

## **PROJECT TWIN STREAMS COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE: FUNDING PLAN FOR STREAM RESTORATION BEYOND 2012**

### **Introduction**

This high-level funding plan addresses funding requirements for continuing stream restoration work within Project Twin Streams (PTS) within a shared Council / community governance structure.

The assessment of future governance options for PTS stream restoration currently being carried out within Council has highlighted the fundraising strengths of governance through a non-government organisation (NGO) structure external to Council. Two future governance options will be recommended to the Council in February 2010, along with analysis which suggests that these options are not mutually exclusive, and that Council consider development of a combined structure that builds on the strengths and opportunities offered by each option. The governance arrangements that were evaluated as most likely to promote PTS objectives were:

- a community-driven legal entity
- a formal multi party partnership

### **Funding Issues**

The Auckland Regional Holdings (ARH) funding for the PTS stream restoration programme ceases in June 2012. From that date there is no allocation for capital costs for:

- the ongoing maintenance of the existing 56 kilometres of stream bank restoration;
- to expand the stream restoration work on the remaining 289 kilometres of streams and tributaries within the PTS catchment; and
- to support the PTS Community Contract Organisations to continue their work post 2012.

Additional funding over and above that granted to the project by Auckland Regional Holdings (ARH) up to June 2012 will be required to build on and sustain the stormwater improvements sought through the project.

Council is establishing the estimated total cost of delivering maintenance on completed planting and all further stream restoration works required to complete the restoration of the twin streams catchment – and further work is required to establish costs estimates for follow through on all phases of the project.

While there are avenues to pursue funding from local/regional and national government, and local government has regulatory responsibilities towards water quality, stormwater management and Integrated Catchment Management planning, it is very likely that external resources will be needed to continue the community development approach.

### **Potential funding sources**

The following potential funding sources for the future stream-bank riparian planting and maintenance programme have been identified:

SOURCE	SCOPE
Carbon credits / trading	Being investigated, but initial assessment is that the Permanent Forest Sink Initiative (PFSI) is designed to recognise carbon sink benefits of converting scrub/grazed land to forest. PFSI has constraints including: not available for publicly funded forestation projects; planted area must be greater than 1 hectare; Riparian margins must have an average width of 30m or more.
Rates - general and targeted	Being investigated as part of Integrated Water Resource Management Planning (IWRMP) work carried out within City Services.
Stormwater charges	
Rebates for permeable surfaces	
Financial contributions	
Development contributions	
Government departments	Further investigation required once scope of future stream restoration work programme is known.
Partnerships	
Business sponsorship	
Lotteries Board	Being investigated – see notes on funding feasibility assessment below.
Licensing Trusts	
Philanthropic organisations	
Community enterprises	Subject of separate funding plan assessment being carried out by Community Contract Organisations.
FORST	Being investigated as part of IWRMP work carried out within City Services.
Buying/selling flood plain properties	
External loans	
Transport Assets from NZTA (NZ Transport Agency)	
Scientific institutions self-funding	

## Initial Funding Feasibility Assessment

An initial funding feasibility assessment for external funding has been carried out, and the findings in summary are:

- Although there are significant funding opportunities in the areas PTS is focusing on, there would be no guarantee of success. For example, ASB Trust recently put their processes on hold while they reviewed their ability to fund.
- Most funders specifically rule out ongoing programmes, creating an obstacle for PTS to secure sustainable financial backing in the long term.
- Funds applications and then subsequent management and reporting would be a significant job if this were the primary, or even a major way to fund PTS as it currently operates. The funds applied for need to be matched to the projects and programmes, ensuring funds are there ready for initiating the next stage of operation. Funds administration would form a major part of the PTS management, e.g. filing and coding funders, regular meetings to keep major funders engaged and up to date, and reporting systems.
- Major funders, such as DIA and ASB Trust, have funding advisers, and it is recommended that the next step in funding feasibility would be for PTS representatives to meet with these advisers to explore areas of synergy and interest, which could then guide the process to maximise the relationship, or save time where it was highlighted that interests did not coincide.
- There are many funds available for specific purposes, such as relief of poverty, mental health, young people's development etc, that could be part of a PTS approach.

