

# Governance Framework Review

Waiheke Local Board pilot  
project

## Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Introduction .....  | 3  |
| Project structure and governance .....                            | 4  |
| Governance oversight .....  | 4  |
| Project management .....  | 4  |
| Timeline .....  | 5  |
| Intervention logic.....   | 6  |
| Scope of the pilot .....  | 8  |
| Activities for inclusion.....                                     | 9  |
| Locally initiated policy, planning and bylaws .....               | 9  |
| Proposed key projects .....                                       | 9  |
| Responding to visitor growth demands .....                        | 9  |
| Matiatia strategic plan.....                                      | 10 |
| Encroachment policy and management.....                           | 11 |
| Community facilities development: community pool .....            | 12 |
| Funding and financial decision making.....                        | 13 |
| Extended allocations and/or delegations.....                      | 13 |
| Increased local operational leadership .....                      | 14 |
| Key projects for inclusion .....                                  | 15 |
| Crescent Road East .....  | 15 |
| Boats on beaches.....   | 15 |
| Auckland Transport and place making .....                         | 15 |
| Key projects for inclusion .....                                  | 16 |
| Development of a 10 year strategic transport plan .....           | 16 |
| Waiheke and Hauraki Gulf Islands Design Guidelines .....          | 16 |
| Delegation of street trading licensing and events permitting..... | 16 |
| Evaluation of the pilot project.....                              | 18 |

## Introduction

1. This document outlines a proposed approach to piloting an increased level of devolved decision making to the Waiheke Local Board. The pilot is an outcome of the governance framework review, initiated by Auckland Council in 2016. The review reflected on the implementation to date of Auckland's local governance model and considers whether it is working optimally in terms of meeting the aims of the 2010 reforms. Its particular focus was on the implementation of the governance model comprising the governing body and local boards as the complementary decision making arms of the Auckland Council.
2. One of the key themes of the review was that local boards do not feel sufficiently empowered to fulfil their role as envisioned in the governance reforms. The review identified that there are some practices that are constraining local boards from carrying out their role, including the inflexibility of funding arrangements and difficulties in feeding local input into regional decision-making.
3. It also noted some local frustrations in relation to transport decision-making, especially in relation to local boards carrying out their role as place shapers at the local level. These issues are being addressed through the wider review process.
4. The review also considered whether it would be feasible for some local board areas to have differential decision making powers depending on the extent of the regional impact of specific local decisions. It suggested that, as a case study or pilot, this could be implemented on Waiheke given:
  - the more clearly defined community of interest on the island (relative to most other local board areas)
  - the separation of the island from the wider Auckland network with respect to services such as roading, stormwater or public transport
  - the desires of the local board for greater decision-making autonomy, and a feeling that the regionalisation of services across Auckland has failed to reflect the unique nature of the island.
5. As an island, Waiheke's communities of interest are generally easier to describe and define than those of the other local boards. Their assets and facilities are mostly local by definition, and they are generally not connected to the rest of the region in a network sense. This provides an argument for differential allocations or delegations of decision-making responsibility.
6. In addition, the local board has consistently sought greater autonomy, arguing that this would deliver better outcomes for the community, and better reflect the principles of subsidiarity and the policy intent of the Auckland amalgamation.

## **Project structure and governance**

7. This section outlines the process for implementing the pilot and the governance structure that will be established to oversee it and its evaluation. It is proposed that the pilot run for a period of three years from 1 October 2017 to 30 September 2020.
8. It is proposed that an evaluation of the pilot's first two years of implementation be put in place, reporting back to the board and the governing body in early 2020. This will allow sufficient time for informed decisions to be made about whether the pilot should be ended, as planned, or whether the changes should be made permanent, or be modified in some way.
9. It will also consider whether any of the approaches used in the trial are transferable to other local boards.

### **Governance oversight**

10. The pilot project will largely be governed by the Waiheke Local Board and regular reporting will be required against project milestones. The board has also indicated that, in its view, a level of governance should be maintained that sits outside of the board, and which can provide an effective overview one step removed from the project's delivery.
11. This oversight could be delegated to an existing committee such as the Environment and Community Committee or the Governing Body. Another proposal has been that the political working party, or a similar joint local board/governing body standing committee, be put in place to consider joint governance matters that affect both local boards and the governing body.
12. This proposal is being considered as part of the wider governance framework review.

