

Specialist Response Template – Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 – substantive Application

Technical Specialist Memo – Mat Collins Transport planning and transport engineering

To:

Warwick Pascoe – Premium Project Lead  
Celia Wong – Senior Planner, Resource Consents  
Louise Barclay & Jo Hart – Senior Planner, Notices of Requirement

From:

Mat Collins, Associate Transport Planner, Abley Ltd

Qualifications  
& Relevant  
Experience:

I hold the qualification(s) of Bachelor of Engineering (Hons) in Civil Engineering and have 11 years of experience in transport planning and transport engineering. I have prepared specialist transport assessments and expert evidence for resource consents, plan changes, district plan reviews, Notices of Requirement and fast-track approvals act applications for Councils and applicants around New Zealand. I have appeared as an expert witness before consent authorities and the Environment Court.

Preparation in  
Accordance  
with the Code  
of Conduct:

I confirm that I have read the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 – Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses ([Code](#)), and have complied with it in the preparation of this memorandum. I also agree to follow the Code when participating in any subsequent processes, such as expert conferencing, directed by the Panel. I confirm that the opinions I have expressed are within my area of expertise and are my own, except where I have stated that I am relying on the work or evidence of others, which I have specified.

Date:

13 May 2026

## 1.0 APPLICATION DESCRIPTION

### Application and property details

Fast-Track project name:

North West Rapid Transit

Fast-Track application number:

FTAA-2511-1146

**Council Resource Consent References:**

BUN60461580

LUC60461581

DIS60461582 (contamination)

CST60461583 (structures)

CST60461584 (disturbance of seabed (other))

CST60461585 (veg removal)

WAT60461586 (groundwater)

LUS60461587 (structure)

LUS60461588 (works)

**Notice(s) of Requirement**

NOR number	Description
NoR 1	Busway between Brigham Creek Rarawaru station and north of Westgate Te Waiarohia station (including stations, Park and Ride and all local road connections)
NoR 2	Busway between north of Westgate Te Waiarohia station and north of Royal Road Mānutewhau station (including stations, Park and Ride and all local road connections)
NoR 3	Busway between Royal Road Mānutewhau Station and Te Whau River (including all stations and local road connections)
NoR 4	Brigham Creek Rarawaru station including Park and Ride
NoR 5	Westgate Te Waiarohia station
NoR 6	Royal Road Mānutewhau station
NoR 7	Lincoln Road Wai o Pareira station
NoR 8	Te Atatū Ōrangihina station
NoR 9	Busway between Waterview interchange and west of Ivanhoe Road (including all stations and local road connections)
NoR 10	Busway between Ivanhoe Road and Ian McKinnon Drive (including all stations and local road connections)
NoR 11	Point Chevalier station
NoR 12	Western Springs station

Site address:

Generally alongside State Highway 16 between Brigham Creek and Auckland City Centre

- NWRT\_Part 6\_5\_Property Schedule\_Land within designation boundary and

- NWRT\_Part 6\_6\_Property Schedule\_Landadjacent to the designation boundary)

## 2.0 Executive Summary / Principal Issues

This memo provides Auckland Council's final specialist transport input on the Northwest Rapid Transit Project (the Project) as lodged under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024.

Overall findings:

- The transport effects of the Project are generally well understood and appropriately assessed at designation stage.
- The envelope-of-effects approach, with construction effects managed through Construction Traffic Management Plans (CTMPs), is appropriate for the scale, duration, and current level of design detail.
- Auckland Transport's (AT) letter of support confirms that effects on the wider operational performance of the transport network do not require further Council assessment.
- In my view, Council's remaining transport interest is appropriately limited to temporary and permanent effects on property access, servicing, and Council assets.

Key matters requiring attention:

- I consider that targeted refinements to the CTMP condition framework are required to ensure that the management measures relied upon in the Assessment of Transport Effects are clearly secured.
- I recommend that a specific Existing Property Access condition is included to provide certainty where the designation affects existing accesses, including where the designation extends across local roads or property frontages.

Subject to these refinements, I support the Project from a transport effects perspective.

