Progressive Transport Solutions Ltd on behalf of Auckland Transport. 		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant's Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These are listed at section 2.1a) – I). 		
15	<p><u>S67 Information Gaps</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The information gaps are identified in the attached document, sections 3 – 11. Please refer to the document titled: 'BUN60460864 / FTAA-2512-1158: The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki – s67 & Red Flags Memorandum' dated 25 March 2026 prepared by Elevate Planning Ltd and Progressive Transport Solutions Ltd on behalf of Auckland Transport. 		
Healthy Waters			
16	<p>No Red Flags.</p> <p>No s67 Request for Information.</p> <p>Interim comments:</p> <p>The HWFR Catchment Management Team have reviewed the Application and have noted in general they do not have any major concerns with this development. The site is subject to a flood prone area but does not sit within a floodplain. They have advised that flood prone areas are generated using LiDAR, and that the accuracy of what is represented on ground will change with this development.</p> <p>It is proposed to continue discharge runoff to the public stormwater network. The redevelopment of the site will trigger the need for authorisation under the RWNDC as a Brownfields Large Development. A Stormwater Management Plan demonstrating</p>		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant's Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	<p>compliance with Schedule 4 of the RWNDC has not been submitted with the Substantive Application and should be resolved prior to lodgement of any EPA. HWFR remain available to work through authorisation under the RWNDC outside of the fast-track process.</p> <p>To note – a condition and advice note recommended by HW will follow in the consolidated condition document.</p>		
Watercare			
	<p>Red flags: Wastewater</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Watercare has advised that on-site wastewater storage and off-peak pumping (Option 4) as indicated on the Basement 04 level drawings is not a desirable solution and should not be presented as a preferred or endorsed outcome. <p>Watercare have advised that they consider options 1 and 4 to be the most viable.</p>		
17	<p>S67 Further information (Wastewater):</p> <p>Option 4: pump station and rising main funding/scope</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Please clarify what other developments are expected to contribute or rely upon the proposed new local pump station and rising main. b) Please provide wider anticipated catchment flow rate that the pump station will service. 		
18	S67 Further information (Water supply):		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant's Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Please provide specific details regarding the proposed on-site water storage tanks intended to meet fire flow requirements. b) Please clearly confirm that the sprinkler demand will be met solely from on-site storage rather than via a direct connection to the public network. 		
Parks Planning			
	<p>Key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The associated planting of one street tree (2000L) in the road reserve (Pohutukawa intended) which is relied upon for wind mitigation. Concerns exist over the potential clash with buses at the corner and ongoing maintenance for this tree location. Please also cross refer to the Arborist comments on this. 		
19	<p>S67 Information request</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A suitable entity should be created to take responsibility over the Urban Room privately owned, but publicly accessible space. Please advise. 		
Infrastructure Funding & Development Strategy			
	Advised do not wish to make any comments / raise any issues.		
Economics			

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant's Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	<p><u>Red Flag:</u></p> <p>Given the purpose of the FTA Act and the weighting to be attributed to development projects with significant regional benefits - a suitable response to the RFIs identified below is required.</p> <p>A detailed response to the below will be particularly helpful to the Panel in their decision making. In this respect it is regarded as a 'red flag'.</p>		
20	<p><u>S67: Description of Missing Information</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Quantification of the Benefits for Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei – High risk b. Consideration of the baseline and/or the counterfactual to establish net economic benefits – High risk. c. Office Market Assessment – High Risk. d. CBA assessment – Low Risk. e. Assessment of externalities associated with the proposed development – Low Risk. f. Update and provide construction costs data – Low Risk. <p>Why is this Information Essential?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei Benefits:</u> potentially Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei will derive a significant benefit from the proposed development, which will in turn support its ability to meet the needs of its members. In past FTAA applications, approval has in part been influenced by findings that significant benefits to iwi are an important factor in assessing whether a project is of regional or national 		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant’s Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	<p>significance. While the precise financial value of this benefit may be commercially sensitive, it may strengthen the application if the economist could provide an estimate of the rough order of magnitude via an indicative assessment, without breaching confidentiality.</p> <p>Providing this context would help the decision-makers understand the significance of the development for Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei and its members, and potentially the region.</p> <p><u>b. Baseline/Counterfactual:</u> the Economic Assessment only provides gross economic benefits, which does not account for the fact that the site can accommodate most of the development even without FTAA approval, and also that some of the proposed capacity could be accommodated elsewhere in Auckland without FTAA approval. That is, regardless of the FTAA approval, it is likely that most of the activity measured in the Economic Assessment will occur anyway, although under most other development options would not result in benefits accruing to Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei and its members. It would be beneficial to provide an estimate of the net benefits, as the gross benefits are not helpful for assessing either whether the activity is regionally significant or if the benefits outweigh the costs.</p> <p><u>c. Office Market Assessment:</u> the Economic Assessment has not provided sufficient detail on the market in the local area or considered the nature of supply proposed in the development. An assessment of the demand and supply should provide an understanding of the nature of the proposal and the potential outcomes. This would then provide an understanding of the implications for the market,</p>		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant's Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	<p>both in terms of scale of office activity accommodated on the site and potential impacts for the rest of the CBD.</p> <p>d. <u>CBA Assessment</u>: the Economic Assessment adopts an economic analysis methodology based on input-output multipliers, which does not account for the relevant costs, including opportunity costs and externalities. Applying a CBA framework would materially reduce the estimated benefits, as future economic activity is discounted relative to activity occurring today. Furthermore, a cost-benefit analysis (CBA) provides a formal structure that explicitly incorporates both costs and benefits, thereby reducing the risk of omitting costs or overestimating benefits.</p> <p>e. <u>Update and provide data on the construction estimates</u>: the assessment applies generic costing data, which is not presented or documented. However, undertaking this update/correction is unlikely to change the findings of the assessment and will simply improve the quality of the assessment.</p>		
Environmental Monitoring			
	Condition comments to follow.		
Contamination			
	Condition comments to follow.		
Air Discharge / Odour			

