

Before an Expert Panel

Under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (**Act**)

And

In the matter of an application for approvals by New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (**NZTA**) to develop a rapid transit link, associated infrastructure and connections between Brigham Creek and Auckland City Centre (**NWRT Project**).

Legal statement on behalf of Stride Holdings Limited in relation to
the NZTA NWRT Project

Dated 26 May 2026

MAY IT PLEASE THE PANEL

INTRODUCTION

1. This statement is made in support of Stride Holdings Limited (**Stride's**) comments to the expert panel for the North West Rapid Transit Project (**NWRT Project**). Stride has been invited to comment on the NWRT Project as an affected and adjacent landowner under section 53 of the Fast-track Approvals Act (**FTA or Act**).
2. Stride is an NZX listed property ownership and investment management business with a property portfolio spanning the country, which includes the NorthWest Shopping Centre and NorthWest Two (**NorthWest**), zoned Metropolitan Centre zone (**MCZ**) in Westgate Precinct (Sub-precinct A). Stride's investors include institutional investors (such as KiwiSaver funds) to individual 'ma and pa' investors.¹
3. NorthWest is Stride's largest and most valuable directly owned retail asset, at \$171.45 million (as at 30 September 2025).² Stride's initial total investment in the acquisition and development of NorthWest was approximately \$200 million.³ Stride is now seeking to implement its Resource Consent for the logical expansion of NorthWest towards Gunton Drive. Stride has invested nearly \$1 million to date in the Resource Consent and the construction costs of this project will be approximately \$485 million,⁴ with anticipated returns in excess of \$500 million.⁵
4. As outlined in the statement of Mr Stansfield, Stride is broadly supportive of the NWRT Project in principle.⁶ Stride has engaged with NZTA and Auckland Transport (**AT**) over the last 10 years to support public transport to Westgate. However, the proposed NoRs as notified have inadequately identified and assessed the significant adverse effects on NorthWest from the proposed land take and construction. It is critical that the NWRT Project support, and

¹ Statement of evidence of Roy Stansfield at [14].

² Statement of evidence of Roy Stansfield at [15].

³ Statement of evidence of Roy Stansfield at [20].

⁴ Statement of evidence of Roy Stansfield at [36].

⁵ Statement of evidence of Roy Stansfield at [49].

⁶ Statement of evidence of Roy Stansfield at [7].

not significantly adversely affect or undermine the operation and development of NorthWest as a regionally significant centre.

5. NZTA has failed to appreciate, assess and take into account the significant adverse effects of the proposed land take on the ability for Stride to proceed with its Resource Consent, and to realise the development potential of the Site.
6. NZTA has also failed to assess and take into account the significant adverse effects on the operation of NorthWest and the wider Westgate Precinct during the construction period.
7. There is simply insufficient information before the Panel to support the approval of NoR 2 and its encroachment onto NorthWest. Stride seeks that NoR 2 be refused, or alternatively that NZTA confirms that the alignment of this section of the busway will be Option 3 with the consequential removal of the NoR 2 boundary off Stride's site and Gunton Drive.
8. Stride also seeks a suite of conditions to avoid significant adverse effects on the operation of NorthWest before, during and post the construction period.
9. Stride has provided the following statements in support of its position on the NWRT Project:
 - (a) Statement of corporate evidence by Mr Roy Stansfield;
 - (b) Statement of traffic evidence by Mr Don McKenzie; and
 - (c) Statement of engineering evidence by Mr Steven Rankin.

SCOPE AND STRUCTURE OF THIS STATEMENT

10. This statement addresses the following:
 - (a) Metropolitan Centre Zone (**MCZ**) under the Auckland Unitary Plan (**AUP**);
 - (b) Existing environment and implications of NoR 2;
 - (c) NZTA's legal submissions;

- (d) Assessment and weighting process under the FTA;
 - (e) Information requirements for the NWRT Project under the FTA;
 - (f) Scope for Panel to decline the NWRT Project under the FTA;
 - (g) NZTA can amend NoR 2;
 - (h) Relief sought.
11. The NWRT Project comprises 12 NoRs in total — 5 primary NoRs and 7 overlapping station NoRs. Stride's submissions relate principally to NoR 2 (Busway between Westgate Station Te Waiarohia and South of Royal Road Station) and NoR 5 (Westgate Te Waiarohia Station), together with NoR 1 insofar as it relates to the Westgate Precinct. Stride only seeks the refusal of NoR 2 and does not oppose the approval of the other NoRs.

METROPOLITAN CENTRE ZONE UNDER THE AUP

12. Under the AUP, NorthWest is zoned MCZ in Sub-precinct A, Westgate Precinct. MCZ's function as centres serving sub-regional catchments providing for a wide range of commercial, residential, and community activities.⁷ They are second only to the City Centre, intended for growth and intensification, fulfilling an important role within the centre hierarchy.⁸
13. Relevantly, the Regional Policy Statement (**RPS**) recognises that realising Auckland's full economic potential will include efficient infrastructure and integrating this with urban growth:⁹
- (a) Policy B3.3.2(3) is to identify and protect existing and future areas and routes for transport infrastructure;¹⁰ and
 - (b) Policy B3.3.2(4)(a) is to ensure transport infrastructure is designed, located, and managed to integrate with adjacent land uses, taking into

⁷ Auckland Unitary Plan, Chapter H9 Business – Metropolitan Centre Zone, at H9.1 – Zone description.

⁸ Auckland Unitary Plan, Chapter H9 Business – Metropolitan Centre Zone, at H9.2, Objective H9.2(5)(a).

⁹ Auckland Unitary Plan, Regional Policy Statement, Chapter B3 – Infrastructure, transport and energy at B3.1 – Issues.

¹⁰ Auckland Unitary Plan, Regional Policy Statement, Chapter B3 – Infrastructure, transport and energy at Policy B3.3.2(3).

account current and planned use, intensity, scale, character and amenity.¹¹

14. The RPS Urban growth and form objectives also include Objectives B2.2.1(1) and (2):¹²

- (1) A well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.
- (2) A well-functioning urban environment with a quality compact urban form that enables all of the following:
 - (a) a higher-quality urban environment;
 - (b) greater productivity and economic growth;
 - (c) better use of existing infrastructure and efficient provision of new infrastructure;
 - (d) good accessibility for all people, including by improved and more efficient public or active transport;
 - (e) greater social and cultural vitality;
 - (f) better maintenance of rural character and rural productivity;
 - (g) reduced adverse environmental effects; and
 - (h) improved resilience to climate change.