Furthermore, I suggest:

- an advice note is considered regarding vehicle crossings, particularly where these may be onto arterial roads
- Council satisfy itself that asset owner matters, such as the loss of Council car parks, can be appropriately addressed through the Public Works Act (PWA).

## 3.0 Documents Reviewed

- Substantive application documents including (transport matters only):
  - Part 2 – The Project
  - Part 4 – Resource Management Act 1991 Approvals
  - Part 6/1 and 6/2 – Indicative Design
  - Part 6/3 – Indicative Cross Section
  - Part 6/4 – Designation Plans
  - Part 6/20 – Assessment of Transport Effects (ATE)
  - Auckland Transport Letter of Support
- Comment Response Register, incorporating NZTA responses to Council comments (NZTA comments dated 20 April 2026 and 30 April 2026)
- Minute 3 and Minute 5 issued by the Expert Panel.

#### 4.0 Additional Reasons for Consent Not included in AEE (Resource Consent only)

No additional reasons for consent have been identified.

The project may include temporary and/or permanent vehicle crossings onto arterial roads. NZTA has stated that any new proposed vehicle crossings would require approval from Auckland Transport (AT) as Road Controlling Authority (RCA) for arterial roads in Auckland, and that AT has an established vehicle crossing application process separate to this consenting process. I agree with NZTA.

I also note that NZTA would be required to seek resource consent for any vehicle crossing onto an arterial road or within a vehicle access restriction. I recommend that an advice note is included to address this matter.

#### 5.0 Specialist Assessment (Notice(s) of Requirement and Resource Consent)

##### **Scope of Transport Review**

In my opinion, Auckland Transport's (AT) letter of support confirms that Council does not need to give consideration to adverse effects on the transport network. Similarly, both AT and NZTA are road controlling authorities and have an overarching responsibility to provide a safe, efficient, and effective transport network.

On this basis, my review does not include:

- Assessment of the detailed design of works within the designation boundaries
- Review of the transport modelling used to support the application
- Assessment of works within Auckland Transport corridors
- Any other matters relating to the safe and efficient operation of the existing or future transport network.

In my view, Council's interest in transport effects is appropriately limited to how the designation may affect safe and efficient access to, and circulation within, private property during both the construction phase and once the Project is complete. However, I have recommended amendments to proposed conditions that step into the realm of AT's network, where I consider these are necessary.

Other than as discussed below, I consider the application material and NZTA's responses to Council transport related comments have adequately addressed the potential transport effects of the application.

##### **Construction Effects and CTMP Framework**

The ATE identifies a wide range of temporary construction transport effects, including delays, access disruption and impacts on public transport and active modes. I agree that these effects are anticipated and can be appropriately managed through CTMPs prepared at the Outline Plan stage.

However, several targeted refinements are required to ensure the CTMP condition framework fully supports the assessment and recommendations of the ATE, including provision for:

- Managing effects on public transport during construction
- Consideration of construction sequencing to manage traffic effects
- Other minor amendments for clarity.

## **Property Access**

The designation boundary affects a number of properties and, in some locations, includes parts of the local road network (e.g. Keppell Street, King Street, Bond Street, Royal Road, Te Atatū Road, Triangle Road and Kasia Close). During pre-lodgement and in my comments on the substantive application I raised concerns about the effect on property access once construction was complete (effects on access during construction being managed via the CTMP).

In its response to Council, NZTA stated that the Outline Plan is legally required to address vehicle access to private properties via s176A(3)(d), and that the requirements of the Government Roding Powers Act and Public Works Act will ensure that properties with existing access continue to be provided with access following construction. NZTA stated that the designation boundary extended over local roads only for the purpose of construction activity, and that no local roads would be closed once construction is completed.

I am not an expert in the Government Roding Powers Act and Public Works Act and therefore cannot provide an opinion on whether these Acts give certainty to affected landowners. While s176A(3)(d) identifies vehicular access and circulation must be addressed as part of OPW, in my view a targeted condition is appropriate, to give landowners certainty that potential effects on property access will be appropriately discussed with them and addressed by NZTA, particularly given the long lapse time and flexibility in design sought by NZTA. Furthermore, I note that a number of designations (largely applied for via the Supporting Growth Alliance), including an “Existing Property Access” condition to address exactly this uncertainty<sup>1</sup>.