### **Project management**

13. A project management structure will be established within the council to undertake the work required to implement the pilot. At a management level this work is currently overseen by a steering group comprising executive leadership team members along with the GM Local Board Services. The steering group is chaired by Phil Wilson, Governance Director. A project manager will be appointed as the first stage of implementation.

## Timeline

| Decision/activity   | Date                     |
|---|--------------------------|
| Workshop with Waiheke Local Board to identify issues and desired outcomes                                       | 11 May                   |
| Additional workshop with Waiheke Local Board to firm up proposals   | 15 June                  |
| Draft proposal presented to political working party workshop  | 21 June                  |
| Executive Steering Group Meeting - provide feedback to ELT  | 29 June                  |
| Attend and present draft recommendations to all local board workshops and business meetings for formal feedback | Throughout June and July |
| Political Working Party – consider draft recommendations for inclusion in paper to PWP                          | 13 July                  |
| Executive Steering Group Meeting  | 21 July                  |
| GB/LB forum – update on upcoming paper to Governing Body  | 26 July                  |
| Political Working Party – final omnibus report to review  | 3 August                 |
| Executive Steering Group Meeting  | 18 August                |
| Final report to Governing Body  | 24 August                |
| Proposed implementation date  | From 1 October 2017      |

## Intervention logic


14. Establishing a clear intervention logic for a project is crucial to enabling effective evaluation of both its success and its challenges.
15. Intervention logic sets out the outcomes that are being sought from the project overall – sometimes broken down further into intermediate and longer term outcomes. It also describes the outputs (or activities) that contribute towards the desired outcomes, as well as the resources that are required to deliver those activities.
16. Good intervention logic will also show how a project's success will be measured, for example reductions in the incidence of smoking resulting from the delivery of smoking cessation programmes, or increased uptake of public transport resulting from investing in improved service frequency.
17. It is important when designing an intervention logic for a specific project that we are clear about what the current state is that we are trying to change, and what the desired vision is that we are trying to achieve.
18. The pilot of extended devolution of decision making on Waiheke is based on the premise that locating decision making closer to the area of greatest impact will result in better decision making and will strengthen local communities. The principle of subsidiarity states that matters should be dealt with at the closest point to those affected.
19. This means, for example, that central government only undertakes those functions that cannot be performed effectively and efficiently at the local level, and in Auckland's case that local boards should be making non-regulatory decisions unless certain conditions are met that require a regional approach. This is required under section 17(2)(b) of the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009.
20. Placing responsibility for decisions with local community leads to growth in local leadership and human, social, economic and cultural capacity. This approach is premised on the assumption that it will lead to greater community investment in, and ownership of, both the problems and the responses to them. It is also assumed that such models will contribute positively to levels of social capital within the communities concerned.
21. In order to develop the intervention logic for the Waiheke pilot, two workshops were convened with the local board that focussed on identifying desired community outcomes and making connections between these outcomes and a set of activities and outputs that could be delivered by, or under the governance of, the local board. Some of the extended decision making powers will be set in place as a result of the broader recommendations of the governance framework review, while others will be unique to the Waiheke pilot.
22. At the workshop the board identified a series of principles that they felt were important to recognise and reinforce through the pilot. They included:

- subsidiarity - the principle of decisions being made closest to those affected;
- local flexibility, speed and responsiveness;
- development of the notion of a resilient community; and
- recognition of the role of volunteer work in contributing to a strong community.

23. The board supported a case study type approach that involved the board identifying a range of projects and ongoing issues that they felt would be responsive to more local leadership. Projects could focus on a range of problems that have been prioritised for action by the board, but which have struggled to get traction under current arrangements.

24. Using this approach would allow an evaluation process that would set out clear objectives for the pilot as well as success measures. Projects could be monitored along the way and feedback loops developed back to the board and the implementation team that would enable modification of the approach, if changes are deemed necessary in order to achieve a successful outcome.