15. NZTA's application concludes that the Project is consistent with the RPS.¹³ However, NZTA's analysis of the RPS provisions above fail to consider and take into account the effects on, and the role and function of, NorthWest and the MCZ. The encroachment of NoR 2 onto NorthWest and the MCZ more broadly does not give effect to these directive¹⁴ objectives and policies of the

¹¹ Auckland Unitary Plan, Regional Policy Statement, Chapter B3 – Infrastructure, transport and energy at Policy B3.3.2(4)(a).

¹² Auckland Unitary Plan, Regional Policy Statement, Chapter B2 Urban growth and form at Objectives B2.2.1(1) and (2).

¹³ Application, Part 4, section 23. NZTA Legal Submissions at [100].

¹⁴ *Southern Cross Healthcare Limited v Eden Epsom Residential Protection Society Incorporated* [2023] NZHC 948 at [121].

RPS.

16. The High Court in *Southern Cross* held that policies framed using the word “enable” are expressed in strong directive language, and are more directive than other verbs used in relation to positive outcomes such as “encourage” or “promote”.¹⁵
17. The ‘enabling’ RPS objectives and policies above must be given significant weight.

EXISTING ENVIRONMENT AND IMPLICATIONS OF NOR 2

18. The statement of Mr Stansfield sets out further detail of the Resource Consent,¹⁶ and that NZTA was made aware of the impacts of NoR 2 and proposed land take on the ability to implement the Resource Consent during direct engagement with Stride.¹⁷ Despite this, NZTA has ignored the Resource Consent as part of the existing environment.¹⁸
19. Mr Stansfield explains that the land take proposed by NoR 2 will stymie the ability to implement the Resource Consent, but also that this loss of valuable development land will severely impact the ability of the site to be developed in a manner and intensity consistent with the MCZ.¹⁹
20. NZTA is seeking a lapse date for the NoRs of 25 years. NZTA has also indicated that the time period for the construction of NoR 2 is within Stage 2, Stage 2B and approximately in 2033 – 2036 (10 years away). However, there is no certainty of this, with the indicated construction timeframes subject to procurement, property acquisition and funding availability.²⁰
21. Stride cannot be left in limbo for this period with uncertainty of whether the NWRT Project will need its land or not. If Stride proceeds with expansion that excludes the NoR 2 encroachment this will involve a redesign of the master plan and will compromise the intensification able to be achieved on

¹⁵ At [120] - [121]. The High Court’s finding was in relation to Policies B2.8.1(1)-(4) of the Regional Policy Statement chapter of the Auckland Unitary Plan, which all use the term “enable” in relation to positive outcomes relating to social facilities.

¹⁶ Statement of Roy Stansfield at [35]-[49], referring to resource consent LUC60350368.

¹⁷ Statement of Roy Stansfield at [30].

¹⁸ *Queenstown Lakes District Council v Hawthorn Estate Ltd* (2006) 12 ELRNZ 299 (HC).

¹⁹ Statement of Roy Stansfield at [49].

²⁰ Application, Part 2, 4.2.1.

the site. Otherwise, Stride will have to wait, for an unknown time period, until there is certainty on the land take required before it can proceed with expansion of the Centre. Both scenarios are unacceptable and have serious implications. Stride has therefore sought approval from NZTA to proceed with the works authorised by the Resource Consent within NoR 2 under ss 176 and 178 of the RMA.²¹ Stride is awaiting a response from NZTA.

NZTA LEGAL SUBMISSIONS

22. NZTA's legal submissions state that the NWRT Project will provide transformative public transport infrastructure for Auckland.²² NZTA acknowledges the Project is in a highly modified urban environment, dominated by existing major transport infrastructure,²³ but submits in this context, the Project's impacts will be much lower than those of other NZTA projects.²⁴ NZTA has therefore taken the approach that the proposed conditions for the NWRT Project are more streamlined than other projects.²⁵

23. NZTA's legal submissions also make broad statements on the benefits of the NWRT Project, including:²⁶

It will support urban growth in one of the city's largest population growth areas (NorthWest Auckland) and improve accessibility to key employment, retail, education and social destinations along the corridor. ...

The Project will also support urban intensification enabled by the Auckland Unitary Plan (AUP). It will provide wider economic benefits, including increased productivity, and provide a range of social benefits. ...

Further, the Project will delivery [sic] profound and enduring benefits for Auckland and New Zealand, and the adverse impacts are limited and manageable through standard measures.

24. NZTA's characterisation of the urban environment as highly modified to minimise the significance of the Project's impacts is a misconceived starting

²¹ Section 176 of RMA is within Part 8 of the RMA, and Schedule 5 Clause 24 provides that Part 8 of the RMA applies to the Fast-Track Approvals Act process (except section 170).

²² NZTA Legal Submissions at [4].

²³ NZTA Legal Submissions at [9].

²⁴ NZTA Legal Submissions at [10].

²⁵ NZTA Legal Submissions at [12].

²⁶ NZTA Legal Submissions at [4], [5], and [13].

point. This has led to an insufficient assessment of the impacts of the NWRT Project on NorthWest and the Westgate Precinct more broadly, the reality of the impacts does not support the benefits claimed.

25. Because the adverse effects have not been identified and assessed, the “streamlined” conditions are inevitably inadequate to appropriately avoid, mitigate or manage the impacts.
26. The application also presents an ‘indicative design’ only to enable an assessment of the potential effects and ‘effects envelope’. If the Panel approves the designation as sought, NZTA can proceed with the project within the full extent of the effects envelope, which is not adequately defined or assessed.
27. NZTA also seeks to rely on the High Court decision in *Poutama Kaitiaki Charitable Trust v Taranaki Regional Council*²⁷ to submit that owners of properties partly within/adjacent to the NoRs who raise concerns about impacts on their property values or business are to be addressed under the Public Works Act 1981 (**PWA**) and are not for consideration by the Panel.²⁸
28. This is incorrect. A proper reading of *Poutama* is that the RMA is concerned with the proposed activities’ effects, “not the nature of the applicant’s legal rights or interests in land.”²⁹ But this does not mean adverse effects of the proposed land take or construction effects on landowners or business operations are irrelevant considerations. Further, there is no certainty on what land will eventually be required, and therefore compensation payable under the PWA.
29. In *Poutama* the High Court confirmed that the Environment Court had considered and been satisfied that the adverse effects on the Pascoes [the affected landowner] and their land under the Act [RMA] were appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated to the extent possible, and therefore the Environment Court was entitled to leave land acquisition and compensation

²⁷ NZTA Legal submissions at [40.1], citing *Poutama Kaitiaki Charitable Trust v Taranaki Regional Council* [2020] NZHC 3159 at [84].