## **Impact on Council owned car parks**

### **Point Chevalier car park**

The ATE identifies that the council-owned car park on the southern side of Great North Road in Point Chevalier, comprising approximately 102 parking spaces, will likely need to be removed to accommodate construction works. Commercial activities on Great North Road also rely on a service lane adjacent to this car park.

The ATE concludes that the transport effects associated with the removal of this car park are expected to be low. This conclusion is supported by an AT parking survey, which indicates that the majority of parking demand is associated with long-stay use, with an average duration of stay of approximately 5.5 hours. Short-stay demand was observed to be relatively limited, and alternative parking opportunities are available within the surrounding area, including on-street parking, nearby private parking associated with businesses and supermarkets, and public transport options.

In my view, the assessment appropriately characterises the transport effects of the car park removal. I assume that any permanent loss of the council-owned parking asset can be addressed through the PWA, including compensation where applicable, and recommend that Council satisfy itself that this is the case. The management of any consequential changes to on-street parking controls, if required to respond to displaced demand, falls within AT’s operational responsibilities rather than the designation framework.

---

<sup>1</sup> Designation 6766 Condition 9, 6780 Condition 10, 6782 Condition 11, 6783 Condition 10, 6784 Specific Outline Plan Requirement OPW2, 6785 Condition 10, 6787 Condition 10, 6788 Condition 10, 6789 Condition 10.

<https://unitaryplan.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/images/Auckland%20Unitary%20Plan%20Operative/Chapter%20K%20Designations/New%20Zealand%20Transport%20Agency.pdf>

With respect to the service lane providing access to properties fronting Great North Road, this will be reinstated upon completion of the works, and I consider that disruption during construction can be suitably managed through the CTMP.

### **Western Springs Gardens car park**

The Project will result in the removal of the Western Springs Gardens car park. While the substantive application documents do not quantify parking demand for this facility to the same extent as was undertaken for the Point Chevalier car park, the nature of the effect is similar.

As with the Point Chevalier car park, I assume that any permanent loss of the Western Springs Gardens car park can be appropriately addressed through the Public Works Act. Any required changes to on-street parking management to respond to altered demand patterns are a matter for AT as road controlling authority and do not require further management through designation conditions.

### **Panel Minutes**

I have considered Minute 3 and Minute 5 issued by the Expert Panel.

Minute 3 raises questions regarding the overall conditions framework and the omission of a “general accordancy” condition. In my view, these matters sit primarily within the planning and legal domain. From a transport perspective, my review remains focused on whether the proposed transport-specific conditions are suitable to manage the construction and operational transport effects identified in the ATE.

Several transport-specific queries raised by the Panel in Minute 5 align with pre-lodgement and substantive application review comments I have provided, particularly in relation to whether the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) condition framework adequately secures the mitigation relied upon in the ATE.

## **6.0 Section 67 Information Gap**

I have not identified any section 67 information gaps relating to transport matters.

## **7.0 Recommendation**

Overall, I consider that the transport effects of the Project can be appropriately managed, subject to the adoption of my recommended refinements to the CTMP condition framework and the inclusion of a targeted condition addressing existing property access. These changes provide additional clarity and robustness while remaining consistent with the effects-envelope approach adopted in the application.

I also suggest an advice note be included regarding any future vehicle crossings onto arterial roads, however I do not consider this to be a critical matter.

Finally, I recommend that Council satisfy itself that asset owner matters, such as the loss of Council car parks, can be appropriately addressed through the PWA.

## 8.0 Proposed Conditions (Resource Consent)

NZTA has not proposed resource consent conditions relating to transport matters, nor do I consider any are necessary.

The project may include temporary and/or permanent vehicle crossings onto arterial roads, however these have not been fully detailed at this stage. NZTA has stated that any new proposed vehicle crossings would require approval from AT. I also note that NZTA would be required to seek resource consent for any vehicle crossing that did not comply with **E27.6.4 Access**. I suggest an advice note be included to highlight this requirement as follows.