25. Irrespective of their mandate, the pilot provides a good opportunity to evaluate the impact of the changes. The proposed intervention logic for the pilot is set out below:



## Scope of the pilot

26. This section outlines the proposed scope of the pilot project. It describes the outputs and activities part of the intervention logic – what will be done to contribute towards achieving the desired outcomes, as well as what resources will be required to deliver the proposed activities.
27. The activities proposed are broader than the technical allocation or delegation of decision making, and include operational issues, policy and planning, funding, compliance and enforcement and relationships with CCOs.
28. It is proposed that the pilot be implemented from 1 October 2017 with the first steps being the establishment of the project structure, the identification of resources required to support the project and the design of the evaluation process. Any changes to allocations will be implemented following notification through the 2018-28 Long-term plan and any delegations will be made at the same time. Any changes to financial policies will be made in year 2 of the LTP following public consultation.
29. The governance framework review suggested a range of functions and decisions that could potentially be devolved to local boards, which are currently under the purview of the governing body or Auckland Transport. They included area planning, community development and safety, developing local visitor infrastructure, managing the stormwater network, some transport decision making and catchment management.
30. Some of the matters the review proposed for devolution are in fact already allocated to local boards or provided for under statute, but boards have not had access to the resources to support them e.g. local area planning, proposing bylaws; or they have not been assessed as a priority in an environment where large regional projects have tended to dominate e.g. the Unitary Plan.
31. There are also some significant local policy issues that could be explored (and potentially decided) at the local level, such as exploring options to address tourism infrastructure deficits through instruments such as visitor levies.
32. It is also clear that some of the issues that frustrate the local board are more operational in nature and could potentially be resolved through the organisational support workstream. There are a number of longstanding compliance and encroachment issues on the island that have become almost intractable due to them not being resolved, resulting in ongoing negative environmental and social impacts.
33. For example, the local board has expressed a desire to have more local operational leadership. They feel that, as elected members, they are often faced with having to personally coordinate responses across the council group to local issues, in the absence of local senior local leadership, or escalate them to a level that should not be necessary to reach resolution e.g. the chief executive's office. The pilot will test new ways of providing organisational support to the board to enable it to deliver the identified outcomes.



## Activities for inclusion

34. What follows is an outline of the proposed activities that would be covered by the pilot, with key projects identified under each heading, along with resourcing implications.

### Locally initiated policy, planning and bylaws

35. Local boards have often struggled to find resource to undertake local policy and planning initiatives, as Auckland Council has needed to focus on the completion of significant regional priorities in its first six years e.g. the Unitary Plan, the Auckland Plan, regional policies and the review and consolidation of all legacy bylaws.
36. Local boards have advocated for the commissioning of local area plans and structure plans but in some cases have been driven to commission these themselves out of LDI funding, not always delivering an outcome that the organisation can either support or is funded to implement.
37. There is no clear route for local boards to commission policy work on local issues, as on the whole, policy is seen as regional by nature with the exception of some social and community policy issues and the triennial local board planning process. This is not to say that local boards are not consulted with in the regional policy development process, more that they have had limited opportunity to initiate local policy development and planning processes.
38. The pilot project will initiate a process by which the council engages with the local board to identify a policy and planning work programme designed to address the board's key priorities, as identified in its draft local board plan and advocacy statements and which are consistent with achieving the outcomes identified in the project's intervention logic. The policy work programme will be endorsed by the local board and resourced with staff time by the council organisation.
39. The outcomes of the process will form part of the evaluation and recommendations for ongoing implementation and/or extension to other local board areas will form part of the evaluation findings.

### Proposed key projects

#### Responding to visitor growth demands

40. The Waiheke Local Board has previously advocated for the introduction of some kind of local visitor levy aimed at providing funding for infrastructure improvements that are generated by the very high and increasing number of tourists who visit Waiheke. As Waiheke is not a growth area, or a spatial priority area, there is no specific budget available to address these impacts and the visitor levy proposal is designed to fill this gap.

41. The board has proposed using the Auckland City Council Bylaw No. 8 – Wharves 2008 (schedule of fees) or another mechanism to levy visitors and provide funding for increased services, infrastructure maintenance or improvement projects that address the impacts of tourism, while also providing local benefit.
42. This same bylaw funds a levy on passenger ferry service users, collected by service providers and paid to Auckland Transport to maintain certain ex-Auckland City wharves. The amount hasn't been adjusted for inflation since 2008 or expanded to other Auckland Council wharves. There is an opportunity to address these inconsistencies at the same time as the visitor levy is explored.
43. The option of a specific targeted rate on Waiheke accommodation providers to fund the impacts of tourism there has also been put forward<sup>1</sup>, but the ability to undertake analysis to determine the best policy instrument to address such revenue issues has been limited due to resourcing pressures. This is a complex policy issue that requires detailed analysis of visitor numbers and sources, the activities undertaken by visitors and the impact of their activities on Waiheke's infrastructure.
44. If the project is able to successfully identify a feasible and acceptable policy instrument, its introduction would need to be informed by the development of a cohesive tourism infrastructure development plan.
45. This work would require the involvement of:
  - Auckland Council – finance, community and social policy, legal, operations
  - Auckland Transport – analysis of current spend of wharf levies and implications of any change to the regime
  - ATEED – analysis of visitor activities and infrastructure demand