²⁸ NZTA Legal submissions at [40.1].

²⁹ *Poutama Kaitiaki Charitable Trust v Taranaki Regional Council* [2020] NZHC 3159 at [82], citing *MacLaurin v Hexton Holdings Limited* [2008] NZCA 570, (2008) 10 NZCPR 1 at [47].

to be dealt with under other processes.³⁰

30. NZTA has incorrectly relied on *Poutama*, and as a result have failed to identify and assess critical and substantial adverse effects of the NWRT Project on landowners and business operations. These are relevant and important considerations for the Panel.

ASSESSMENT AND WEIGHTING PROCESS UNDER THE FTA

31. Schedule 5, clause 12 of the FTA provides that a NoR application must include the following information (amongst other matters):³¹
- (a) the effects of the project on the environment with a description of how adverse effects will be mitigated;
 - (b) an assessment of the project against ss 5, 6 and 7 of the RMA and relevant provisions of a national policy statement, regional policy statement, and unitary plan;
 - (c) an assessment of whether the project and designation sought are reasonably necessary for achieving the objectives of the requiring authority;
 - (d) any consideration of alternative sites, routes or methods of undertaking the project or work; and
 - (e) any conditions proposed.
32. Schedule 5 clause 24 of the FTA provides that when considering a notice of requirement, including conditions, the Panel must take into account:
- (a) the purpose of the FTA, being to facilitate the delivery of infrastructure and development projects with significant regional or national benefits and give this the greatest weight; and
 - (b) the provisions of Part 8 of the RMA³² that direct decision making on an application for a designation, including adequate consideration to

³⁰ *Poutama Kaitiaki Charitable Trust v Taranaki Regional Council*, above n 16, at [86].

³¹ Fast-Track Approvals Act 2024, Schedule 5, clause 12(1).

³² Excluding s170 of the RMA.

alternative sites, routes, and methods and explain how the works are reasonably necessary for achieving the project's objectives.³³

33. Under s85(3) of FTA the Panel may decline an approval if:
- (a) The adverse impacts of the proposal are sufficiently significant to be out of proportion to the project's regional or national benefits, even after taking into account:
 - (i) any conditions that the Panel may set in relation to those adverse impacts; and
 - (ii) any conditions or modifications that NZTA may agree to or propose to avoid, remedy, mitigate or offset or compensate for those adverse impacts.
34. The panel deciding the Bledisloe North Wharf and Fergusson North Berth Extension application set out what is required in giving greatest weight to the purpose of the FTA. It found that a panel must not rely solely on the purpose of the FTA at the expense of other matters, and must consider the other matters on an individual basis before standing back and conducting overall weighting.³⁴
35. In respect of the assessment of effects, the panel in *Bledisloe* also found:³⁵
- The purpose of the FTAA is not logically relevant to an assessment of environmental effects. Environmental effects do not become less than minor simply because of the purpose of the FTAA. What changes is the weight to be placed on those more than minor effects; they may be outweighed by the purpose of facilitating the delivery of infrastructure and development projects with significant regional or national benefit, or they may not.*
36. The panel for the Waitaha Hydro Project also had the task of considering a regionally significant project that gave rise to significant adverse effects on a regionally significant matter. The panel adopted a structured approach – to

³³ Fast-Track Approvals Act 2024, Schedule 5 Clause 24, providing that section 168(3B)(b) of the RMA is applicable.

³⁴ Bledisloe North Wharf and Fergusson North Berth Extension, FTAA Panel Decision, 21 August 2025, at [120] – [121].

³⁵ Bledisloe North Wharf and Fergusson North Berth Extension, FTAA Panel Decision, 21 August 2025, at [121].

assess the relevant matters (effects and policy considerations) individually, then “stand back” and perform an overall balancing giving the greatest weight to the FTA purpose.³⁶ In that decision the effects were finely balanced but the policy framework supported approval.³⁷

37. The Panel therefore is required to consider:
- (a) the adverse effects of the NWRT Project, including the effects from the proposed land take and construction effects on property owners and businesses;
 - (b) an assessment of the NWRT Project against the relevant provisions of the planning framework, including the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2022 (**NPS-UD**), RPS and AUP;
 - (c) whether the project and designation sought are reasonably necessary for achieving the objectives of NZTA;
 - (d) NZTA’s consideration of alternative sites, routes or methods of undertaking the project or work; and
 - (e) any conditions proposed by NZTA.
38. NorthWest and the MCZ is a regionally significant centre. NZTA has failed to identify and assess the adverse effects on NorthWest and the MCZ in terms of both land take and construction effects.
39. NZTA submits that even if parties argue the Project is not consistent with RMA [and HNZPTA] considerations, the “significant national and regional benefits of the Project weigh powerfully in favour of granting the Application with the Proposed Conditions...”.³⁸
40. The Panel cannot make a finding that the NWRT Project will deliver its purported benefits on the basis of the assessment provided. The failure to adequately assess effects on the receiving environment, manage those effects through robust conditions, and genuinely consider alternatives that

³⁶ Waitaha Hydro Scheme, FTAA Panel Decision, FTAA-2505-1069, at [806].

³⁷ Waitaha Hydro Scheme, FTAA Panel Decision, FTAA-2505-1069, at [875] – [877].

³⁸ NZTA Legal submissions at [39].

have less impact on private property, means that the Panel cannot confirm that the benefits of the NWRT Project support approval.

INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE NWRT PROJECT UNDER THE FTA

41. The information supporting the NWRT Project is insufficient and inadequate. We expand below with reference to the statements submitted by Stride.

Inadequate identification and assessment of effects

42. NZTA submits that the NWRT Project's potential adverse environmental effects post mitigation are 'moderate' at most, and in a few categories only, and that in many cases effects will be positive.³⁹ NZTA further submits there is no credible argument that adverse impacts will be so significant as to be out of proportion to the national and regional benefits of the NWRT Project.⁴⁰

43. This position is wrong. As set out in the statements on behalf of Stride, the impacts of the NWRT Project, and in particular NoR 2, will have significant and enduring adverse impacts on the operation and development of NorthWest, and the Westgate Precinct.

44. The Panel cannot be satisfied that it has sufficient information to assess the adverse effects of NoR 2 of the NWRT Project, and it follows that the proposed mitigation is also incomplete and insufficient.

Inadequate assessment of alternatives

45. In considering alternatives, NZTA must demonstrate that it sufficiently investigated alternative sites, routes, or methods for delivering the NWRT Project.⁴¹ A more careful consideration of alternatives is required where adverse effects are significant.⁴² Where private land is affected, consideration should be given to an alternative where no private land is involved and be proportionate to the extent of effects.⁴³ Adequate

³⁹ Legal submissions at [33.8].