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant's Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	Some condition amendments requested and an additional monitoring condition recommended noting the sensitivity of receptors. To follow.		
Noise & Vibration			
	<p>Key issues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demolition activities noise has not been assessed adequately. 2. The noise report has advised that the childcare centre Kindercare in podium of AON building will vacate their tenancy prior to the start of demolition of the Downtown Carpark Building and assessed the noise effect accordingly. 3. Noise monitoring 4. CNVMP – including review of CNVMP 		
21	<p>S67 Request for further information</p> <p>With respect of demolition activities noise has not been assessed adequately:</p> <p><i>Inadequate demolition noise assessment</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The noise report has predicted that during demolition only concrete sawing will exceed the noise standards. As shown in the noise data (table 6 of acoustic report), concrete breaking can generate noise similar to concrete sawing, hence have potential for noise exceedances. While its noise level may not be higher than the concrete saw, it may prolong the total duration of noise infringement. 		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant's Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	<p>b. The acoustic report has not explicitly assessed the noise of removal of the footbridge over Lower Hobson St and the vehicle on/off ramp over Custom St West. Based on the noise data in MDA report, the use of crane and concrete saw at night has potential to exceed the AUP nighttime construction noise limit. No separate schedule is proposed for these night works.</p> <p><i>Kindercare</i></p> <p>c. No confirmation of Kindercare vacating has been provided in the application, with the exception of a statement in the AEE. The childcare operation appears to still be operating.</p> <p>d. Please provide confirmation and evidence of the operation vacating and by what date, or provide further noise mitigation if the childcare facility operates in the AON building during the demolition and construction.</p> <p><i>Noise Monitoring</i></p> <p>e. It is noted that only complaints and works that require a schedule to CNVMP will be monitored for noise and or vibration. Given the scale of the project and extensive range of high noise activities, this may not be best practicable noise management. Please clarify in CNVMP whether noise intensive tasks activities/situations such as concrete breaking/sawing, piling or nighttime work need to be monitored.</p> <p><i>CNVMP (including reviews)</i></p>		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant's Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	f. Apart from the triggers for review stated in the CNVMP, CNVMP must be reviewed by written request of the council when there is evidence of repeated non-compliance with noise conditions.		
Hazardous Substances			
22	<p>S67 Requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Please provide an inventory of all hazardous substances proposed to be stored and used in site (including substances- cleaning and maintenance products- that may have a PA status) b. Appendix A of the Hazardous Substances Assessment (Downtown West Carpark Basement Preliminary plans) c. Clarity is requested on the storage capacity of the hazardous substance's bunds - whether they will be at a minimum of 110% capacity? 		
Regional Earthworks			
Arborist			
23	<p>S67 Request for information</p> <p>Four 2000-litre trees on the corner of Quay Street and Lower Hobson Street. The ability to plant trees of this size in this location is dependent on if there are any underground obstructions or existing or proposed services. At present there are both stormwater and wastewater connections in the vicinity of these trees. It is not clear from the information provided if there is a conflict. The area provided also looks fairly small to establish four</p>		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant's Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	<p>trees of this species. In comparison, there is an existing Pohutukawa to the north of the proposed planting location that occupies a similar space as the four trees proposed to be planted.</p> <p>I don't see anything within the information provided that addresses if these trees can actually be planted in this location and if the space allowed is sufficient for trees of this size.</p> <p>a. Please provide details of the ability to plant trees of this size in the space available identifying any below ground constraints.</p>		
Groundwater			
24	<p>No s67 information requests provided that all additional information responses provided in relation to pre-application discussions that is additional to the lodged FTAA documentation is formally lodged / provided to the EPA.</p> <p>Please can this be confirmed.</p>		
Archaeology			
Built Heritage			
25	<p>No s67 requests subject to requested conditions being proposed by the applicant (see separate document to follow).</p>		
Urban Design			
26	<p>The following <u>key issues</u> have been identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Shading and additional bulk effects 		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant's Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	<p>2. Wind conditions 3. Reduced chamfers (Tower 1) 4. Verandah Cover and Custom Street West Interface</p> <p>Additional detail for the above is provided within the attached Urban Design Note, prepared by Mustafa Demiralp dated 25 March 2026.</p> <p>Refer to attachment.</p>		
27	<p>S67 Further information Request:</p> <p>Shading – Additional Bulk Effects</p> <p>In the context of the building bulk and scale proposed, to support an effects-based assessment of shading, please provide shading diagrams that clearly distinguish the extent of shading generated by the proposed development relative to a building envelope that complies with the relevant Business – City Centre Zone Standards.</p> <p>This should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comparative shading overlay showing the shade arising from a building envelope that complies with the Business - City Centre Zone Standards and the proposed development; • Clear graphic differentiation (e.g. colour tone or hatch) identifying shading attributable to the Business – City Centre Zone Standards that are not complied with, including the additional upper-level massing (with respect of infringed Standards H8.6.2 and H8.6.5; and • Identification of the extent and duration of this additional shading, particularly on public open spaces. 		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant's Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
Landscape			
28	<p><u>Key issues:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I consider that change is anticipated in the city centre by the Auckland Unitary Plan: Operative in Part (AUP:OP) and a comprehensive mixed-use development is appropriate in the site location. However, the proposal and its significant infringements to the General height standard and the Harbour Edge Height Control Plane will change the form of the city centre in a way that is not anticipated by the AUP:OP and that will be visually incongruent to its waterfront setting. 2. The proposal will create a landmark on the Harbour edge that will be viewed from a very wide range of vantages from which the city centre and its Harbour landscape context is highly valued. The towers will be visually incompatible with the Harbour edge context as they exert a prominent verticality and combined bulk/massing that will create dominance over the waterfront and neighbouring sites and will reduce visual permeability between the Harbour and city centre. 3. The significant infringements to the Harbour Edge Height Control Plane will nullify the transition down to the waterfront as anticipated by the AUP:OP, effectively meaning that this control will become obsolete as the transition in the AUP:OP, and has generally given effect to currently, will no longer be legible. 		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant’s Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	4. The proposed towers will create an abrupt and dramatic change in building heights to the neighbouring Viaduct Harbour Precinct, creating dominance effects and preventing the transition of heights to neighbouring sites. The proposal will be inconsistent with the AUP:OP planned character of the waterfront setting.		
Universal Design			
29	<p>S67 Further information requests: To better understand the variety of dwellings offered in the multi-level residential component of the development, please respond how the project aims to successfully accomplish the following policy H8.3(16) – ‘Enable a significant and diverse residential population to be established and maintained within a range of living environments and housing sizes’,</p> <p>a. Are any dwellings proposed to be accessible units with interior design to suit universal design parameters given the spatial requirement of an accessible unit is slightly above average with specific toilet designs required?</p>		
30	<p>Design amendments requested Lower Hobson Street / P2:</p> <p>The clear accessible path of travel in front of the accessible stair connections from Lower Hobson leading at ground level of P2 remains compromised due to heavy movement anticipated along that path with access to the residential lobby, office lobby and the hotel lobby, all situated along the length. Pinch points are created at the edges of the stairs with rounded off projections giving minimal relief in terms of visibility and blind spots created. Two egresses,</p>		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant's Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	<p>one from the office lobby and one from the residential lobby further add to the challenges of pedestrian safety, particularly for the disabled people in an event of emergency evacuation, as the clear accessible path of travel will be flooded with people descending down the stairwell and subsequent movement across.</p> <p>a. It is recommended the applicant design team revisits the accessible steps configuration and design on Lower Hobson</p>		
31	<p>Appendix 11_Urban Design Assessment p 119 refers to separate vehicle and pedestrian access within parking areas. Does that refer to the service lane, along the North south axis connecting Quay Street to Customs Street West? Comments on the footpath being grade separated or the possibility of a shared space is mentioned.</p> <p>Further information to review pedestrian safety and access in this area is requested as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Reasons for not co-locating the accessible lift with the main circulation area/ central stairs b) Operating hours of the accessible public lift c) Demonstrate sufficiency of the provision, i.e, one accessible lift catering to the expected pedestrian traffic through the site d) Alternative vertical movement paths for the elderly, caregivers and wheelchair users in case of lift breakdown 		
32	<p>Any consideration to accommodate an Adult Changing Facility (ACF) ground floor level from any of 'on grade' entry points with a</p>		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant’s Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	24x7 access to the facility, given the strategic location of the site and the landmark status of the project?		
33	<p>A comprehensive active surveillance plan and lighting plan is requested as additional information to understand the effects of terrain, building functions, and time of the day with no, low or high occupancy of the towers at lower levels to fully comprehend pedestrian safety within the proposal. This information request is explained by the comments below. Noting that The CPTED assessment has been considered and is generally supported, with the exception of the below.</p> <p>The Urban Room surrounded primarily by retail shops within the site, and entry to the office lobby of T1 may lose a sense of safety after hours, once the businesses close for the day and the office occupancy reduces. Some respite in terms of passive surveillance may come for the 24/7 operational hotel lobby of T2 at ground level.</p> <p>However, it is not easily approachable for pedestrians walking along Lower Hobson due to the level difference and another entrance via a revolving door accessed from the urban room space. In addition, informal seating integrated with landscaping elements towards custom street, accessible stairs along Lower Hobson, staircase with tiered seating at the center of the urban room still creates a risk of being potential areas for congregation for anti-social elements, and could be an easy invitation for rough sleepers thereby discouraging pedestrians to come into the site and lowering the building appeal in general.</p> <p>Similarly, the staircase along the southern laneway connecting Aon Tower and the new Tower 1 with a landscaping bed in between is described as ‘not immediately intuitive’ for visitors. However, for the</p>		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK: Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158) Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant's Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	same reason and due to split levels with lack of passive surveillance, it can also potentially become an area of congregation and an unsafe path for pedestrians.		
Wind			
34	<p>The following key matters are brought to the attention of the applicant. They could be regarded as both <u>key issues</u> and s67 <u>Request for clarification / further information</u> to improve the quality of the reporting to the Panel:</p> <p>a. Wind tunnel testing was carried out for the existing situation and the proposed development, both without any of the existing vegetation.</p> <p>Results are also reported for the proposed development with both the existing vegetation and mitigation measures. This means that we do not have results for the existing situation with the existing vegetation. Therefore, we cannot compare the configuration the applicant wants to build with the actual current situation.</p> <p>What we can do is compare the conditions for the configuration that the applicant wants to build with the wind conditions appropriate for the space, as identified in the AUP.</p> <p>b. The development with the proposed development, including the existing vegetation and mitigation creates Category D conditions at some locations which are higher than considered appropriate under the AUP wind</p>		

