



TE ARA HAUĀURU NORTHWEST RAPID TRANSIT - Comment on project

From [REDACTED]
Date Sat 2026-05-23 4:04 PM
To Substantive <substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz>
Cc Tomas Antunes [REDACTED]

Dear Environmental Protection Authority/Fast-track team

This email is in response to the letter dated 28 April 2026 (File ref FTAA 2511-1146). We have been asked to provide comment.

First Name: Lily Li and Tomas Antunes
Postal Address: [REDACTED]
Mobile Phone: [REDACTED]
Email address: [REDACTED]

I can receive emails and my email address is correct.

I wish to raise concerns regarding the accessibility and transparency of the Notice of Application and request for public comment relating to the North West Rapid Transit proposal.

The notification process places an unreasonable burden on members of the public attempting to review and respond to the application. The notice primarily directs recipients to lengthy web links contained within the letter itself, rather than providing clear, simple, and accessible methods for obtaining the relevant documents and information.

For many people, especially older residents, those with limited digital literacy, or those accessing information from printed letters or mobile devices, manually entering long URLs is inconvenient and creates an unnecessary barrier to participation. A public consultation process should aim to maximise accessibility and engagement, not make participation more difficult.

At a minimum, the notice should include:

- A direct email address where application documents can be requested;
- Simplified web addresses or QR codes;
- Clear instructions for obtaining printed copies;
- A summary of key proposal impacts in plain language.

Given the scale and significance of the North West Rapid Transit proposal, affected residents should not be expected to navigate complex online systems simply to understand a project that may have substantial long-term impacts on their communities.

The current process risks excluding meaningful public participation and undermines confidence that consultation is being conducted fairly and transparently. I request that the notification and

[REDACTED]

consultation process be improved to ensure all members of the public can reasonably access the relevant information and provide informed feedback.

I also oppose the North West Rapid Transit (NWRT) proposal in its current form.

While improving transport infrastructure in northwest Auckland is important, this proposal raises serious concerns regarding cost, environmental impact, community disruption, transparency, and long-term effectiveness.

First, the project appears to prioritise large-scale infrastructure expansion without adequately demonstrating that lower-impact or more cost-effective alternatives have been fully explored. Upgrading existing bus services, improving feeder connections, staggering development growth, or investing in more flexible transport solutions may achieve similar outcomes with substantially less environmental and financial cost.

Second, the scale of land acquisition, construction activity, and corridor development associated with the proposal will significantly affect existing communities and natural environments. Residents along the corridor face years of disruption, noise, traffic changes, visual impacts, and potential loss of local character. The proposal risks permanently altering neighbourhoods and open spaces without sufficient assurance that the long-term benefits justify these impacts.

There are also concerns about environmental effects. Large transport corridors create ongoing pressure on ecosystems, stormwater systems, waterways, and urban green space. The project documentation does not provide enough confidence that cumulative environmental impacts will be adequately avoided or mitigated over the full life of the project.

The financial risks are equally concerning. Major transport infrastructure projects frequently exceed initial budgets and timelines. In a period where Auckland and New Zealand already face significant infrastructure funding pressures, committing billions of dollars to a project with uncertain future demand assumptions may not represent responsible long-term planning. Taxpayers and ratepayers should not be exposed to escalating costs without stronger evidence of value for money.

I am also concerned about the use of the Fast-track process for a project of this scale and significance. Fast-track mechanisms reduce opportunities for meaningful public participation, independent scrutiny, and appeal rights. Decisions with long-lasting consequences for communities and the environment should proceed through a robust and transparent planning process, not an accelerated pathway that limits public input.

The proposal also relies heavily on projected population growth and transport demand modelling extending decades into the future. These assumptions may change significantly due to evolving work patterns, economic conditions, technology, and urban development trends. Large irreversible infrastructure decisions should be approached cautiously where future demand remains uncertain.

Finally, the project risks encouraging further urban sprawl and intensification pressures without adequately addressing the wider social and infrastructure consequences. Transport investment should support genuinely sustainable urban planning rather than simply enabling continued expansion without corresponding investment in local services, green space, and community infrastructure.

For these reasons, I oppose the North West Rapid Transit proposal as currently presented and request that decision-makers require a more transparent assessment process, fuller public consultation, and a more rigorous examination of alternatives before any approvals are granted.

5/25/26, 12:56 PM

Please acknowledge receipt of this email.

Kind regards

Lily