⁴⁰ Legal submissions at [33.9].

⁴¹ *Queenstown Airport Corporation Ltd v Queenstown Lakes District Council* [2013] NZHC 2347 at [68].

⁴² *New Zealand Transport Agency v Architectural Centre Inc* [2015] NZHC 1991, at [140]-[142].

⁴³ *New Zealand Transport Agency v Waikato Regional Council* [2023] NZEnvC 55 at [63].

consideration does not mean exhaustive, but rather satisfactory or sufficient.⁴⁴

46. The Panel's task is to assess the adequacy of the process to investigate alternatives – not to decide what route might be more suitable.⁴⁵
47. NZTA's preferred alignment, Option 7, is identified as having 'Large Negative' effects on property. However, this rating has not taken into account the magnitude of the impacts on NorthWest, the MCZ and the Westgate Precinct.
48. Inadequate consideration has been given by NZTA to the alternative options, because:
 - (a) NZTA has failed to understand and take into account the adverse impacts of the NoR proposed land take on NorthWest, the Resource Consent, the ability to develop NorthWest and the MCZ more broadly;
 - (b) NZTA has not adequately weighted the ability for Option 3 to be undertaken largely within the existing NZTA designation, avoiding land take from NorthWest, and significantly reducing land take from the MCZ;
 - (c) NZTA has not adequately identified and assessed the adverse construction effects on NorthWest, its tenants, and the other owners and operators in the MCZ, and Westgate Precinct; and
 - (d) NZTA's MCA is flawed and inconsistent in its scoring methodology and has led to an inappropriate preferred option.
49. Mr Rankin's evidence demonstrates that Option 3 will significantly reduce the requirement for private land take, reduce disruption to NorthWest, the MCZ and the Westgate Precinct during construction, and will meet NZTA's project objectives.

Insufficient assessment against relevant policy statements and plans

⁴⁴ *New Zealand Transport Agency v Waikato Regional Council* [2023] NZEnvC 55 at [62], citing *New Zealand Transport Agency v Architectural Centre Inc* [2015] NZHC 1991 at [137].

⁴⁵ *New Zealand Transport Agency v Waikato Regional Council* [2023] NZEnvC 55 at [65(a)], citing *Queenstown Airport Corp. Ltd v Queenstown Lakes District Council* at [18].

50. NZTA submits that the NWRT Project will contribute to a well-functioning urban environment (in accordance with the NPS-UD),⁴⁶ and as above, that the project is consistent with the RPS.
51. Due to the narrow lens of the assessment undertaken by NZTA, with a focus on the delivery of infrastructure, the adverse effects of the project on the role and function of Auckland's major centre at Westgate has been down-played.
52. NZTA has not demonstrated how the NWRT Project will contribute to a well-functioning urban environment in light of the significant and enduring impacts on NorthWest and the MCZ.

Proposed conditions fail to appropriately avoid, mitigate or manage significant adverse effects

53. NZTA's "streamlined" approach to conditions flows directly from its underassessment of effects.
54. The continued operation of the MCZ during the construction period demands specificity – not a light-handed approach.
55. Stride proposes a suite of conditions to provide more certainty on how adverse effects from the project will be mitigated on the operation of NorthWest and the Westgate Precinct. These are addressed in the evidence of Mr McKenzie and Mr Stansfield, and are also **attached** to this statement as **Appendix A** (and addressed further below).
56. Notwithstanding any change to the boundary of NoR 2 to exclude the NorthWest site, these conditions are required to ensure that significant adverse effects on the operation of NorthWest and the Westgate Precinct do not arise during the long construction period.

SCOPE FOR PANEL TO DECLINE THE NWRT PROJECT UNDER THE FTA

57. The Panel cannot determine the NWRT Project on the basis of the information before it, specifically for NoR 2, because:

⁴⁶ NZTA Legal submissions at [41.3].

- (a) NZTA has not adequately considered alternatives;
- (b) NZTA has not satisfied that the boundaries of NoR 2 are reasonably necessary for achieving the objective of the NWRT Project, when Option 3 for NoR 2 equally achieves the objectives and requires substantially less private land;⁴⁷
- (c) adverse effects have not been identified or assessed; and
- (d) the proposed conditions are not a remedy to significant adverse effects that outweigh the benefits of the Project.

NZTA CAN AMEND NOR 2

58. As identified above, section 85 of the FTA sets out when a panel must or may decline an approval. Section 85(3)(b)(ii) provides that a panel may decline an approval if it forms the view that adverse impacts are sufficiently significant to be out of proportion to the project's regional or national benefits, even after taking into account any conditions *or modifications that the applicant may agree to or propose to avoid, remedy, mitigate, offset, or compensate for those adverse impacts* (emphasis added).
59. As set out above, the effects of NoR 2 on NorthWest and the MCZ are sufficiently significant to be out of proportion to the NWRT Project's benefits.
60. As set out in the evidence of Mr Rankin, there is another option which NZTA identified in its multi-criteria analysis which would achieve the Project's objective and significantly reduce the impacts on NorthWest and the MCZ.
61. It is open to NZTA to propose or agree to a modification of NoR 2 to enable Option 3 and reduce the NoR 2 boundaries to exclude the NorthWest site and Gunton Drive.

⁴⁷ The Environment Court held that a territorial authority may consider the extent of land that would be affected by the designation in considering whether the designation is reasonably necessary for achieving the objectives of the project or work; see *Bungalow Holdings Ltd v North Shore CC* EnvC A052/01 at [66].

RELIEF SOUGHT

62. Stride seeks that NoR 2 of the NWRT Project be declined.
63. Alternatively, to enable approval:
- (a) NZTA must amend NoR 2 to remove the designation boundaries off the NorthWest site and Gunton Drive, and confirm Option 3 as the alignment for NoR 2; and
 - (b) the Panel impose conditions as sought by Stride, as set out in Appendix A below relating to conditions generally, and Appendix B relating to transport conditions and addressed further in the statement of Mr McKenzie.