Section 67 Request for Information: FAST TRACK:			
Council ref: BUN60460864 – The Downtown Carpark Redevelopment – Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki (FTAA-2512-1158)			
Date: 26 March 2026			
Item	Information Request / Red flag	Applicant’s Response (XX/XX/XX)	Item resolved?
	<p>standards, and are higher than the existing situation, even without any vegetation.</p> <p>c. Wind conditions in the narrowest section of the Urban Room remain Category D, even with existing vegetation and mitigation options. Whether this space is a pedestrian transit (walking) needs to be clarified.</p> <p>d. The ability of the applicant to incorporate the additional trees for mitigation has yet to be established.</p>		
Waste Solutions			
	Comments on conditions to follow, including a requirement for a Site-Specific Construction Waste Management Plan (SSCWMP)		
Tree Asset Owner			
	No response received.		
Growth, Transport & Infrastructure Strategy			
	No Response.		
Policy			
	No response.		

Attachments:

1. Development Engineering Discussion Document, dated 23 February 2026
2. Auckland Transport
3. Urban Design
4. Geotechnical Review Register 2026.03.24

Attachment 2

CVA



Urban & Environmental

Cultural Values and Impact Assessments

Downtown Carpark Site Development Proposal

2 Lower Albert St, Auckland

Prepared by
Ngaati Whanaunga Incorporated Society
19 December 2025



Table of Contents

1.	Whakaraapopototanga	3
2.	He Koorero Whakataki	4
3.	Te Tuu o Ngaati Whanaunga	5
3.1.	Whakapapa	5
3.2.	Te Whakaminenga o Marutuahu	5
3.3.	Nгаа Hapuu o Ngaati Whanaunga	6
3.4.	Te Hononga	6
3.5.	Mai i te Taunga Mai o Tauwi Tae Noa ki te Tuku Kereme WAI100	6
3.6.	Te Mana Taawharau o Ngaati Whanaunga	8
3.7.	Te Anga Whakamua o Ngaati Whanaunga	9
4.	Ngaati Whanaunga ki Taamaki	9
4.1.	Te Rohe Pootae o Ngaati Whanaunga	9
4.2.	Te Hononga ki Taamaki me Oona Hapuu Katoa	11
5.	Ngaati Whanaunga me Te Taiao	12
5.1.	Nгаа tikanga taiao	13
5.2.	Taha wairua	13
5.3.	Kaitiakitanga	13
5.4.	Aapoopoo atu nei	13
5.5.	Maatauranga Whanaunga me te maatauranga tauwi	14
6.	Ngā Tikanga	14
6.1.	Whanaungatanga	14
6.2.	Kaitiakitanga	15
6.3.	Manaakitanga	15
6.4.	Te reo me oona ake tikanga	16
6.5.	Mana i te whenua	17
7.	He Arotake	17
7.1.	Whakawhitiwhiti korero	17
7.2.	Kaupapa mahere taiao	18
7.3.	Arotake taiao	20
7.4.	Nгаа tikanga aa ture	21
7.5.	Nгаа whakaritenga	21
8.	Whakataunga	22
9.	Papakupu	23

1. Whakaraapopotanga

This cultural values assessment (CVA) was commissioned by Barker & Associates ([Barker](#)) on behalf of Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited ([Precinct](#)) who intends to lodge a substantive application under the Fast-track Approvals Act (FTAA) for a proposal to redevelop the Downtown Carpark site at 2 Lower Albert Street Auckland CBD into a mixed-use commercial development.

Ngaati Whanaunga provides this report anticipating that it will assist the Precinct to better understand the impacts of the proposal, and enable integration of the considerations of this report into the progressing of its various applications and the subsequent development.

In this report, we identify cultural values and view the proposal in light of these. In doing so, we have also reviewed the technical assessments and information contained in some forty appendices that accompanied Barker's AEE and Statutory Analysis document. We note that, citing information sensitivity, five appendices¹ were withheld from us.

In the end, we arrive at a set of six recommendations. They are, that Precinct:

1. Engage with tangata whenua to incorporate cultural narratives in the project design; for example, in integrating the functionality of building lobbies and shopfronts with expression of *tangata whenua* cultural narratives and that *iwi* and *hapuu* that have *mana i te whenua* be involved.
2. Include Ngaati Whanaunga in any further work of integration of cultural identity in design.
3. Engage with *tangata whenua* (rather than outside consultants) in relation to any future work that draws from "Maaori inherited knowledge and lived relationships".
4. Engage *tangata whenua* to contribute to developing integrating cultural experiences, such as traditional Maaori performances, workshops, or food offerings within the complex.
5. Ensure that the *iwi* representatives are informed at least 48 hours before the start of any works requiring archaeological monitoring, and that Precinct recommend to the Panel that this be a condition of consent or archaeological authority.
6. Ensure that a placeholder for *iwi* information be included in any conditions of consent relating to the sought after archaeological authority.

¹ Appendix 2_Letter of Support_Ngati Whatua Orakei; Appendix 3_Completed Application Form; Appendix 5_Corporate Statement; Appendix 6_Corporate Statement; Appendix 21_Consultation Summary Report.

2. He Koorero Whakataki

This cultural values assessment (CVA) was commissioned by Barker on behalf of Precinct Precinct who intends to lodge a substantive application under the FTAA for a proposal to redevelop the Downtown Carpark site at 2 Lower Albert Street Auckland CBD.

Ngaati Whanaunga provides this report anticipating that Precinct will more readily understand the impact of the proposal on Ngaati Whanaunga's cultural values. Once thus informed, we hope that Precinct may integrate such considerations into its application as well as future management of the site.

In presenting the report, we acknowledge that its originating commission is set in the framework of an application under the FTAA for consents, including an archaeological authority, for a development in the highly built area that is the Auckland CB; and, others might expect that the report would stay in that narrow lane. However, Ngaati Whanaunga is not thus compartmentalised in expressing, sharing and applying our *tikanga*. All of Ngaati Whanunga *tikanga* has the purpose of uplifting and sustaining people and our environment – including in the context this proposed commercial development - and to this end this report has been written and presented.