## **Next Steps**

Further assessment of potential funding sources will be required, and it is intended that a detailed funding plan be prepared by mid-2010 as part of transition planning for PTS stream restoration.

### **Timeline**

January - February 2010: align Funding Plan with PTS Community Contract Organisation funding strategy.

January – March 2010: evaluate local government funding instruments as part of IWRMP workstream.

February - May 2010: develop detailed Funding Plan with PTS Community Contract Organisations, including a range of grant funding options and identification of possible options for income generating ventures to be progressed in 2010-2011 year. Incorporate funding opportunities that are specific to particular activities, projects and functions within the scope of the proposed PTS stream restoration programme post 2012.

June 2010: Funding Plan finalised, for inclusion in potential report to ATA mid-2010.

A3

## **Project Twins Streams (PTS) Future Governance of Stream Restoration: Assessment of Options**

During October, November and early December 2009 Council officers and managers of the four current Community Contract organisations coordinating community delivery of PTS stream restoration (Te Ukaipo Sisters of Mercy; Community Waitakere; Maclaren Park Henderson South Community Initiative and Ecomatters Environment Trust) met to discuss options for future governance of PTS stream restoration programmes.

The range of options identified were:

- Option 1: Do nothing**
- Option 2: Full Council governance**
- Option 3: Council Controlled Organisation (CCO)**
- Option 4: Public-Private Partnership (PPP)**
- Option 5: Formal interagency, multi party relationship**
- Option 6: Community driven legal entity**
- Option 7: Non-legal entity**

In assessing the range of possible governance structures we evaluated a range of options against criteria that had broad agreement from the group.

Our assessment responded to the PTS goal of creating a sustainable catchment: healthy land, streams and harbours, and communities who are strong, happy, connected and responsive to the challenges that face us. Furthermore, the objective of the PTS Future Governance Project was identified as being:

*To establish a PTS governance structure for restoration of the streams and tributaries in the wider PTS catchment using community development and quadruple bottom line methods to support the integrated management of the four waters (within the policy and strategic framework of the new Auckland Council).*

In order to evaluate the options, their strengths and weaknesses in relation to PTS and future governance objectives, and their fit with a community development delivery method, we looked for a structure that would have the most likelihood of meeting the following criteria:

### **1. Has a charter that promotes the following principles:**

- a) Learning and behaviour change
- b) Local engagement across diverse communities
- c) Creative engagement methods
- d) Local ownership and solutions for healing the people and the streams
- e) Upholding and honouring kaitiakitanga and the Treaty of Waitangi
- f) social, environmental, economic and cultural sustainability
- g) Integration of community development methods with a sustainable catchment approach

### **2. Provides governance that:**

- enables the community and iwi to play a key governance role in the future of the streams
- ensures governance and management systems drive the community development approach

- ensures an effective means of selection and replacement of governance members to maintain continuity of the PTS vision
- is distinct from, although supportive of the management functions for the programme

### **3. Builds on existing successful PTS partnerships with others including:**

- community, iwi, scientific bodies and other key stakeholders
- the unitary authority, so that statutory responsibilities can be met

### **4. Has sound financial and funding systems that:**

- enable the best cost/benefit ratio at the least cost to council
- minimise expenditure on administration and maximise 'on the ground' deliverables
- ensure effective financial oversight
- have the capacity to generate substantial funding and independent income

### **5. Manages risk by:**

- minimising potential risks to the PTS goal and objectives
- minimising risks to business (including procurement), governance, legal compliance, built assets, human resource, information systems, and financial risk. For example, "Risk Management for Local Government"<sup>1</sup>

## **The Options Assessment Process**

Several meetings were held to discuss and agree a common set of options and criteria with which to measure these. These meetings were intended to ensure that Council's requirements for meeting regulatory requirements around stormwater management were balanced with community requirements around access to all levels of decision making – and plenty of common ground was covered during the process.

Once options and criteria were agreed, PTS WCC-ARC steering group, joined by Community Contract organisation managers met to carry out a formal evaluation process.

This was a facilitated two stage procedure, with the ARC electing to act in a probity role to oversee the process. The first stage involved individual members of the assessment group filling out a comprehensive evaluation form arranged by criterion, scoring the likelihood of each governance structure meeting the criteria, and comments to support the score given.