### **Matiatia strategic plan**

46. The local board is already progressing a Strategic Plan for council owned land at Matiatia and requests that any future development is guided by this plan and appropriate funding is allocated within the Long-term plan 2018-2028 (LTP) for both transport and non-transport infrastructure related priorities.
47. Currently Direction Matiatia Incorporated (a local NGO) is leading the preparation of the strategic plan, which covers the sustainable development and management of council (and CCO) owned land at Matiatia. The plan is being developed in recognition of the importance of Matiatia as a gateway and transport hub, to address community aspirations and to protect the area's environment and cultural heritage now and into the future.
48. This plan is being developed in collaboration with Auckland Council's Plans and Places unit, Auckland Transport, mana whenua, and the local community. Panuku

---

<sup>1</sup> This specific proposal may be superseded by the targeted rate on accommodation providers currently proposed in the Annual Plan

Development Auckland and Watercare Services Ltd which manage some public land at Matiatia are also being kept informed.

49. In its advocacy to the governing body during the 2017 -18 Annual Plan process, the board requested that the governing body review the status of the Auckland Council owned land at Matiatia. It argued that the current land management structure, particularly of the Panuku Development Auckland managed land and the associated unrealised expectation of a significant financial return on investment (at purchase) is unrealistic and that this status is delaying an outcome to the multitude of issues that exist at Matiatia.
50. If this proposal was progressed, and the governance model over the council owned land was modified, it would be an opportunity to ensure that the locally led planning process was able to be supported and implemented by the relevant arms of the council group,
51. This work would require the involvement of:
- Auckland Council – policy and planning team, legal, finance
  - Auckland Transport – ongoing involvement in planning process
  - Panuku Development Auckland – information and analysis of revenue/costs of land holdings
  - Watercare – input on future plans for Watercare owned land
  - Mana whenua who have cultural interests and aspirations over some currently unspecified areas at Matiatia Bay

### **Encroachment policy and management**

52. There are over 100 currently documented encroachments onto various categories of reserve land on Waiheke. While there are practice guidelines that were developed by the parks department in 2015, subsequent structural changes mean these remain largely unused, and there is no clear council policy for how encroachments are managed on the island. Auckland Transport has developed processes and enforcement regimes for the approval and management of encroachment into road reserve, although it is not clear to what extent these are enforced with regard to existing encroachments.
53. Officer resource to address these encroachments is also lacking and any concerted effort needs to be resourced from off island, which is seldom prioritised.
54. The topography of the island and its development pattern over many years has led to a wide range of structures, plantings and accessways being located either partly or entirely on council owned land. As properties change hands, with new owners being unaware that an encroachment exists, it becomes increasingly difficult to manage the impact of these encroachments on access to public land.

55. While these issues are not unique to Waiheke<sup>2</sup> they are more prevalent than other areas of Auckland, their impact is felt more keenly in the constrained physical environment of the island. Wellington city, which has similar physical constraints has a well embedded and broadly accepted policy and practice for issuing and enforcing encroachment licenses in both airspace and on the ground.
56. Undertaking a stocktake of encroachments on the island, then investigating options for how to best manage existing encroachments, is a piece of work that is potentially transferable across Auckland or to other local board areas experiencing similar issues.
57. This would require the involvement of:
- Auckland Council – community and social policy, licensing and compliance, parks, sports and recreation, legal
  - Auckland Transport