**Advice note:**

Any temporary or permanent vehicle crossing within the road reserve will require prior approval from Auckland Transport. The requiring authority should contact Auckland Transport as soon as possible to ensure any required approvals are issued prior to construction.

Temporary or permanent vehicle crossings may require resource consent.

## 9.0 Proposed Conditions (Notices of Requirement)

Other than as stated below, I support the proposed conditions as they relate to transport matters.

I suggest the following amendments and additions in the table below.

9.0 Proposed Conditions (Notices of Requirement)			
My amendment to proposed condition (in red)	My explanation	NZTA comment on Council amendments to conditions (20 and 30 April 2026)	My comment
<b>16. Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)</b>			
<i>(b) (vii) Measures to maintain safe and efficient access to, and from <b>and within</b> properties and/or private roads where practicable, or to provide alternative arrangements where this is not practicable, including details of how access and circulation will be managed for loading and unloading of goods, rubbish collection, and mail/courier deliveries.</i>	Refines the CTMP requirement relating to property access to better capture internal circulation and servicing activities. This change is consistent with NZTA's decision on the NoR for the New Rapid Transit Corridor between Albany and Milldale <sup>4</sup> .	Nil	I recommend my amendment is adopted for the reasons described.
<i>(b) (vi) Measures to maintain the function of the <b>North-western Shared User Path</b> to a reasonable level of service, to the extent that is reasonably practicable, and where this is not practicable, provide safe detour routes that provide a reasonable level of service.</i>	Clarifies the identity of the shared user path to avoid ambiguity.	Nil	I recommend my amendment is adopted for the reasons described.
<i><b>vi.(a) Measures to maintain the function of Public Transport services to a reasonable level of service, to the extent that is reasonably practicable, and where this is not practicable, provide safe detour routes that provide a reasonable level of service. This shall include:</b></i>  <i>1. <b>Maintaining two-way bus movements on the Carrington Road bridge throughout the construction period</b></i>	Introduces an explicit requirement to manage public transport impacts. This aligns with recommendations in Section 3.4.2 of the Assessment of Transport Effects, including for the Carrington Road bridge.	NZTA does not consider the addition of b(vi)(a) to be necessary or appropriate. The term "reasonable level of service" is highly uncertain. The function of public transport services during construction will be discussed with AT through the CAR process. Additionally, the existing b(iii) will address impacts on public transport service levels (as it relates to vehicular traffic) and b(v) covers safe detour routes. Further, NZTA cannot commit to proposed b(vi)(1) relating to the Carrington Road bridge at all times during the construction period.  In relation to the proposed addition of b(xiii), scheduling of road closures will be considered through b(iii).	I consider the CTMP should specifically recognise the importance of maintaining Public Transport operations and, in our view, b(ii) does not address this.  I am concerned that NZTA cannot commit to maintaining bus operations on Carrington Road bridge. Section 3.4.2 of the ATE identifies that:  "Detours [should Carrington Road bridge be closed to buses] are not considered feasible for buses, as alternative routes would significantly increase travel times and cause substantial disruption for public transport users."
<i>(b) (x) Details of minimum network performance parameters during the construction phase including any measures to monitor compliance with the performance parameters. <b>This shall include consideration of construction sequencing within individual work packages, and coordination with other work packages within the Project and with other concurrent projects in the area.</b></i>	Acknowledges that construction activities may not occur in isolation and require coordination to manage cumulative effects, including staging recommended by the ATE and cumulative effects that may arise from third-party projects affecting the transport network.	NZTA considers the proposed addition of b(xiv) is not necessary or appropriate. Part 4 of the Application states:  "I note that specific recommendations in Ms Bates' report regarding construction sequencing (intended to manage potential construction traffic effects) are based on the Indicative Design. These matters will be considered through the development of the CTMP and the preparation of approvals from the relevant road controlling authority for local road works. I agree with Ms Bates that these are best developed further in the CTMP for a specific stage of work, when detailed design and construction methodologies are available."	I emphasise that NZTA's response is in relation to a similar, but more specific, condition than my recommended amendments in Column 1.  I consider my amendment to Condition 16(b)(x) strikes a middle ground between the specific staging requirements requested by Auckland Council (in condition b(xiv)), and the flexibility sought by NZTA, while achieving the desired outcome of managing potential construction traffic effects.
<i><b>X. Existing Property Access</b></i> <i><b>Prior to submission of the Outline Plan, consultation shall be undertaken with landowners and occupiers whose vehicle access to their property will be altered by the project. The Outline Plan shall demonstrate how safe reconfigured or alternate access will be provided.</b></i>	An additional condition relating to existing property access is appropriate, as the Project will in some instances require changes to existing vehicle accesses. While the Public Works Act provides for compensation where access is permanently affected, and CTMPs manage temporary construction effects, this condition ensures that safe access outcomes are addressed at the Outline Plan stage. This approach is consistent with NZTA's decision on the NoR for the New Rapid Transit Corridor between Albany and Milldale <sup>5</sup> .	The Outline Plan is legally required to address vehicle access (s176A(3)(d)). Further, the requirements of the Government Roadworks Powers Act and Public Works Act will ensure that properties with existing access continue to be provided with access following roadworks. The condition proposed by AC would duplicate existing (and well established) processes, and is unnecessary.	My experience is that this type of condition is included where effects to property access are uncertain.  For example, the following designations <sup>6</sup> include this condition: Designation 6766 Condition 9, 6780 Condition 10, 6782 Condition 11, 6783 Condition 10, 6784 Specific Outline Plan Requirement OPW2, 6785 Condition 10, 6787 Condition 10, 6788 Condition 10, 6789 Condition 10.