Scores were given numerically: extremely likely (5 points), very likely (4 points), possible (3 points), unlikely (2 points), and very unlikely (1 point). Scores were then aggregated for each option, and anomalies discussed (for example, when very disparate scores were given for an option against a particular criterion. Individuals were given the opportunity to speak to the scores and comments they had assigned to the various options – and were able to revisit and amend scores. In fact, there was relatively strong agreement on most aspects of the assessment and very few amendments made to the original scores given.

The chart below shows mean score given to each option (listed down the page) against the criteria (across the page), and the summary column shows the overall level of support for each option across all criteria.

<sup>1</sup> Standards New Zealand HB 4360: 2000

Options	Charter principles	Governance	PTS partnerships	Financial systems	Risk management	Summary
1: Do nothing	●	●	●	●	●	●
2. Council control	●●	●●	●●	●●	●●	●●
3. CCO	●●	●●	●●	●●	●●	●●
4. PPP	●●	●●	●●	●●	●●	●●
5. Formal multi-party partnership	●●●	●●●	●●●	●●●	●●●	●●●
6. Community legal entity	●●●●	●●●●	●●●●	●●●●	●●●●	●●●●
7. Non-legal entity	●●●	●●	●●	●●	●●	●●

The scoring part of the process showed two options in particular as having more likelihood of meeting the criteria: Community legal entity and Formal multi-party partnership. Other options were assessed as having considerably less likelihood of providing a governance structure to support the aims and objectives of PTS stream restoration.

The second stage involved the group in detailed and careful consideration of the comments noted during the individual scoring phase, deriving statements that the whole group could support, and which most closely described the pros and cons of each structure.

### Assessment Outcomes

The following comments are intended to summarise the points raised in the group discussion phase.

#### Option 1: Do nothing

The risks of not proceeding with PTS stream restoration work beyond 2012 far outweigh the short term fiscal savings to Council. In particular, the incremental and compounding effects of ceasing PTS work at that point are likely to become sizeable within a relatively short period of time.

It is clear that degradation of water quality in the Waitemata is directly attributable to human activity on stream banks causing sedimentation and continued untreated stormwater discharge – and the Henderson and Huruwuru (Twin Stream) catchments are major vectors of that pollution. Unmitigated degradation of stream banks is likely to have a negative impact on ecological wellbeing of the Waitemata harbour and the streams themselves, community vitality, stormwater quality and amenity value – to name a few of the impacts.

Doing nothing not only removes any possibility of realising the immense potential of provision of natural stormwater services through the whole catchment and a wide array of other social, ecological and cultural benefits through community development; doing nothing poses serious risk to the investment made in the project to date.

AG

## **Option 2: Full Council governance**

On a superficial level this option is a continuation of the status quo in terms of a governance structure for PTS stream restoration. However, the combination of new structural arrangements within the new Auckland Council and uncertainty over any arrangements to carry forward a Council/Community partnership approach into infrastructure provision must also be assessed as significant risks to PTS stream restoration work.

If governance of PTS stream restoration is carried through into the new Auckland Council without increased iwi and community involvement, this will impact negatively on long-held desires and plans for greater community and iwi involvement at all levels of PTS stream restoration: governance, management and delivery of the project.

Also, the scale of the new Council entity in relation to the local on-the-ground organisations and structures may pose difficulties for community to engage Council in meaningful discussions about locally-directed delivery of stream restoration services.

## **Option 3: Council Controlled Organisation (CCO)**

The success of governing PTS stream restoration through a CCO is highly reliant on Council control of the CCO through the statement of intent.

The relatively narrow focus of a CCO (as compared with a whole-of-Council involvement) may introduce constraints to on-the-ground deliverables due to lack of integration with other Council services/programmes.

The business-oriented approach typical in CCOs may be a significant barrier to realising Quadruple Bottom Line (QBL) benefits sought through Community development methods. On the other hand such a structure is likely to provide effective financial and monitoring systems for PTS stream restoration.

## **Option 4: Public-Private Partnership (PPP)**

The Government's stated priorities for fiscal control and return to core services, and uncertainty of strategic and funding priorities for unitary authority creates uncertainty and risks to PTS vision, goal and objectives. These risks are not likely to be mitigated by additional pressures from private for-profit entities.