DATED this 26th day of May 2026



Bianca Tree

Counsel for Stride Holdings Limited

Appendix A – Additional relief sought in respect of conditions

NoR number	Condition number	Condition	Stride comment	Relief sought
Designation conditions				
ALL	1	Lapse	As identified by the Panel ⁴⁸ who has sought additional information on the justification of the lapse date, a 25 year lapse period is an unduly prolonged period of time for a designation to sit on land, creating uncertainty for future site planning and development, particularly compared with the default 10 year RMA lapse period. ⁴⁹	Stride seeks a reduction of the lapse date from 25 years to 15 years for NoR 2 to provide more certainty for this critical part of the transport network.
ALL	9	Flood Hazard	<p>As proposed, this condition provides that the Project will be designed so it does not cause a more than 50mm increase in flood level on land parcels with Building(s) and a Low Danger Rating; or a more than 100mm increase in flood levels on either land parcels with no Buildings present or land parcels with Building(s) and a Moderate or High Danger Rating.</p> <p>Allowing increased flood risk on adjoining properties is inconsistent with and does not give effect to the National Policy Statement on Natural Hazards (NPS NH) and the AUP. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The National Policy Statement on Natural Hazards 2025 directs a proportionate risk-based approach, and Policy 4 specifically provides that <i>where subdivision, use, or development, including any associated mitigation measures, will <u>create or increase significant natural hazard risk</u></i> 	<p>Stride seeks that this condition be amended to be consistent with national policy direction and proposed changes to the AUP to take a risk based approach to flood hazard management to avoid or mitigate adverse effects and to not increase a hazard risk.</p> <p>Specifically, Stride seek that this condition remove any permission for an increase of flood level in any scenario.</p>

⁴⁸ Minute 5 of the Panel dated 7 May 2026 at [3] – [7].

⁴⁹ Section 184 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

			<p><i>on other sites, that risk <u>must be avoided or mitigated using an approach that is proportionate to the level of natural hazard risk.</u></i> (emphasis added).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective E36.2 of the AUP seeks that <i>subdivision, use and development including redevelopment in some areas only occurs where the risks of adverse effects from natural hazards to people, buildings, infrastructure and the environment <u>are not increased overall and where practicable are reduced</u></i> (emphasis added). Proposed new Objective 3A of Plan Change 120 to the AUP seeks that the risk from natural hazards is <i>reduced</i> over time. A condition permitting an increase in flood hazard level is directly contrary to that objective. Similarly, proposed new Objective 3C of PC120 seeks that use and development is managed in away that <i>avoids creating or exacerbating</i> natural hazard risks on other properties. Again, condition 9 as currently proposed is directly contrary to this. <p>Permitting this condition as proposed would potentially result in a design for NoR 2 that would increase flood risk to NorthWest with significant consequences. NZTA's proposed condition is not appropriate in a built urban environment.</p>	
All, or at minimum NoR 1, 2 and 5.	NEW	<p>Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan – NorthWest</p> <p>A specific site-specific approach to take precedence over the generic conditions</p>	<p>Conditions 17, 18 and 19 take an inappropriately broad and generic approach which does not recognise the variables or tolerances of different activities to construction noise and vibration, and the potential effects of these on different buildings and occupants.</p> <p>The generic Construction Noise and Vibration</p>	<p>In a similar approach to the site-specific Construction Traffic Management Plan (addressed in Appendix B and the evidence of Mr McKenzie) Stride seeks the introduction of a new condition requiring a NorthWest-specific CNVMP. This should also include:</p>

		<p>provided for by condition 17(Construction Noise), condition 18 (Construction Vibration Criteria), and condition 19 (Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan).</p>	<p>Management Plan (CNVMP) across 12 NoRs which traverse a significant distance across north-west Auckland and will apply to variable receiving environments is too simplistic and fails to adequately respond to noise and vibration effects on NorthWest.</p> <p>It is appropriate given the highly amenity environment at NorthWest and its proximity to the works that a NorthWest specific CNVMP is prepared.</p> <p>This approach is appropriate to recognise that managing effects on NorthWest is critical to ensure that it can continue to operate through construction, and that effects on amenity, noise and vibration are mitigated to an appropriate level for a highly patronised, people-centric development.</p> <p>This is the approach taken in the Northern Corridor Improvements Proposal Board of Inquiry decision, with conditions that specifically provided for site specific construction noise management plans (SSCNMP) and site specific construction vibration management plans (SSCVMP) for key stakeholders.</p> <p>This approach was also taken in the Eastern Busway EB2 decision, where condition 26 required a site-specific construction management plan for Pakuranga Plaza, and condition 54 required site-specific construction noise and vibration monitoring for The Warehouse Pakuranga.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed building condition surveys before and after works associated with vibration, including piling or heavy earthworks; • Minimum setback distances for high-vibration machinery; • In consultation with including experts engaged on their behalf, identify appropriate daytime noise limits to respond to the consented and development land use, and different tolerance levels between commercial offices (once built per Stride’s expansion), open spaces, and retail activities; • In consultation with Stride including experts engaged on their behalf, identify and set appropriate construction vibration criteria specific to the built form and tolerance of different buildings and occupants within NorthWest; • Monitoring requirements throughout construction to monitor and enforce conditioned noise limits and vibration levels; • Specific provision that this site-specific management plan shall take precedence where there is any inconsistency with the generic noise or vibration conditions or the general CNVMP prepared in accordance with condition 19.
--	--	---	---	---

Appendix B – Transport Conditions

Proposed Traffic Conditions for the NWRT Project

Pre-Construction Conditions

A. Northside Drive Connection

The Requiring Authority shall not commence construction of the project works in the vicinity of Fred Taylor Drive before the Northside Drive bridge across State Highway 16 including motorway on- and off-ramps catering for both northbound and southbound movements are complete and operational.