This report should be read as a useful set of guidelines and reference points that provide cultural insight and context for, ultimately, the successful management of an integrated mixed-use commercial precinct in an area that is culturally significant to Ngaati Whanaunga and our kin hapuu and iwi.

We commence with *Te Tuu o Ngaati Whanaunga*, our place in *Taamaki* and our connection with *te taiao*, setting out the *whakapapa* and cultural frame of reference for the report. We then discuss Ngaati Whanaunga's cultural values in the context of the proposal and the application information made available to us, before wrapping up our presentation in a summary and recommendatory form.

3. Te Tuu o Ngaati Whanaunga

Ngaati Whanaunga is a sovereign *iwi* that is made up of several distinct *hapuu* and whaanau. We set out in this section the *whakapapa*, principles and values that underpin Ngaati Whanaunga.

3.1. Whakapapa

Ngaati Whanaunga descends from Marutuahu. Marutuahu married a Te Uri o Pou woman named Paremoehau, and from this union came our eponymous ancestor Whanaunga, and others. Whanaunga became a leader of the Marutuahu *iwi* and *hapuu* following his father's death and is the eponymous ancestor of Ngaati Whanaunga.

3.2. Te Whakaminenga o Marutuahu

Marutuahu lends its name to *te whakaminenga o Marutuahu*, the Marutuahu confederation of Pare Hauraki tribes.

By definition, a confederation is a collective of sovereign entities that choose to unite for a common purpose. And so it is with *te whakaminenga o Marutuahu*.

The confederation comprises *iwi* who are descended from Marutuahu's marriages to two sisters from Ngaati Pou (te uri o Poutukeka) of Wharekawa and Taamaki, daughters of Ruahiore; the aforementioned Paremoehau and Hineurunga. The *iwi* who constitute this *whakaminenga*, have taken the names of the children from those marriages;

From the first marriages came Tamatepoo, Tamateraa and Whanaunga (Ngaati Whanaunga).

From the second marriage came Te Ngako and Taurakapakapa.

These *tuupuna* are the progenitors of the tribes that make up the many *hapuu* of the Marutuahu confederation of Pare Hauraki.

Tamatepoo consists of (among others): Ngaati Rong-uu, Ngaati Pakira, and Te Uringahau; Ngaati Tamateraa (of Tamateraa); Ngaati Whanaunga (of Whanaunga); Ngaati Maru (of

Ngako and Taurakapakapa); and Ngaati Paaoa (of Tamateraa's granddaughter Tukutuku and her husband Paaoa of Waikato); and (all the aforementioned) *hapuu*.

3.3. Ngaa Hapuu o Ngaati Whanaunga

Te Mateawa, Ngaati Karaua, Ngaati Kotinga, Ngaati Pakira, Ngaati Te Aute, Ngaati Ngaropapa, Ngaati Rangiaohia, Ngaati Ramuri, Ngaati Tauaiwi, Te Rapupo, Ngaati Piri, Ngaati Hinerangi, Ngaati Ngaupokopoko, Ngaati Puku, Ngaati Matau, Ngaati Rangiuiira, Ngaati Koheru, Ngaati Wharo, Ngaati Hauauru, Ngaati Umuhau, among others are the *hapuu* of Ngaati Whanaunga.

3.4. Te Hononga

Everything has *whakapapa* and *hononga* (connection).

Ngaati Whanaunga recognises the interconnectedness between all living and non-living elements, their dependence on each other and the linkages between the life supporting capacity of healthy ecosystems and people's wellbeing.

These connections are explained in the story of Ngaati Whanaunga creation from Te Kore (the nothingness) through to Te Po (the night), to Te Ao Marama (the world of light). The latter explains how the landscape, people, plants, and animals came into being as children of Ranginui (our sky father) and Papatuanuku (our earth mother). *Mauri* is the essence by which we are all connected. It is the bond Ngaati Whanaunga share with the living, the non-living, past, current, and future generations to come. Any degradation of this life force affects the wellbeing of the environment, and by association, Ngaati Whanaunga's wellbeing as a people. For Ngaati Whanaunga, the inextricable kinship between people and the natural world creates an obligation to nurture the environment, so it (in turn) can nurture us.

3.5. Mai i te Taunga Mai o Taiwi Tae Noa ki te Tuku Kereme WAI100

Pre-European contact and into the early 1800s, Ngaati Whanaunga inhabited areas within Taamaki.

A significant transaction took place in 1836 when a missionary negotiated a deal involving a large tract of land in Taamaki with Ngaati Whanaunga and other iwi. This agreement included a provision that allowed the *iwi* and *hapuu* selling the land to retain rights to one-third of it.

However, the Crown did not fulfil its obligation to return this one-third to the original landowners; nor did it establish reserves for the former Ngaati Whanaunga proprietors.

Furthermore, there was no inquiry by the Crown into whether Ngaati Whanaunga had adequate land to satisfy their needs. In addition to this transaction, the *iwi* participated in other land negotiations prior to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi at Aotea, Hikutaia, and Ahuahu, with Ngaati Whanaunga leaders formally signed the Treaty at two sites: Karaka Bay in Taamaki and Waiau in the Coromandel.

In 1841, the Crown purchased approximately 220,000 acres at Mahurangi and Omaha from Ngaati Whanaunga and other Marutuuahu *iwi*. The boundaries of this sale were later disputed by Ngaati Whanaunga. In 1850 the Crown granted the Awataha block to the Catholic Bishop. In the 1920s, Ngaati Whanaunga petitioned the Crown stating that the Awataha block in Takapuna had not been included as part of the 1841 agreement, and therefore the Crown grant to the Bishop was invalid.

From 1852 onwards, Ngaati Whanaunga entered into several agreements with the Crown, permitting some Maaori-owned land to be used for licensed gold mining while ensuring that the land would remain under Maaori ownership.

When these agreements were not honoured, Ngaati Whanaunga, together with other Hauraki *iwi*, presented petitions to Parliament, contending that they had not received all payments owed from mining activities. A commissioner recommended an ex-gratia payment between £30,000 and £40,000 for the affected *iwi*, but despite further advocacy, this payment was never made.

In July 1863, the Crown launched an invasion of the Waikato, crossing the Mangataawhiri Stream against the advice of the renowned Ngaati Whanaunga ally Patuone who was, at that time, influential with the Governor resident in Taamaki. The Waikato invasion prompted resistance from Ngaati Whanaunga who, as close kin of the Waikato *iwi*, joined in guerrilla warfare against Crown military forces.

In November of that year, Crown troops seized Puukorokoro after the area was shelled by HMS Miranda, leading to the destruction of homes and waka. The Crown later fortified Puukorokoro, renaming it Miranda.

During 1864 and 1865, the Crown designated confiscation blocks in various regions, including Waikato, Pokeno, East Wairoa, and Tauranga (Katikati to Te Puna), affecting the interests of Ngaati Whanaunga in these territories.

Starting in 1865, native land legislation precipitated the individualisation of Maaori land tenure, which was an abhorrent and foreign concept to Ngaati Whanaunga and rendered our lands susceptible to alienation.

Ngaati Whanaunga was not consulted during the development of native land laws in Aotearoa; and the establishment of the Native Land Court – also known as *Te Kooti Taahae Whenua* (the land stealing court) - gradually oversaw the diminution of traditional social structures and the tribal estate of Ngaati Whanaunga.

By the conclusion of the nineteenth century, Ngaati Whanaunga's remaining land holdings were primarily held in the Western Firth of Thames, often in blocks that were shared with other *iwi*. Throughout the twentieth century, nearly all of these lands, along with significant areas within Taamaki, were alienated to private buyers and the Crown.