The other main strand of risk is that the importance of local people connecting with local issues and solutions may be watered down amongst the interests of private or public partner organisations that are not locality based. Conversely, greater private sector involvement could broaden the reach, appeal and skill base for stream restoration work.

A likely strength of a PPP structure is that clear distinctions between governance and management are likely, as are effective financial control and monitoring systems. A further potential benefit is the financial advantage to ratepayers because a PPP can access non-public funding.

## **Option 5: Formal interagency, multi party relationship**

A formal interagency, multi-party partnership is likely to provide for rigorous financial and risk management, as well as clear separation between management and governance roles.

A strong charter, diverse skills, capacity and broad funding access are also potential strengths of such an arrangement, and would be likely to contribute to a good cost/benefit ratio for Council. The likelihood of strong governance roles confirmed through the formal partnership agreement(s) for iwi and community is high – but the structure would be highly

dependent on the quality of the collaboration between parties and the willingness of all parties to contribute resources to a major stormwater stream restoration programme in the long term.

**Option 6: Community driven legal entity**

This structure offers significant benefits to PTS work in the medium to long term. A key aspect of Community governance through a community driven entity is that this approach is most likely to deliver locally focussed outcomes by engaging the wide range of diverse groups within the PTS community in identifying issues and solutions through community ownership of the problems, issues and solutions, and implementing behaviour change for more sustainable stormwater and community outcomes. As an independent legal entity, significant opportunities for grants, alternative funding sources and community enterprises would be available.

While the likely need for significant capacity building in the environmental and administrative areas is acknowledged, the cost/benefit ratio is likely to be greater due to generally lower administration costs than other options. A possible barrier to this option is whether the new Auckland council will be willing to continue contributing resources for this major stormwater programme as part of its responsibility to stream restoration and improved harbour water quality.

**Option 7: Non-legal entity**

Of major concern is that the lack of a legal structure to govern a long term people-resource and financial investment in restoring the stormwater environment. This structure is very unlikely to gain Council acceptance, in that it doesn't appear to support the large-scale regulatory work that Council requires. As a non-legal entity, the structure would have severely restricted funding options.

AS

**APPENDIX**

**KEY ISSUES IN FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT WAITAKERE CITY FREIGHT PLAN CONSULTATION**

<b>ISSUE</b>	<b>FEEDBACK</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>CHANGE PROPOSED</b>
<p><b>Freight Modes – Rail</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responses, including feedback from KiwiRail indicated cautious support for the investigation of the possibility of rail spur in the proposed new Whenuapai industrial area. ARTA provided feedback that the investigation should focus firstly on the need for such a link, before any engineering or financial feasibility studies are carried out.</li> <li>The Herald Island Residents and Ratepayers submission indicated a lack of awareness of proposals for facilitating industrial development in Whenuapai.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The intention was that the investigation of a possible NorSGA rail spur should focus firstly on the need for this spur, before engineering and financial feasibility is investigated.</li> <li>The Herald Island Ratepayers Association has now, through its participation in the NorSGA Urban Development Committee, been made aware of intentions regarding the development of the Trig Road – Whenuapai area.</li> </ul>	<p>The Draft should be amended to clearly state that the investigation of the possible NorSGA rail spur focus firstly on the need for this spur, before engineering and financial feasibility is investigated.</p>
<p><b>Freight Modes – Sea</b></p>	<p>The Draft Plan discounts any substantial further use of coastal shipping as a freight mode. The Auckland Regional Council Officers' submission identifies an increasing shortage of aggregate in the region and argues that there is scope for increased movement of aggregate by coastal barge.</p>	<p>The wording in the Draft Plan was based on the outcome of the previous trial which indicated limited viability.</p>	<p>The Draft should be amended to note that further demand for barging of aggregate into Waitakere may be generated due to shortage of this material.</p>
<p><b>Freight Modes – Air</b></p>	<p>The ARTA response recognises that the Council support joint civilian and military use of Whenuapai Airport. It points out that there is currently no regional position on a second commercial airport for Auckland.</p>	<p>The Draft Plan is intended to convey the Council's position, not that of the region as a whole.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>