B. Land Use Integration

- a) The Requiring Authority shall set up a Land use Integration Process for the period between confirmation of the designation and the Start of Construction. The purpose of this process is to encourage and facilitate the integration of master planning and land use development activity on land directly affected or adjacent to the designation. To achieve this purpose:
 - i. within twelve (12) months of the date on which this designation is included in the AUP, the Requiring Authority shall include the contact details of a nominated contact on the project website (or equivalent information source) required to be established by Condition D; and
 - ii. the nominated contact shall be the main point of contact for a Developer or Development Agency wanting to work with the Requiring Authority to integrate their development plans or master planning with the designation.
- b) At any time prior to the Start of Construction, the nominated contact will be available to engage with a Developer or Development Agency for the purpose of:
 - i. responding to requests made to the Requiring Authority for information regarding design details that could assist with land use integration; and
 - ii. receiving information from a Developer or Development Agency regarding master planning or land development details that could assist with land use integration.
- c) Information requested or provided under Condition B(b) above may include but not be limited to the following matters:
 - i. design details including but not limited to:
 - A. boundary treatment (e.g. the use of retaining walls or batter slopes);
 - B. horizontal and vertical alignment of the road (levels);
 - C. potential locations of vehicle and pedestrian crossings;
 - D. integration of stormwater infrastructure;
 - E. outputs from any flood modelling; and
 - F. how to access traffic noise modelling contours to inform adjacent development.
 - ii. potential modifications to the extent of the designation in response to information received through Condition B(b)(ii)
 - iii. a process for the Requiring Authority to undertake a technical review of or provide comments on any master planning or development proposal advanced by the Developer or Development Agency as it relates to integration with the Project; and
 - iv. details of how to apply for written consent from the Requiring Authority for any development proposal that relates to land is within the designation under section 176(1)(b) of the RMA.
- d) Where information is requested from the Requiring Authority and is available, the nominated contact shall provide the information unless there are reasonable grounds for not providing it.
- e) Where a Developer or Development Agency wishes to advance development plans, the Requiring Authority shall:
 - i. Engage with the Developer or Development Agency in good faith to consider how the designation can integrate with the development plans;
 - ii. Use all reasonable endeavours to advance the design of the relevant part of the designation to understand how it can integrate with the development plans;
 - iii. Use all reasonable endeavours to minimise the impact of the designation on development plans (including, but not limited to, considering design and construction methods to minimise the loss of land available for the development plans); and
 - iv. Give notice to Auckland Council under section 182 of the Resource Management Act 1991 where any reduction in the extent of the designation is confirmed.
- f) The nominated contact shall maintain a record of the engagement between the Requiring Authority and Developers and Development Agencies for the period following the date in which this designation is included in the AUP through to the Start of Construction for a Stage of Work. The record shall include:
 - i. a list of all Developers and Development Agencies who have indicated through the Notice of Requirement process that they intend to master plan or develop sites along the Project alignment that may require specific integration with the designation;

Proposed Traffic Conditions for the NWRT Project

- ii. details of any requests made to the Requiring Authority that could influence detailed design, the results of any engagement and, where such requests that could influence detailed design are declined, the reasons why the Requiring Authority has declined the requests; and
 - iii. details of any requests to co-ordinate the forward work programme, where appropriate, with Development Agencies and Network Utility Operators; and
 - iv. Details of any agreed changes to achieve integration with development plans.
- g) The record shall be submitted to Council for information ten working days prior to the Start of Construction for a Stage of Work.

Construction conditions

C. Management Plans – Certification and Review

- a) Management Plans must be submitted to the Council no less than six (6) months prior to construction commencing for the relevant Stage of the Project to which the Management Plan relates for certification or written approval (as determined by the relevant conditions).
- b) For the Management Plans listed in Table 1 below, the Requiring Authority must submit these plans for certification or written (as determined by the relevant consent conditions) no less than six (6) months prior to construction commencing for the relevant Stage of the Project to which the Management Plan relates, subject to the following requirements:
 - i. During the preparation of the draft Management Plans listed in Table 1 below the Requiring Authority must provide to the listed parties in Table 1 copies of those listed plans for comment no less than six (6) months prior to the date that they are to be submitted to the Council for certification or written approval.
 - ii. Where the listed party has engaged a technical expert to assist with matters addressed in the Management Plan the Requiring Authority shall enable and facilitate that expert to engage with its experts to discuss the contents of the Management Plan directly and to confirm if the contents can be agreed.
 - iii. Where practicable the Requiring Authority must adopt recommendations received from the parties listed.
 - iv. The following information must be provided with the Draft Management Plans listed in Table 1 at their lodgement with the Council for certification or written approval and a copy provided to the relevant listed party:
 - A. The submitted records of the consultation undertaken with the parties listed;
 - B. A summary of changes to sought by the parties listed. This summary must also include commentary from the Requiring Authority in regard to the changes sought by this party, whether the Requiring Authority has or has not adopted these changes and the reason(s) for adoption/non-adoption of the changes.

Table 1: Listed Parties and Management Plans Subject to Consultation

Stride Holdings Limited (as owner of the NorthWest Shopping Centre)

- Key Stakeholder Communication and Consultation Plan.
- Construction Traffic Management Plan.
- Westgate Construction and Traffic Management Plan.
- NorthWest Construction and Traffic Management Plan.
- NorthWest Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan.

Costco

- Key Stakeholder Communication and Consultation Plan.
- Construction Traffic Management Plan.
- Westgate Construction and Traffic Management Plan.

D. Key Stakeholder Communication and Consultation Plan

- a) The Requiring Authority must submit a final Key Stakeholder Communication and Consultation Plan (KSCCP) for certification in accordance with Condition C. The objective of the KSCCP is to set out a framework to ensure appropriate communication and consultation is undertaken with the community, stakeholders, affected parties and interest groups during construction of the Project.
- b) The KSCCP must set out how the Requiring Authority will for the Project:
 - i. Inform the community and businesses of construction progress and future construction activities;
 - ii. Provide information on key project milestones;

Proposed Traffic Conditions for the NWRT Project

- iii. Provide a process for responding to queries and complaints including, but not limited to:
 - A. Who is responsible for responding;
 - B. How responses will be provided;
 - C. The timeframes for responses to be provided; and
 - D. How complaints will be reviewed and monitored to ensure mitigation is effective.
- c) The KSCCP must include:
 - i. A communications framework that details the Requiring Authority's communication strategies, the accountabilities, frequency of communications and consultation, the range of communication and consultation tools to be used (including any modern and relevant communication methods, community noticeboard, local paper, newsletters or similar, advertising etc.) and any other relevant communication matters;
 - ii. Contact details of the person responsible for communication and consultation for the Project, including phone, email, project website and postal address;
 - iii. Details of where this contact information will be available;
 - iv. Details of how a point of contact will be maintained throughout construction works for the project;
 - v. Methods for identifying, communicating and engaging with people affected by the construction works for the project, including but not limited to:
 - A. All residential owners and occupiers affected by construction works for the Project;
 - B. All business property owners and occupiers affected by construction works for the Project;
 - C. Any community, medical and education facilities directly affected by the construction works for the project, including methods to assist these facilities to consult with their customers/stakeholders;
 - D. Key stakeholders (including the parties listed in Condition C Table 1); and
 - E. Network utility operators.
 - vi. Methods for communicating with and notifying directly affected parties in advance of:
 - A. Proposed construction activities outside normal working hours (including night works);
 - B. Temporary traffic management measures for vehicles and pedestrians during construction;
 - C. Permanent changes to road networks and layouts; and
 - D. A record of the consultation undertaken with the community including specific access requirements for businesses and residents.
 - vii. Details of specific communications proposed for updating stakeholders including affected parties on construction timeframes;
 - viii. A list of the stakeholders affected to be communicated with (including those listed in Condition C Table 1);
 - ix. Linkages and cross references to other management plans where relevant;
 - x. Identification of opportunities for those stakeholders identified under Condition C Table 1 to collaborate on specific issues if required;
 - xi. A Development Response Addendum including:
 - A. The measures to maximise opportunities for pedestrian and service access to businesses, residents and social services/facilities that will be maintained during construction, within the practical requirements of the CTMP;
 - B. The measures to mitigate potential severance and loss of business visibility issues by wayfinding and supporting signage for pedestrian detours required during construction;
 - C. The measures to promote a safe environment during construction;
 - D. How loss of amenity for residents, community services and businesses as a result of construction activities will be or has been mitigated through other management plans;
 - E. Identification of any other development response measures designed to support those businesses, residents and community services/facilities during construction.
 - xii. Details of engagement with the community to identify opportunities to minimise construction impacts;
 - xiii. Details of monitoring the implementation of the CCP including, but not limited to:
 - A. Community feedback on the management of construction related impacts and the Requiring Authority's response to that feedback;
 - B. And feedback and complaints received on matters other than addressed by (xii)
 - C. Any outcomes or actions undertaken in response to feedback and complaints; and
 - D. Any development response outcomes.
 - xiv. The KSCCP must be reviewed at least annually and updated with reference to the outcomes of the monitoring listed in (xii).