As if this tragic land loss was not impactful enough, for decades Ngaati Whanaunga children faced discouragement from speaking their native language in schools run by the Crown.

By the end of the twentieth century, coinciding with the WAI 100 Hauraki claim before the Waitangi Tribunal, only one-in-four Ngaati Whanaunga members were fluent in *te reo Maaori* and only around 2% of the Parehouraki tribal estate remained in Maaori ownership.

Land loss, the deterioration of tribal structures and the decline of the *te reo Maaori* significantly contributed to the loss of Ngaati Whanaunga knowledge and cultural identity. In both the twentieth and twenty-first centuries – and through to the present day - Ngaati Whanaunga encounters poorer health outcomes compared to Pākehā, including lower life expectancies and higher rates of infant mortality. Unsurprisingly, given the destruction of our economic base - Ngaati Whanaunga faces higher unemployment rates and has lower average annual income compared to the wider population.

3.6. Te Mana Taawharau o Ngaati Whanaunga

Ngaati Whanaunga Incorporated Society (NWIS) was established in 1992 to advance the interests of Ngaati Whanaunga.

An important milestone in Ngaati Whanaunga’s development was reached when, on 29 June 2011, the Crown recognised the mandate of NWIS, and the mandated negotiators, to negotiate a comprehensive settlement of the historical Te Tiriti o Waitangi claims.

On 25 August 2017, Ngaati Whanaunga and the Crown initialled a Deed of Settlement. The Deed is subject to ratification by the members of Ngaati Whanaunga and conditional on the enactment of the settlement legislation. Subject to ratification, the Ngaati Whanaunga Ruunanga Trust will manage the settlement assets upon settlement. In addition, Ngaati Whanaunga’s membership in Ngaa Whenua o Taamaki Makaurau (the Taamaki Collective); Pare Hauraki Collective and the Marutuuahu Collective is recognised.

NWIS continues to lead Ngaati Whanaunga development and represents *iwi* and *hapuu* interests.

3.7. Te Anga Whakamua o Ngaati Whanaunga

In presenting this report, NWIS is true to Ngaati Whanaunga’s over-arching mission “*to enhance the wellbeing of our people both now and in the future by ensuring the sustainable management of our resources.*”

Our core objectives seek to ensure the long-term wellbeing of our land, freshwater, coastal and marine areas, biodiversity, air, culture, and heritage such as historic structures, archaeological sites, places of significance that may include nature features such as trees, springs, rivers, or mountains which are associated with historical or cultural activities or events. These help connect our people to the land and maintain our strong sense of belonging within Taamaki and beyond.

4. Ngaati Whanaunga ki Taamaki

Kei a Ngaati Whanaunga he wahanga mana i te whenua o roto o Taamaki. The subject site of this project is within Taamaki, and we therefore establish our standing there.

4.1. Te Rohe Pootae o Ngaati Whanaunga

The breadth and width of our tribal estate is captured in the saying “*Mai Matakana ki Matakana*” – it extends along the east coast from the sunken reefs of Ngaa Kuri-a-Whaarei near Matakana Island in the south; up through parts of the Taamaki isthmus, Takapuna,

Whangaparaoa, and Mahurangi to the Matakana River estuary in the north. Hence, “*Mai Matakana ki Matakana*”.

The western boundary extends to Mount Te Aroha, along the ranges of Te Hapuu-a-Kohe and the Hunua Ranges to Moumoukai and Papakura.

The seaward boundary of our rohe includes parts of Aotea (Great Barrier Island) to its origin of Ngaa Kuri-a-Whare ki Te Arai o Tahuhuniarangi including the inner gulf islands of Tikapa Moana (Firth of Thames) and offshore islands along the eastern coastline of Te Tai Tamawahine excluding Tuhua Island (refer to Turoa 1997). Our tribal estate, *te rohe potae* of Ngaati Whanaunga is a land and maritime estate.

The map below shows *Te Rohe Pootae* o Ngaati Whanaunga.



4.2. Te Hononga ki Taamaki me Oona Hapuu Katoa

Through occupation, *whakapapa*, *whanaungatanga* and *hononga*, Ngaati Whanaunga has shared interests in Taamaki.

Used here, the term *interest* is to be understood in the context of *whakapapa*, *whanaungatanga* and *hononga*, and not in the European context of a legal right of an individual or entity to own, control and use land or resources independently to others. Ngaati Whanaunga's mana to speak to issues across Taamaki is based on familial, cultural and spiritual connection and not (European) legal entitlements.

In substantiating the cultural validity of taking this approach, it is appropriate that Ngaati Whanaunga acknowledge our connection with Taamaki in the context of *whakapapa* and our historical relationships with many *hapuu* of our kin iwi within Taamaki.

Maa to maatou hononga ka tuutapatahi ai maatou, ko maatou-tahi, ka tika.

*Ko Ngaati Paoa te iwi, ko oona hapuu, ko maatou whanaunga ko eenei:
Ko Te Patukirikiri, ko Te Matekiwaho, ko Ngaati Hura, ko Te Urikaraka, ko
Ngaati Kapu, ko Ngaati Taurua, ko Ngaati Rakura, ko Ngaati Putoa, ko
Ngaati Hingawaka, ko Ngaati Te Umu, ko Ngaati Manawa, ko Ngaati
Tuahuru, ko Ngaati Te Haupa, ko Ngaati Rauhea, ko Ngaati Paeahi, ko
Ngaati Huruhuru, ko Ngaati Kahungeri, ko Ngaati Kaimarire, ko Ngaati
Whataroa, ko Ngaati Ruarangi, ko Ngaati Te Wai, ko Ngaati Tahuna, ko
Ngaati Omakau, ko Ngaati Naho, ko Ngaati Kauahi, ko Te Iwitaupou, ko Te
Matekiwaho, ko Ngaati Horowhenua.*

*Ko Ngaati Tamatera te iwi, ko oona hapuu, ko maatou whanaunga ko eenei:
Ko Ngaati Tawhaki, ko Ngaati Pinenga, ko Ngaati Mango, ko Ngaati Taireina,
ko Ngaati Taiuru, ko Te Matewaru, ko Ngaati Taharua, ko Te Kiriwera, ko
Ngaati Rangi, ko Ngaati Rangitaua, ko Ngaati Te Kiko, ko Te Uriwha, ko
Ngaati Rongo, ko Te Patu, ko Ngaati Tangata, ko Ngaati Hura, ko Ngaati Tu,
ko Ngaati Rangipuata, ko Ngaati Te Hihī, ko Ngaati Koroki, ko Te Mahurehure,
ko Ngaati Pohutu, ko Ngaati Waipunarangi, ko Ngaati Manuiti, ko Ngaati
Rakei, ko Te Iwītutu, ko Ngaati Te Roro, ko Te Mateatua, ko Ngaati Pukeko,
ko Ngaati Pare.*

*Ko Ngaati Maru te iwi, ko oona hapuu, ko maatou whanaunga ko eenei:
Ko Ngaati Naunau, ko Ngaati Patu, ko Ngaati Ua, ko Ngaati Ahu, Te*

Matewaitai, Te Matewhakapapa, Ngaati Parematau, Ngaati Parakore, Ngaati Matewhiti, Ngaati Rangirangi, Ngaati Hikairo, Ngaati Tarakihi, Ngaati Whanga, Ngaati Pu, Ngaati Hinerangi, Ngaati Hineahi, Te Uringahu, Ngaati Hape, Ngaati Rongou, Ngaati Tumoana, Ngaati Wawenga, Ngaati Te Ahumua, Ngaati Te Kahu, Ngaati Whare, Ngaati Waihinu, Ngaati Parakore, Ngaati Tahae, Ngaati Ruahuri, Ngaati Mauopo, Ngaati Waikaukau, Ngaati Hinehau, Ngaati Pupu, Ngaati Wharo, Ngaati Hei, Ngaati Hauauru, Ngaati Te Aute, Ngaati Te Ngako, Ngaati Rautao;