<p><b>Freight Movements into and through Henderson</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was support from the Henderson Community Board for the proposal that the eastern freight approach to Henderson South industrial area should be via Vitasovich Road which would require the reconstruction of the View Road Bridge.</li> <li>• There was strong opposition to the identification of Edmonton Road /Te Atatu Road as freight routes due to their location in residential areas. There was also criticism that the Draft Plan was proposing duplication of freight routes for Henderson. There is support for the identification of Central Park Drive Extension as future freight route.</li> <li>• The Henderson Community Board feedback, while accepting the need for a freight route along Universal Drive to service the Swanson and Ranui industrial areas noted that this runs through a residential area and related usage (including a geriatric hospital). Therefore the Board feels that some restriction of truck movement (e.g. time restriction) should be considered.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More detailed planning of the View Road Bridge route will be done in a future Local Area Freight Management Plan (LAFMP).</li> <li>• The intention of the Draft Plan was that funding priority would be used to mitigate the adverse effects of the freight route on residential areas. Te Atatu Road, Edmonton Road and Central Park Drive, including the proposed future Central Park Drive Extension should be retained as freight routes because they are direct and efficient routes between SH16 and Henderson and Great North Road. The duplicate routes reflect the routes that trucks currently take and will continue to use.</li> <li>• This matter should be dealt with in a LAFMP. The area of the proposed Ranui/Swanson LAFMP, scheduled for 2013, includes the Universal Drive corridor as far as Lincoln Road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Draft Plan to be amended to indicate that the Vitasovich View Road routing is a proposal, to be further developed in a LAFMP, rather than an option for investigation.</li> <li>• Te Atatu Road, Edmonton Road and Central Park Drive should be retained as freight routes with funding priority.</li> <li>• The Draft Plan should be amended to provide for restrictions on freight movement/ mitigation measures along Universal Drive to be investigated in the Swanson Ranui LAFMP.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Freight Movements through Te Atatu Peninsula</b></p>	<p>The Te Atatu Peninsulas Business Improvement District raised concerns that the current freight route to Te Atatu Peninsula industrial area is through Te Atatu Peninsula Town Centre. Feedback from the Henderson Community Board further explored these</p>		<p>The Draft Plan will be amended to provide for further investigation of how best to provide freight movement to Te Atatu Peninsula industrial area.</p>