E. Construction Traffic Management Plan

- a) The Requiring Authority must lodge the CTMP for certification with Auckland Council at least six (6) months prior to construction commencing for each section of the Project. The purpose of the CTMP is to appropriately manage any adverse traffic safety and efficiency impacts on other road users caused by the Project.

Proposed Traffic Conditions for the NWRT Project

- b) A CTMP shall be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced person and shall be submitted as part of the relevant outline plan of works (OP).
- c) To achieve this purpose, the CTMP shall include:
 - i. Methods to manage the effects of temporary traffic management activities on the network;
 - ii. Measures to manage the safety of all transport users;
 - iii. The estimated numbers, frequencies, routes and timing of traffic movements, including any specific non-working or non-movement hours to manage vehicular and pedestrian traffic congestion.
 - iv. Site access routes for heavy vehicles, the size and location of parking areas for plant, construction vehicles and the vehicles of workers and visitors;
 - v. Identification of detour routes and other methods for the safe management and maintenance of traffic flows, including public transport, pedestrians and cyclists;
 - vi. Measures to maintain the function of the existing Shared User Path to a reasonable level of service, to the extent that is reasonably practicable, and where this is not practicable, provide safe detour routes that provides a reasonable level of service
 - vii. Measures to maintain access to and from properties and/or private roads where practicable, or to provide alternative arrangements when it will not be, including details of how access is managed for loading and unloading of goods, rubbish collection, and mail/courier deliveries;
 - viii. The management approach to loads on heavy vehicles, including covering loads of fine material, the use of wheel-wash facilities at site exit points and the timely removal of any material deposited or spilled on public roads;
 - ix. Methods that will be undertaken to communicate traffic management measures to affected road users;
 - x. Details of minimum network performance parameters during the construction phase including any measures to monitor compliance with the performance parameters; and
 - xi. Details of any measures proposed to be implemented in the event of minimum network performance parameters identified in Condition E(b)(x) above being exceeded.
 - xii. Auditing, monitoring and reporting requirements relating to traffic management activities shall be undertaken in accordance with the New Zealand Guide to Temporary Traffic Management or any subsequent version thereof.

F. Westgate Construction Traffic Management Plan

- a) The Requiring Authority must submit a Construction Traffic Management Plan – Westgate (CTMP-W) for certification in accordance with Condition C. Where there is any inconsistency between the CTMP-W and any other management plan (except for the CTMP-NW), the provisions of the CTMP-W shall prevail.
- b) The purpose of the CTMP is to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on traffic safety and network efficiency on routes that provide access to and egress from the Westgate Precinct resulting from the construction works, in order to:
 - i. Protect public safety, including the safe passage of pedestrians and cyclists;
 - ii. Maintain capacity and connectivity of all routes and all modes to and from the Westgate Precinct;
 - iii. Minimise delays and congestion to all road users, pedestrians and cyclists, and particularly public transport at all times, especially bus travel times at peak traffic periods during weekdays (06:30 to 09:30 and 16:00 to 19:00); and
 - iv. Avoid construction works which impact traffic capacity to and from the Westgate Precinct between 1 November and 7 February.
 - v. Inform the public and landowners about any potential temporary impacts on the road network.
- c) The CTMP-W shall be prepared using best practice (to better understand the effects of construction of the works subject of the OP on the affected road network), which may include the use of traffic modelling tools. Any such assessment shall be undertaken in consultation with Auckland Transport and have the ability to simulate lane restrictions and road closures. The outcome of consultation undertaken between the Requiring Authority, Auckland Transport and affected landowners listed in C. Management Plans shall be documented and any comments not acted on provided with the final CTMP-W when submitted to the Council.
- d) The CTMP-W shall describe the methods for avoiding, remedying or mitigating the local transportation effects resulting from the Project works subject of the relevant OP, and shall address the following matters:
 - i. Methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate the local effects of the construction of individual elements of the Project (e.g. intersections/overbridges/underpasses) and the use of staging to ensure minimal disruption to the transport network;
 - ii. Traffic management measures to address and maintain traffic capacity of all routes within and surrounding the Westgate Precinct and minimise adverse effects including, where applicable to the relevant OP;

Proposed Traffic Conditions for the NWRT Project

- iii. Retaining the existing number of traffic lanes along Gunton Drive and allow for existing traffic movements along Gunton Drive (between Tawhia Drive and Maki Street), noting that temporary restrictions to one lane or temporary full closures may be required overnight (between 9pm and 6am) for traffic switches or stage changes, where applicable to the relevant OP;
- iv. Retaining two traffic lanes on Gunton Drive between Fred Taylor Drive and Tawhia Drive throughout the construction period, noting that temporary restrictions to one lane or temporary full closures may be required overnight (between 9pm and 6am) for traffic switches or stage changes, where applicable to the relevant OP;
- v. Retaining the existing number of traffic lanes on the Hobsonville offramp, Fred Taylor Drive and Hobsonville Road that provide movements to Gunton Drive, where applicable to the relevant OP;
- vi. Measures to maintain existing vehicle access to private properties, or where the existing property access is to be removed or becomes unsafe as a result of the construction works, measures to provide alternative access arrangements (including any revised internal layout changes resulting from the change) in consultation with Auckland Transport and the affected landowner.