Ko Te Waiohua te iwi, ko oona hapuu, ko oo maatou whanaunga ko eenei: Ko Ngariki, ko Ngaati Reko, ko Ngaati Rewha, ko Te Aua, ko Te Uriika, ko ko Ngaati Kaihua, ko Ngai Tai, ko Ngaati Tai, ko Ngaati Taimanawaiti, ko Ngaati Taihaua, ko Ngaati Te Raukohekohe, ko Ngaati Kohua, ko Te Urioteao, ko ko Ngaati Hinewai, ko Ngaati Tamaoho, ko Ngaati Te Atairehia, ko Ngaati Pou, ko Ngaati Koheriki, ko Ngaati Tarao, ko Ngariki, ko Ngaiwi, ko Ngaoho, ko Te Akitai, ko Ngaati Pare, ko Poutukeka;

Ko Kawerau me Ngai Taahuhu ngaa iwi, oo raaua hapū, ko eenei: Ko Ngaati Kahu, ko Ngaati Poataniwha, ko Ngaati Manuhiri, ko Te Kawerau a Maki, ko Ngaati Rehua, ko Te Kapotai

Ko Ngaati Whatua te iwi, ko oona hapuu, ko oo maatou whanaunga ko eenei, Ko Te Uri Ngutu, ko Te Uri-o-Hau, ko Ngaati Rango, ko Ngaati Rongo, ko Ngaati Whatua Tuturu, ko Te Mangamata, ko Ngaati Mauku, ko Te Roroa, ko Te Taouu, ko Ngaoho.

5. Ngaati Whanaunga me Te Taiao

The subject proposal is being processed within the framework of the FTAA and resource management regulation.

Ngaati Whanaunga's approach to resource management is fundamentally founded in *whakapapa* that features the interrelationships between *taangata*, *whenua*, and *te taiao*. This framework is informed by a confluence of historical, spiritual, and pragmatic insights regarding natural resources and their essential role in inter-generationally shaping identity, promoting sustainability, and enhancing well-being. This is how Ngaati Whanaunga defines *resource management*.

5.1. Ngaa tikanga taiao

Ngaati Whananga views the environment as an holistic system, all the parts of which are interconnected. The *whenua*, *wai*, *haa* and all living things – including people - are seen as part of a larger ecosystem. Each has innate value, and each contributes to the health of the whole.

5.2. Taha wairua

Ngaati Whanaunga has a spiritual relationship with *te taiao*. We view *whenua*, *moana* and *wai* as *tuupuna* that deserve our reverence and respect. It is this deep sense of regard that is the essence of the spiritual dimension of *te taio*.

5.3. Kaitiakitanga

Kaitiakitanga is the ethic of stewardship. In the context of *te taiao*, Ngaati Whanaunga are stewards. The responsibility of stewardship includes conservation and sustainable management to protect and enhance the *mauri* of our *whenua*, *wai* and *moana*. It also extends to caring for people and their families, including visitors, who (for example) are experiencing the effects of commercial development in an already highly built area, such as the Auckland CBD.

5.4. Aapoopoo atu nei

Kaitiakitanga is an intergenerational responsibility. In all that we do and say, including in the delivery of this report, we consider the needs of future generations. Our practices are informed by *maatauranga Whanaunga*, tribal knowledge passed down to us through generations. An example of this is the *taonga tukuiho* of our respected Marutuahu Betty Williams, who left us the following account of *mauri* and the part it plays in the natural world.

“Natural taonga have evolved from the union of Papa and Rangi (Earth and Sky). They include flora, fauna, air, water, soil, minerals, humankind, natural phenomena, sun, moon, planets etc. Natural taonga exist through mauri, the vital life essence and energy force that gives everything existence and being. Mauri connects everything to the Universe.

The human being is merely an extension, a re-arrangement of the same living matter, in terms of Mauri and the basic elements which make up water, soil, minerals, flora and fauna, air etc. Natural taonga have an intrinsic value in terms of their own existence and being and their value to

the interconnected nature of the natural environment, to the integrity of the Earth, and to human survival”

Today's *kaitiaki* have a responsibility to pass such *taonga tuku iho* on to future generations. *Maatauranga Whanaunga* covers a wide range of knowledge relating to traditional ecological. This body of knowledge supports effective resource management based on historical a, experiential practices and observations.

5.5. Maatauranga Whanaunga me te maatauranga tauwi

We acknowledge and readily seek to integrate *maatauranga tauwi* (western science) with *maatauranga Whanaunga*. We believe that integration enhances holistic understanding of environmental management that respects both our traditional knowledge and western scientific methodologies.

Mātauranga Whanaunga encompasses a body of knowledge that supports effective resource management based on cultural and experiential practices and observations.

6. Ngā Tikanga

Before discussing Ngaati Whanaunga values in connection with the proposal, we acknowledge and commend Precinct's reference to *Te Aranga Maaori Design Principles* as a set of useful guidelines for incorporating cultural values into the design. Additional to the values we set out in this section, we acknowledge the seven design principles of Te Aranga. These Te Aranga principles are:

- Mahi toi
- Tohutohu
- Ahi kaa
- Mauri tuu

Having acknowledged with these, we now discuss the following Ngaati Whanaunga values as being relevant.

6.1. Whanaungatanga

In Ngaati Whanaunga culture, *whanaungatanga* is foundational to understanding relationships and community connection. *Whanaungatanga* emphasises kinship, interconnectedness, and the importance of family and social ties.

At its core, *whanaungatanga* is about building and enhancing relationships. In the context of this proposal for a complex that includes commercial, residential, hotel, retail, food and beverage, and civic uses the subject proposal, this extends to fostering connections among the various users, residents, business owners, employees, and visitors. Such can create a vibrant, inviting atmosphere that enhances the overall customer, visitor and residence experience. When visitors feel engaged and welcomed, they are more likely to spend time (and money) in the complex.

Incorporating *tangata whenua* culture and identity into the development is crucial for exemplifying *whanaungatanga*. This could mean integrating *tangata whenua* design principles in architecture, public art installations that reflect local history and narratives, and spaces for cultural events and gatherings. A focus on cultural heritage promotes a sense of place and strengthens community connection.

Whanaungatanga encourages collaborative goals that reflect the aspirations of the community. Ngaati Whanaunga invites stakeholders of the proposal to engage with us and other iwi. This could involve incorporating *tangata whenua* perspectives in the remaining planning process, enhancing a goal that the development supports local businesses, and provides employment opportunities.

6.2. Kaitiakitanga

We have already discussed the ethic of *kaitiakitanga*.

We suggest that the development can embrace sustainable practices that reflect *kaitiakitanga*; for example, using environmentally friendly materials, implementing green building standards, and designing spaces that promotes *hauora* (holistic wellbeing).

6.3. Manaakitanga

Manaakitanga is central to *te tuu o Ngaati Whananuga*. The Ngaati Whanaunga ethic of *manaakitanga* provides a strong foundation for creating a mixed-use commercial development that prioritises hospitality, respect, and customer experience. *Manaakitanga* clearly has applicability to the social, economic and commercial aims of the proposed development.