10.0 Designation Review Matrix – Specialist Review				
NOR number	Location Description	Information Adequacy (High / Moderate / Low)	Key Issues Identified	Comments / Recommendations

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/content/dam/ac/docs/plans/unitary/nor/nor-1/sg-north-nor-1-nzta-decision.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> Ibid

<sup>6</sup> <https://unitaryplan.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/images/Auckland%20Unitary%20Plan%20Operative/Chapter%20K%20Designations/New%20Zealand%20Transport%20Agency.pdf>

NoR 1	Busway between Brigham Creek Rarawaru station and north of Westgate Te Waiarohia station (including stations, Park and Ride and all local road connections) (0.3km length)	High	Nil.	Refer to Section 9 above. It appears that existing vehicle access will not be affected, therefore the “Existing Vehicle Access” condition may not be required.
NoR 2	Busway between north of Westgate Te Waiarohia station and north of Royal Road Mānutewhau station (including stations, Park and Ride and all local road connections) (3.3km length)	High	Nil.	Refer to Section 9 above.
NoR 3	Busway between Royal Road Mānutewhau Station and Te Whau River (including all stations and local road connections) (5km length)	High	Nil.	Refer to Section 9 above.
NoR 4	Brigham Creek Rarawaru station including Park and Ride (within NoR 1)	High	Nil.	Refer to Section 9 above. It appears that existing vehicle access will not be affected, therefore the “Existing Vehicle Access” condition may not be required.
NoR 5	Westgate Te Waiarohia station (within NoR 2)	High	Nil.	Refer to Section 9 above.
NoR 6	Royal Road Mānutewhau station (within NoR 3)	High	Nil.	Refer to Section 9 above.
NoR 7	Lincoln Road Wai o Pareira station (within NoR 3)	High	Nil.	Refer to Section 9 above.
NoR 8	Te Atatū Ōrangihina station (within NoR 3)	High	Nil.	Refer to Section 9 above.
NoR 9	Busway between Waterview interchange and west of Ivanhoe Road (including all stations and local road connections) (2.7km length)	High	Nil.	Refer to Section 9 above.
NoR 10	Busway between Ivanhoe Road and Ian McKinnon Drive (including all stations and local road connections) (2.7km length)	High	Nil.	Refer to Section 9 above.
NoR 11	Point Chevalier station (within NoR 9)	High	Nil.	Refer to Section 9 above.
NoR 12	Western Springs station (within NoR 10)	High	Nil.	Refer to Section 9 above.