### **Community facilities development: community pool**

58. Currently there is no public swimming pool on Waiheke Island. The only pool that has been available for community use e.g. swimming lessons, has been an ageing primary school pool with a limited useful life. The nearest alternative public pool is in mainland Auckland.
59. While Auckland Council has assessed the need for a pool as being medium priority in its 2014 Aquatic Facilities Network Plan, the island's low population means it is unlikely to be prioritised within the next ten years. It has also been identified as an area of need where an innovative approach and partnership funding could be part of the solution. The local board funded the development of a detailed financial feasibility study in 2014.
60. The Waiheke Community Pool Incorporated Society was also formed in 2014 with a purpose of helping drive forward the plans for a new community swimming pool and increase awareness and opportunity for people in the community to learn to swim and be safe in the water. The society's goals for 2017 are to:
- determine a preferred location for a pool
  - complete consultation regarding the facility with the community and key stakeholders
  - prepare a tender document for the final design and construction of the facility (concept drawing are already in place)
  - achieve in principle support from Waiheke Local Board and Auckland Council for partnership involvement in the project
  - achieve in principle support from two major benefactors and have identified at least three major sponsors

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c\\_id=1&objectid=11836294](http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=11836294)

- reach a target of raising at least \$50,000.
61. The Waiheke Local Board has already indicated that the pool is one of its key priorities in its draft 2017 local board plan stating that it “will continue to advocate to council’s governing body and consider a targeted rate or partnership opportunities to develop a community pool”.
62. The pilot project will provide support to the Waiheke community to progress its goals, with the end goal being to have a developed and viable proposal for a shared use community pool by the end of the pilot. This would include supporting the development of partnership agreements, funding applications, negotiations with landowners e.g. Ministry of Education and attracting corporate sponsors.
63. This would require the involvement of:
- Auckland Council – strategic partnerships team, community facilities, community and social policy, finance, legal.

### **Funding and financial decision making**

64. The funding and finance workstream of the governance framework review has been exploring options for increasing local board autonomy (and) over local services budgets.
65. Depending on the outcomes of this work, which will be decided following consideration by the political working party and subject to governing body decision making, there may be the opportunity to implement a more devolved model of financial decision making at the local board level.
66. This could potentially include local rate setting for the local activity components of council services, meaning that local boards would have the ability to change service levels of fund new activities through the setting of the local component of the general rate. Waiheke is considered to be one community where such an approach may be achievable and could well have considerable support.
67. Any changes to council’s financial policies would be subject to public consultation during the long term plan 2018-28 development process and would be implemented in Year 2 of the LTP at the earliest, or year 3 of the pilot project.

### **Extended allocations and/or delegations**

68. Waiheke Local Board (and others) have the view that key activities are often decided regionally when boards feel they should be making more of these decisions according to the subsidiarity principle and in line with the provisions that decision making should be “local, unless there is a clear reason to be regional” in the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009. In some cases boards would like the allocation table changed, or more delegations given. In other cases they feel the application of the allocation table isn’t quite right.

69. In a number of cases aspects of local activities are decided regionally. For example, boards have decision-making over many elements of local parks but not reserve classification under the Reserves Act 1977, or whether a specific local park/open space should be designated a reserve under the Reserves Act or under the Local Government Act. This is because those decisions are regulatory decisions<sup>3</sup>, and so are governing body's responsibility under s 15(1)(a) of LGACA.
70. These issues have been analysed in some depth as part of the policy workstream in the governance framework review, with the conclusion being that it is recommended that some of these decisions be delegated to local boards.
71. Any delegations would need to be consistent with tests under the LGACA and the LGA. In order to delegate these decisions, the governing body would need to carry out the test in the LGA which requires it to "weigh the benefits of reflecting local circumstances and preferences (through a delegation) against the importance and benefits of using a single approach in the district (through itself retaining the responsibility, duty, or power concerned".
72. If approved, the consequences of these changes will be evaluated and recommendations about the extension of the allocations or delegations beyond the timeframe of the pilot project could form part of the evaluation findings.

### **Increased local operational leadership**

73. It is proposed that the project implementation provides for the establishment of a local operational leadership function as part of the pilot's implementation. This will involve the placement of a person with decision-making authority and a focus on progressing "sticky" operational issues that otherwise aren't getting addressed and are causing ongoing significant concerns.
74. Many of these have been previously identified and documented, but remain unresolved. There is also a significant backlog of compliance issues that by and large go unresolved due to the time and energy resolution would take. Officers come over from time to time to make a "push" on areas of concerns such as illegally moored boats, but there is seldom consistent, and ongoing effort.
75. This function will ensure actions are consistent with local board (and pilot project) objectives, and will create a direct and consistent communication channel between the board and operational staff/activities across the council group. Having a locally based senior officer able to direct and coordinate activity and keep action going will be an immense help and would send a signal to the community about council's responsiveness to local concerns. It is essential that this position has significant authority and a mandate to make things happen, if it is to be successful.