Here's how:

- *Hospitality*: A foundational principle of *manaakitanga* is that all visitors, residents, and business owners should feel welcomed and valued. This happens to also be a foundational commercial principle.
- *Cultural connection*: By honouring and integrating *tangata whenua* cultural narratives and practices into the design and operation of the development, the complex can foster a sense of belonging and welcome among all visitors. Ngaati Whanaunga acknowledges that landscape and visual design, and the form of the towers and their facade, has been developed through collaboration with Ngaati Whaatua ki Ooraakei enabling the establishment of an authentic cultural narrative.
- *Reciprocity*: Across the mixed-uses of the development, businesses can adopt an ethic of reciprocity, where they not only seek profit but also contribute positively to the community.
- *Workplace culture*: A commitment to *manaakitanga* translates into treating employees with respect, dignity, and care. Creating a positive workplace culture within the businesses in the development can enhance employee satisfaction, retention, and commercial success.
- *Service Excellence*: Businesses within the development that embody *manaakitanga* prioritise exceptional customer service. This approach not only creates a positive experience for visitors but also encourages repeat patronage and commercial success.
- *Safety*: Ngaati Whanaunga supports the application of public safety elements of the *National Guidelines for Crime Prevention through Environmental Design in New Zealand* as being consistent with *manaakitanga* and Precinct's duty to public safety.
- *Cultural experiences*: A "holy grail" of business success is inimitability of a competitive advantage. If there is one thing that is inimitable in our domestic and international commercial landscape, it is Maaori culture. Integrating cultural experiences, such as traditional Maaori performances, workshops, or food offerings within the complex precinct is good business. In this regard, we note the THSA Hotel Advisors Report's comment on the value of cultural engagement.

6.4. Te reo me oona ake tikanga

The inclusion and promotion of *te reo* through signage, art, and other opportunities for cultural engagements will enhance both social and economic outcomes that are sought through the development and operation of the complex.

As a practical but meaningful way to involve *te reo*, Ngaati Whanaunga recommends the engagement of Para Kore, including bilingual *te reo Maaori* English signage as noted in the Operational Waste Management Plan.

6.5. Mana i te whenua

Ngaati Whanaunga, along with other iwi, hold *mana i te whenua* in relation to the subject site.

We note the inclusion of a cultural design report by Haumi Ltd. However, it is not clear from our review of it whether Haumi, in delivering the report, engaged with *iwi* who have *mana i te whenua*.

We do note that Haumi's professed approach "draws from inherited knowledge and lived relationships", and we declare that it is *tangata whenua* that possess such knowledge and relationships with the subject site, and we wonder to what extent, if any, that Haumi has or intends to engage with us and others who hold that *mana i te whenua*.

In any case, we recommend to Precinct that any such future engagements be had with iwi and hapuu, *noo raatou te mana i te whenua*.

I kitea nei taa Haumi koorero² ko raatou e tuku mihimihi o Te Waitamataa ki a wai ranei, me too raatou koorero moo "te manawa o Taamaki". Kaare e tika ana ka riro maa te hunga kee atu te koorero mihimihi e puutake mai ana i Taamaki. He poka noa eera mahi.

It is our hope that in any future opportunities for of such inputs Precinct engage such.

7. He Arotake

Ngaati Whanaunga has taken the Barker report *Assessment of Environmental Effects and Statutory Analysis* (7 November 2025) to be the head document. The Barker document includes a voluminous array of appendices (reports) and provides information on a variety of dimensions. We have already referred to various of those reports, and this section references our analysis of others.

7.1. Whakawhitiwhiti korero

The consultation section of the Barker document posits that the application fulfils the requirements of the FTAA. We have noted the following key points:

² Te Pūmanawa o Tāmaki, p2

- *Engagement with Local Authorities:* The project team conducted pre-application meetings with Auckland Council to discuss various project aspects, and separate discussions with Auckland Transport and Watercare.
- *Consultation with Iwi Authorities:* There were no Treaty Settlement Statutory Acknowledgement Areas identified on Auckland Council's GeoMaps for the subject site or any adjacent properties. We are following up as to whether such sites have been identified in other databases such as any held by Te Tari Whakatau. We acknowledge that although (it is stated that) there are no Mana Whakahono ā Rohe agreements applicable to the project area, consultation was still carried out with iwi authorities identified by Auckland Council.
- *Other agencies:* The project has engaged with the Ministry for the Environment and Pouhere Taonga for feedback on various assessments, including archaeological reports.
- *Nearby property owners:* Informational outreach was conducted with neighbouring property owners and stakeholders through letters, emails, and meetings to keep them informed and solicit feedback.
- *Ongoing engagement:* We acknowledge that the consultation process emphasises ongoing engagement with iwi authorities and commitment to incorporating cultural narratives in the project design.

7.2. Kaupapa mahere taiao

The planning framework section outlines regulatory and procedural considerations for the development. Ngaati Whanaunga acknowledges that the document emphasises regulatory compliance, proactive management of potential impacts during construction, and the integration of archaeological and environmental considerations into the development process.

Here are the key points that we noted:

- *Compliance with geotechnical recommendations:* Ngaati Whanaunga notes that a method statement and certification from a qualified engineer is required to ensure that construction works adhere to the Geotechnical Report recommendations.
- *Archaeological management:* The draft Archaeological Management Plan outlines that a project archaeologist will monitor and record any archaeological findings as may be stipulated by consent conditions. We recommend proposed conditions of consent relating to the sought archaeological authority that include a placeholder for iwi information.
- *Protected customary rights:* It is posited that no protected customary rights pertain to the site, hence no assessment requirement under specified clauses of the FTAA.

- *Historic heritage and character:* The surrounding location includes scheduled historic heritage buildings. Ngaati Whanaunga notes that conservation plans are typically required for significant alterations, but that the proposed works concerning the façade of the Auckland Harbour Board Workshops will not necessitate a plan since they are not defined as substantial demolition or significant modification.
- *Transport and parking compliance:* Ngaati Whanaunga notes that the application includes an Integrated Transport Assessment as required by relevant regulation to manage the traffic implications of the proposed development.
- *Environmental risks:* Ngaati Whanaunga notes that a hazard risk assessment is necessary for the development because it could be affected by coastal erosion or flooding due to climate factors. We also note that specific assessments related to these risks have been included.
- *Treaty settlement provisions:* Precinct posits that there are no applicable Treaty Settlement Statutory Acknowledgement Areas affecting the site, following its review of relevant iwi settlement Acts and Deeds. Ngaati Whanaunga adds that, although such may be the case, we declare that the subject site is nonetheless part of our *rohe potae* and tribal estate. In making such a declaration, Ngaati Whanaunga in no way disregards *mana i te whenua* held by other iwi and *hapuu* within that *rohe*.
- *Customary Marine Title groups:* Ngaati Whanaunga acknowledges that the subject site does not intersect with any customary marine title groups or the requirements stemming from the Marine and Coastal Area Act.
- *Proposed consent conditions:* Ngaati Whanaunga acknowledges the section covering draft consent conditions; that they focus on managing adverse effects, mitigation measures, monitoring plans, and ensuring compliance with RMA requirements. In reviewing the proposed consent conditions, Ngaati Whanaunga also notes that amongst 65 pages covering some 30 conditions of consent, there are no express conditions referencing Maaori cultural values, notwithstanding the attachment to that document of the *Te Pūmanawa O Tāmaki* report by Haumi.
- *Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP):* Ngaati Whanaunga acknowledges that the proposal is assessed against various statutory provisions, including national and regional standards, with the intent to ensure consistency with the City Centre Zone aims in the AUP.
- *Mitigation and monitoring:* Various management plans are proposed to mitigate adverse effects from construction, including construction management, noise management, and ecological considerations.