G. NorthWest Construction and Traffic Management Plan

- a) The Requiring Authority must submit a Site-Specific Construction and Traffic Management Plan – NorthWest Centre (CTMP-NW) for certification in accordance with Condition C. The objective of the CTMP-NW is to avoid, remedy or mitigate the potential adverse effects of construction activities, including those associated with vibration, dust, pedestrian access, vehicle access, manoeuvring and on-site parking provision, at the NorthWest Shopping Centre. Where there is any inconsistency between the CTMP-NW and any other management plan, the provisions of the CTMP-NW shall prevail.
- b) The CTMP-NW must include practicable measures, including staging of work, that the Requiring Authority is required to adopt to:
 - i. Address how the Requiring Authority will manage the staging of all work within 500m of NorthWest Shopping Centre to avoid or mitigate effects on the operation of the centre;
 - ii. Ensure safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian customer access into and out of the NorthWest Shopping Centre site is maintained at the same or similar level of service, scale, form and proximity of access to the current NorthWest Shopping Centre, including existing customer and emergency vehicle access to and from Gunton Drive (maintaining one signalised accessway catering for the same number of traffic lanes and turning movements as currently exist, plus one priority controlled, all-turns accessway) and Tawhia Drive (one priority controlled, all-turns vehicle crossing), as well as ongoing delivery and service vehicle access to both Woolworths NorthWest and the wider NorthWest Shopping Centre;
 - iii. The means by which appropriate safe and efficient service and delivery vehicle access to the existing loading dock of Woolworths NorthWest, Farmers and other existing loading docks within NorthWest Shopping Centre, will be maintained to provide for their business activities. The Requiring Authority shall ensure that the NorthWest Shopping Centre loading docks (including the Woolworths Northwest loading dock) shall be operational at all times. This includes:
 - A. Enabling a 23m High Productivity Motor Vehicle (HPMV) semi-trailer to enter the dock without any delay related to construction activities between specified time periods;
 - B. Ensuring that any changes to the surrounding road network can be arranged to accommodate a 23m HPMV semi-trailer to safely enter the NorthWest Shopping Centre site and Woolworths service dock. Any such changes must be completed before any works on Gunton Road and Tawhia Drive commence or any changes are made to NorthWest Shopping Centre loading dock;
 - C. Enabling other loading vehicles (smaller trucks and vans) to enter and exit the dock at all times via a controlled entrance through the construction site;
 - D. Providing for the NorthWest Shopping Centre's existing arrangements for waste and recycling materials collection.
 - iv. The means by which the overall Level of Service of all roadways and intersections adjacent to the NorthWest Centre and the access routes for customers of the NorthWest Centre leading from Hobsonville Road and SH16, will be maintained throughout the construction period of the Project;
 - v. Provide for the efficient access of emergency vehicles (Fire and Ambulance) to NorthWest at all times;
 - vi. How construction of temporary or new access points will ensure the maintenance and operating capacity of access to and from the NorthWest Shopping Centre when any existing access points are temporarily closed or restricted due to Project construction activities;
 - vii. The traffic management measures to maintain access for NorthWest customer access to and from Gunton Drive and via the Gunton Drive/Fred Taylor Drive intersection at all times;
 - viii. Provision for additional measures, such as construction staging, to avoid construction activities which impact traffic capacity to and from NorthWest Shopping Centre during the annual holiday trading period between 1 November to 7 February each year;

Proposed Traffic Conditions for the NWRT Project

- ix. Provision for Project-related staff parking areas that are located such that Project-related parking is avoided within the NorthWest Shopping Centre;
 - x. Ensure that owners and tenants at NorthWest Shopping Centre, are provided with a minimum of 20 (twenty) days' notice of material changes to traffic management, and enable feedback to be provided on these changes before they are adopted;
 - xi. Identify the methods for wayfinding and advertising (signage) into and out of the NorthWest Shopping Centre site during construction, including for specific tenancies where requested, and signage on the main approaches to the NorthWest Shopping Centre to advertise that the "NorthWest Centre remains open" during construction of the Project;
 - xii. Wayfinding in the wider area for the purpose of reducing congestion in the vicinity of NorthWest Shopping Centre;
 - xiii. Appointment of a liaison person and the procedure for regular meetings, to be held at least monthly or at an alternative frequency as agreed between the Requiring Authority, Stride Holdings Limited, and major tenants, during the construction period for the Project;
 - xiv. The means by which construction related dust in the vicinity of NorthWest Shopping Centre will be controlled to mitigate any adverse effects on owners, tenants, and customers of the NorthWest Shopping Centre;
 - xv. Ensure that construction debris, waste and sediment will be managed within the Project construction footprint so it does not enter NorthWest Shopping Centre;
 - xvi. The means by which any overland flow of stormwater in excess of that currently entering NorthWest Shopping Centre will be managed during construction to prevent any increased overland flows (including during storm events) entering the NorthWest Shopping Centre site;
 - xvii. Appointment of a liaison person and the procedure for regular meetings, to be held at least monthly or at an alternative frequency as agreed between the Requiring Authority, Stride Holdings Limited, and any major tenants, during the construction period for the Project;
 - xviii. In the event that any of the thresholds above are exceeded the Requiring Authority is to give details of the exceedance to the Auckland Council Environmental Monitoring Team Leader (email: monitoring@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz) together with notice of measures to be implemented.
 - xix. A procedure for monitoring, reporting and review of the performance of the CTMP – NW during the construction period. The results of the monitoring and reporting must be shared with Stride Holdings Limited each quarter (every three months). These results must also be provided to the Environmental Monitoring Team Leader (email: monitoring@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz)
- c) A review of the CTMP-NW must be undertaken twice annually or due to the following:
- i. As a result of a material change to the project;
 - ii. To address unforeseen or materially greater adverse effects arising from construction of the Project
- d) A review of the CTMP-NW must take into consideration:
- i. Any changes to construction methods; and
 - ii. Results of monitoring and reporting procedures associated with the management of access to and from the NorthWest Shopping Centre during the Project construction period (including monitoring of customer access and queuing during the annual holiday trading period between 1 November to 7 February each year); and
 - iii. any mitigation measures to address unforeseen or materially greater adverse access and movement effects during construction of the Project.

Operational Conditions

H. Operational access and egress at NorthWest Shopping Centre

The Requiring Authority must maintain (as a minimum) the same number of entry and exit lanes, turning movements and intersection controls between Gunton Drive and NorthWest Centre as currently exists. Provision must also be made for the establishment of an additional left turn entry-only access leading into the NorthWest Centre from Gunton Drive as shown on the Buchan Drawing A-RC-2010 (Rev B, 28/02/20) "Northwest Shopping Centre Expansion" as attached to Auckland Council approved resource consent LUC60350368 dated 04/05/2020.