

Date: Tuesday 21 April 2015
Time: 9.30am
Meeting Room: Upper Harbour Local Board Office
Venue: 30 Kell Drive
Albany

Upper Harbour Local Board

OPEN MINUTE ITEM ATTACHMENTS

ITEM	TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
11	Local board advocacy and feedback on Long-term Plan 2015 – 2025 proposals	
A.	20150421, Upper Harbour Local Board, Item 11, Advocacy Items	3

Upper Harbour Local Board input into LTP 2015 - 25

Local priorities

Advocacy request	Activity area	Why is it a priority?	Funding implications or options
Building and completing the Albany Community Hub	Parks, Community and Lifestyle	The community facility is necessary to fill a proven gap in community infrastructure, as referenced in the Communities Network Plan, and required to meet future needs in a rapidly growing part of Auckland.	
Take a strategic approach to the access and provision of a quality range of existing and future indoor sports and recreation facilities.	Parks, Community and Lifestyle	The local board recognises that new facilities cannot necessarily be built in every area of Auckland, so a strategic network approach is required. Sport and recreation facilities are important for all members of society for health and well-being. Outdoor sporting activities are well services in the Auckland Region but there is a significant shortage of indoor facilities.	
Special Housing areas - The board will advocate for the continual mitigation of cumulative effects on infrastructure by the Special Housing Areas (SHAs). Adequate provision of open and recreation space in close proximity to SHAs is imperative.	Auckland Development	The board supports SHAs as a way to increase Auckland's housing stock. However, intensification has an effect on existing infrastructure which may not always be able to cope. We need to ensure that we plan for this growth and take the cumulative effects into consideration.	
Converting the Hobsonville Point Sovereign Boat Shed into an indoor sports facility.	Parks, Community and Lifestyle	There are approximately 55 sports organisations, including regional sports organisations (RSOs), who offer sport and recreation opportunities in the Upper Harbour area. There is a serious shortage of indoor sports facilities across Auckland, but particularly in the Upper Harbour area where there is no Council owned facilities. Sporting codes in particular need of facilities are basketball, netball, badminton, table tennis, gymnastics and trampolining.	

Strategic approach to the acquisition of open space and recreation land in order to accommodate for current and future growth.	Parks, Community and Lifestyle	There is a concern regarding the unfair distribution of capital expenditure across the region, especially the acquisition of recreation and open space in new developments and the lack of securing land for future use. Open space provisions is paramount to a growing population and as the census figures show, Upper Harbour is growing exponentially.	
--	--------------------------------	---	--

CCO Priorities

Advocacy request	CCO	Why is it a priority?	Funding implications or options
Concerned about the intent to discard land as all open space is of critical value.	ACPL	The board does not support the divestment of any parks and reserves, as it is of the opinion that on open space is redundant. In the Upper Harbour Local Board area, the overwhelming majority of residents highly value the parks and reserves, as they make a significant contribution to well-being.	
There is no reference to or importance given to local priorities	AT - Policy and planning	At the local level the outcomes contained in the local board plan are as important as the overarching Auckland Plan outcomes. Some cognisance and weight to these local outcomes (and associated objectives and key initiatives) is needed in the prioritisation framework. Often a local board investment in place-making will be affected / influenced by Auckland Transport decisions.	

<p>It is the local boards responsibility to ensure local place shaping and this role can only be fulfilled if they have an opportunity to input substantially into Auckland Transport local project prioritisation.</p>	<p>AT - Policy and planning</p>	<p>The prioritisation criteria of Strategic Fit, Effectiveness and Efficiency in part is supported, as a professional, evidenced based approach is required, however these criteria should not preclude local projects from being prioritised and implemented. The current weighting uses words such as 'significantly' in many of the individual criteria. This wording provides an inbuilt bias in favour of larger projects. Few if any small local projects will provide significant benefits (at the regional level) and as such under the current prioritisation methodology they will score lower than bigger projects.</p>	
<p>Dairy Flat Highway / The Avenue Intersection Upgrade</p>	<p>AT - Roads</p>	<p>The board, once again, indicates its preference for the Dairy Flat Highway / The Avenue intersection upgrade and widening of the bridge to be prioritised further up the capex project list due to the fact that it has been in the works for 15 years, there is a funding agreement with NZTA to cover 65% of the project and the safety risk for vehicle users and pedestrians, especially children walking to and from school.</p> <p>There are also 3 new subdivisions being developed in the immediate vicinity of the intersection which will create the traffic flow substantially.</p>	

Regional Proposals - top four consultation topics

Investing in Auckland

The board does not support the proposed budget envelope for the parks, community and lifestyle theme, as these activities are the most significant for local boards and are the most valued by our communities and are seen to be the 'bread and butter' core services of council. It is imperative that Auckland Council has its priorities correct in line with the priorities of the ratepayers. Across the board cost reductions are not effective as they detract from essential services such as sport fields/ground and facilities, parks maintenance, open space provision, footpaths, libraries, adequate public transport services and rubbish collection.

<p>Fixing Transport</p> <p>There needs to be fairness and equity in the determination of transport charges. Due to the nature of the geography of the North Shore and the lack of alternative options, residents utilise both SH1 and SH18 as part of the local roads network out of necessity.</p> <p>The transport funding options presented in the LTP were not adequate and restrictive. Alternate funding options need to be considered such as just fuel tax; or a motorway toll capped at 2 to 4 trips per day; or selling new main arterial roads, in Auckland Council ownership, for private management (not local roads); or leasing new main arterial roads, in Auckland Council ownership, for private management (not local roads); or investigate public / private partnerships.</p>
<p>Your rates</p> <p>Supports an equitable budget allocation which will ensure that the level of investment in Upper Harbour, as previously assured to our community can continue, and that budget cuts need to be found in regional budgets rather than local parks, community and lifestyle activity areas. Auckland Council cannot keep increasing rates on the one hand and taking away what is core expected service on the other. It is time that Council re-evaluates its definition of core services, as there is a definite disconnect between what Auckland residents and Auckland Council consider core service.</p>
<p>Housing and Development</p> <p>The board does not have a particular opinion about the formation of Development Auckland as long as specific outcomes are achieved, such quality urban form, high level amenities, good community provision, high quality urban design, good infrastructure provision, with a focus on open space delivery. It is imperative that realistic targets are set for this and all other CCOs, to ensure that sound, professional, evidenced based decision making occurs.</p>

Regional Proposals - other proposals with local impact

Proposal	Feedback	Funding implications or options
Chemical Weed Spraying	The board supports the status quo, as opposed to chemical spraying.	
Reduction of levels of service in parks	The board does not support any proposed adjustments to levels of service in our parks and reserves where there is a material impact on our ratepayers' experience of these assets.	

Development Contributions Policy	<p>The Development Contributions Policy must consider current and future population growth and the subsequent need for infrastructure and the acquisition of open space to cater for the growth. Emphasis needs to be placed on the importance of neighbourhood parks, footpaths and the connectivity of new subdivisions to existing residential developments. The board wants to ensure that previous mistakes of growth and poor planning are not repeated. The board feels that the current development contributions policy will not deliver these outcomes. Catchments need to be more locally focused which will then truly mitigate growth and development effects, which is the intent of the legislation.</p>	
----------------------------------	---	--