7.3. Arotake taiao

Section 9.0 of the Barker document assesses the development's effects on the environment, surrounding communities, and the economy. Ngaati Whanaunga considers that this suitably portrays a commitment on the part of Precinct to mitigate adverse effects through various management practices and monitoring. The overall outlook proposed by the Precinct is that the development will enhance the precinct significantly, providing substantial benefits while managing associated risks effectively. Ngaati Whanaunga's summation is, with appropriate management and mitigation measures, any adverse effects from the development are conscionable given benefits resulting from it; such benefits include growth, employment opportunities, and urban regeneration. Here the key points that we have noted:

- *The neighbourhood and broader community:* The assessment considers the effects on the immediate neighbourhood and the broader community. We note the inclusion of Appendix 8, listing the owners and occupiers of adjacent lands who may be impacted.
- *Geotech and site stability:* The site has been assessed for geotechnical hazards, highlighting that no significant risks are predicted, if engineering recommendations are followed. Ngaati Whanaunga notes that the geotechnical reports include suggested mitigations for risks associated with seismic activity and groundwater.
- *Contamination:* Preliminary assessments indicate potential soil and groundwater contamination due to the site's historical uses. Ngaati Whanaunga supports the requirement, as part of anticipated consent conditions, of the Detailed Site Investigation (DSI) and the Contamination Site Management Plan.
- *Noise and vibration:* Ngaati Whanaunga notes the anticipation of excessive noise during construction, and we also note mitigation measures to minimise disturbance such as restricted working hours and noise barriers. Post-construction, we note operational noise effects from mixed-use activities at the site are anticipated to be consistent with an urban high noise environment.
- *Flood and coastal hazards:* Ngaati Whanaunga notes that flood risks are assessed with mitigation measures proposed such as elevated floor levels and flood barriers. Risk to adjoining properties has also been considered. We also acknowledge the long-term adaptability of the development regarding future sea-level rise and flooding.
- *Social and economic effects:* As already stated, Ngaati Whanaunga acknowledges the projected overall social and economic benefits. We concur with the view that these positive impacts outweigh temporary construction-related disruptions.

7.4. Ngaa tikanga aa ture

This section is our review of relevant statutory considerations, specifically those that sit under the FTAA. The assessment concludes that the proposal is consistent with the FTAA and relevant statutory considerations, thus setting the stage for the next steps in the approval process.

With reference to certain critical statutory documents, Ngaati Whanaunga comments as follows.

- *National Environmental Standards:* Ngaati Whanaunga acknowledges that the documents demonstrate the application's compliance with National Environmental Standards.
- *National Policy Statements:* Ngaati Whanaunga views the proposal as aligning with the objectives of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD). This policy statement focuses on creating well-functioning urban environments. As already stated, we see the development as being positive for urban growth, facilitating improved integration with transport infrastructure and contributing to sustainability goals by, for example, reducing greenhouse gas emissions through decreased car parking.
- *New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement:* Even though the proposal does not directly involve coastal marine activities, given the development's proximity to Te Waitemataa, the NZCPS is acknowledged as an important reference.

7.5. Ngaa whakaritenga

With reference to Appendix 24 *Proposed Conditions*, we comment that to the extent that we can ascertain through the information made available to us, we believe that the proposal is a significant opportunity for urban development that supports regional growth and urban density, while mitigating short-term disruptions and longer-term environmental impacts. We believe that with appropriate conditions, significant potential effects can be adequately avoided, remedied, or mitigated. However, we note that according to our reading, amongst 65 pages covering some 30 conditions of consent, there are no express conditions referencing Maori cultural values.

8. Whakataunga

This report commenced with *Te Tuu o Ngaati Whanaunga*, and our connection with *te taiao*, setting out whakapapa and the cultural frame of reference for the report. Thereafter, we discussed Ngaati Whanaunga’s cultural values in the context of the proposed development and the application information made available to us. Then, in section 7, we provided commentary on and our observations of the various technical assessments and appendices to the Barker head document – or at least such as were provided to us. We are now at the point where we can bring all of that together into a suite of recommendations that are presented in the table below.

Recommendations
<p>Ngaati Whanaunga recommends that Precinct:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Engage with <i>tangata whenua</i> to incorporate cultural narratives in the project design; for example, in integrating the functionality of building lobbies and shopfronts with expression of <i>tangata whenua</i> cultural narratives and that <i>iwi</i> and <i>hapuu</i> that have <i>mana i te whenua</i> be involved.2. Include Ngaati Whanaunga in any further work of integration of cultural identity in design.3. Engage with <i>tangata whenua</i> (rather than outside consultants) in relation to any future work that draws from “Maaori inherited knowledge and lived relationships”.4. Engage <i>tangata whenua</i> to contribute to developing integrating cultural experiences, such as traditional Maaori performances, workshops, or food offerings within the complex.5. Ensure that the <i>iwi</i> representatives are informed at least 48 hours before the start of any works requiring archaeological monitoring, and that Precinct recommend to the Panel that this be a condition of consent or archaeological authority.6. Ensure that a placeholder for <i>iwi</i> information be included in any conditions of consent relating to the sought after archaeological authority.

9. Papakupu

A glossary of terms. When used in this report, the following te reo Whanaunga terms and phrases may be interpreted thus:

Ahi kaa	The principle of maintaining the "home fires" and ongoing presence of <i>mana whenua</i> .
Āpōpō atu nei	The future
Arotake taiao	Environmental assessment
Haa	The breath of life; life essence
Hapuu	Sub-tribe
He koorero whakataki	Preface
Kaitiakitanga	Stewardship
Kei a Ngaati Whangaunga he wahanga mana i te whenua o roto o Taamaki	Ngaati Whanaunga has mana derived from whenua in Taamaki
Mahi toi	Cultural artistry, and creative and performing arts
Mai i te Taunga mai o Tauwi Tae Noa ki te Tuku Kereme WAI100	From the time of European contact to WAI 100, the Hauraki Inquiry before the Waitangi Tribunal
Maatauranga Whanaunga me te māatauranga tauwi	Ngaati Whanaunga traditional knowledge and western science
Mana	Authority, prestige, and status
Mauri	Life essence
Mauri tuu	The concept of maintaining the life force
Ngaa whakaritenga	(Proposed) consent conditions

Nгаа Hapuu o Ngaati Whanaunga	Ngaati Whanaunga hapuu
Nгаа tikanga taiao	Dimensions of the natural world
Ngaati Whanaunga ki Taamaki	Ngaati Whanaunga in Auckland
Oo raaua hononga	Their connections
Taha wairua	The spiritual dimension
Taamaki	Auckland
Te Anga Whakamua o Ngaati Whanunga	Ngaati Whanaunga's strategic direction
Te Hononga ki Taamaki Me Oona Hapuu Katoa	Cultural ties in Auckland
Te Mana Taawharau o Ngaati Whanaunga	Ngaati Whanaunga Incorporated Society
Te Reo Whanaaunga	The language of Ngaati Whanaunga
Te reo me oona ake tikanga	The language and its cultural underpinnings
Te Rohe Pootae o Ngaati Whanaunga	Ngaati Whanaunga's tribal estate
Te Tuu o Ngaati Whanaunga	Ngaati Whanaunga's world view
Te Whakaminega o Marutuahu	The Marutuahu confederation
Tikanga	Custom and lore
Tikanga taiao	Resource management

Tohutohu	Signs, symbols, and indicators
Whakapapa	Origin and connection
Whakaraapopototanga	Executive summary
Whakataunga	Conclusion and recommendations
Whanaungatanga	Kinship