A10

	<p>concerns. The Community Board have requested that possible time restrictions for freight movements through the town centre be investigated together with the investigation of the feasibility of an alternative route using Gunner Drive as freight route to the industrial area. Staff agreed that Te Atatu Peninsula required more attention.</p>		<p>while mitigating adverse effects on the town centre.</p>
<p><b>Additional linkage to the Rosebank Peninsula</b></p>	<p>The proposal in the Draft Plan for an additional crossing of the Whau Creek linking Hepburn Road in Kelston with Rosebank Road in the Rosebank Peninsula was supported by a submission from an Industrial business located in the Span farm industrial area as well as by National Road Carriers.</p>		<p>No changes proposed.</p>
<p><b>Freight Movements into and through New Lynn</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An objection to the proposal to route a freight by-pass around New Lynn through a realigned Veronica Street was raised by a resident likely to be affected by the realignment.</li> <li>• The lack of provision for an interim freight route before the construction of the Clark Street Extension was queried.</li> <li>• Staff raised the issue of possible improved linkages to the Avondale Racecourse site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The residential area affected is only that along part of Binsted Road, leading to Veronica Street from Rata Street and which would require realignment. Veronica Street itself runs through commercial and industrial development.</li> <li>• Great North Road can continue to be used in the interim until Clark Street Extension is built. However, this should not be shown on the map as it could defer plans for making Great North Road into more of a main street.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Draft Plan should be amended to provide for more detailed investigations of all the implications of proposing a realignment of Binsted Road through the residential area to provide a through freight route into Veronica Street. This would be addressed in the New Lynn/Kelston LAFMP scheduled for 2011.</li> <li>• This should include references to the need to explore future links to the Avondale racecourse site.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Freight Movements through NORSGA</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Herald Island Residents and Ratepayers association argued that freight planning for NorSGA should be delayed until the completion of the extensions to the SH16 and SH18 motorways.</li> <li>Submissions on behalf of landowner developers queried Figure 9 Waitakere Freight routes as it relates to the alignment of the proposed Spine Road. The possible barrier effect of a freight route along Hobsonville Road between Don Buck Road and the SH 16 interchange was also queried by a number of submitters including the Auckland Regional Transport Authority (ARTA). ARTA also has concerns as to the effect on future public transport links to Albany of the continued use of Hobsonville Road as a freight route.</li> <li>In addition to queries regarding figure 9 (Freight Routes through Waitakere City), the suggestion was made that a more detailed map of the freight routes through the NorSGA area would be helpful.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategic Planning should anticipate rather than react to the outcomes of major infrastructural development. The Draft Plan is intended to guide developments being planned at NorSGA.</li> <li>A NorSGA area freight route map was omitted from the consultation draft but later developed for stakeholder consultation.</li> <li>The continued identification of Hobsonville Road as a freight route is intended to serve the developments along it (e.g. supermarkets). NZTA currently requires Hobsonville Road to continue to be a heavy haulage route after SH18 is completed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan should be amended to include a NorSGA area freight route map, which shows proposed freight routes, with a note that further routes may be identified as NorSGA develops.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Overweight and Over Dimension (OD) Freight Routes</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A key component of the Draft Plan is the identification of existing, interim and future OD and OW routes. The Draft Plan suggests the eventual future alignment of these routes with the State Highway motorway network. The New Zealand Transport Agency has indicated a willingness to work through the issues raised</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is the first indication from NZTA that it would be willing to consider using SH18 as a heavy haulage route rather than Hobsonville Road.</li> <li>As all OD movement is at night and OW movements will be supported by improvements to the road, the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The mapping in the Draft Plan will be amended to ensure a consistent approach. There will be separate maps showing existing routes and proposed routes. A new map of freight routes for</li> </ul>

A12

	<p>by this proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An objection has been raised from a business located in Central Park Drive to the continued use of the northern section of Central Park Drive as an OD and/or OW route due to concerns as to possible congestion.</li> <li>For reasons of consistency it was suggested that the local freight network map of Henderson show the OD and OW routes as is the case with the New Lynn mapping. It was further suggested that this approach be applied to a proposed new local freight network map for NorSGA.</li> <li>Staff suggested that the proposed realigned Veronica Street freight route should also be considered as a future heavy haulage route to SH20.</li> <li>Staff suggested investigation as to whether an OW route to the quarry was required.</li> <li>Staff suggested a heavy haulage route from the Hobsonville Marine Industry Precinct along the launch road should be included in the map of OD/OW routes.</li> </ul>	<p>concerns regarding increased congestion on Central Park Drive are not well founded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sufficient heavy haulage capacity is already provided by Rata Street. The present extent of SH20 is temporary pending construction of the Waterview connection.</li> </ul>	<p>NorSGA will be provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If necessary, the Draft Plan should be amended to include the access route to the quarry.</li> <li>The Draft Plan should be amended to include the OD/OW route from the Hobsonville Marine Industry Precinct along the launch road.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Regulatory Approach</b></p>	<p>Although this matter is not raised in the Draft Plan, the prohibition of overnight parking of Heavy Commercial Vehicles in residential areas is entirely consistent with the Waitakere City Parking Plan and the adopted Town Centre Parking Management Plans.</p>	<p>The Draft Plan should be amended to include cross references to the Parking Plans requirement to prohibit overnight parking of HCVs in residential areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Draft Plan should be amended to provide that present and future</li> </ul>	

A13

	<p>restrictions be identified for inclusion in the Draft Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback from staff included the need to make information about freight route restrictions easily available to transporters and other interested parties.</li> </ul>		<p>regulatory restrictions be itemised in LAFMPs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Draft Plan should be amended to provide that information about freight route restrictions should be readily accessible to the public.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Design of Roads</b></p>	<p>The Henderson Community Board requests that footpath berms on freight routes to be located between the road and the footpath as a buffer.</p>	<p>This matter will be dealt in the code of practice with other matters relating to design of roads on freight routes.</p>	<p>No changes proposed.</p>

24.