---

<sup>3</sup> External legal advice has been sought on this issue at the request of the political working party. It has not been received at time of writing this paper (13 June 2017)



76. It is anticipated that this person would lead on pursuing resolution of a number of the issues outlined in this paper and it is expected that other issues will emerge and be resolved over the life of the pilot.

77. Some key issues are highlighted below, but it is expected that other issues will emerge and be resolved over the life of the pilot.

## **Key projects for inclusion**

### **Crescent Road East**

78. The Crescent Road East extension provides the only vehicle access to over thirty properties. It is not a legal road, and has been formed on a mix of reserve and unclassified council owned land over time.

79. It is currently maintained to a limited extent by Auckland Transport, but a sustainable and safe solution needs to be found in order to provide access and egress for both residents and service vehicles, as well as provide for its ongoing maintenance.

### **Boats on beaches**

80. This is a long standing issue that is growing as Auckland housing costs and a shortage of local rental options is driving an increase in the practice of living aboard boats, and renting them out to visiting workers. The practice can create a range of hazards including illegally discharged sewage, pollution from boat maintenance being carried out on water rather than on controlled hard stand and the creation of navigation hazards through mooring systems.

81. The options available to control this practice under the Resource Management Act and council bylaw have limitations. If a boat is moved to another site following the issuing of an abatement notice, the notice is void and has to be reissued at the new location taking the notice period back to the beginning.

82. This issue probably needs to be approached from the policy and the operational perspective, with a view to reviewing the bylaw provisions while undertaking consistent and strong enforcement action.

## **Auckland Transport and place making**

83. The activities of Auckland Transport can be at times be misaligned with the wishes and aspirations of local boards. This has been particularly evident on Waiheke, where the local board feels local needs and character are not adequately taken into account in the design and delivery of transport projects which are approached from a standardised regional network perspective. Examples include an increased use of the kerb and channel approach to stormwater management, a one size fits all approach to public transport, and what the board and community see as little account being taken of the island's different character and communities.

84. Auckland Transport has recently made significant efforts to be more responsive to local boards. A team of relationship managers have been engaged and a board member, Mark Gilbert, has specific portfolio responsibility for the strategic relationship with local boards. Expectations that AT will engage with local boards and consider delegating some decision making to local boards have been set out in both the Mayor's letter of expectation and are proposed for inclusion in the organisation's draft Statement of Intent.
85. This includes a proposal to provide for significant growth in the Local Transport Capital Fund. Other initiatives have included signalling the development of a Waiheke and Hauraki Gulf Islands design guide and engagement with the board on an Investment Logic Mapping exercise to identify transport problems, solutions and ultimately funding.
86. Where commercial activities are applied for on the road reserve, these are considered and granted by Auckland Transport in discussion as appropriate with Council's street trading licensing team. Auckland Transport has indicated that it is prepared to consider delegating this function to the local board on a trial basis for the pilot project. Auckland Transport has also signalled that it is prepared to delegate event permitting in road reserves to the local board, initially on a trial basis.
87. Another example of positive change occurring has been the transfer of responsibility for stormwater planning and management in the road corridor from Auckland Transport to the council's Healthy Waters team. Recent significant rainfall and flooding events on Waiheke, have highlighted both historical unaddressed issues and the need to make changes to how stormwater is managed on Waiheke. This change enables the Waiheke Local Board to have closer involvement in this activity.

## **Key projects for inclusion**

### **Development of a 10 year strategic transport plan**

88. Auckland Transport will work with the local board on the development of a Waiheke 10 year strategic plan for transport, encompassing all modes i.e. car and freight movement, public transport, active transport and ferry services. The plan will prioritise investment over time and reflect community preferences as expressed in the local board plan.

### **Waiheke and Hauraki Gulf Islands Design Guidelines**

89. Auckland Transport has indicated that is intending to produce design guidelines specific to Waiheke and the gulf islands. These will reflect the unique nature of the island's roading network and will set out the standards and expectations for maintenance and renewal of transport assets on the island.

### **Delegation of street trading licensing and events permitting**

90. It is proposed that Auckland Transport delegate decision making to the local board on street trading licenses and event permitting in road corridor areas that are not actively



being used for transport purposes. Supporting this decision making will require the involvement of Auckland Council's street trading licensing team and event permitting team. The delegation will be reviewed as part of the project evaluation.

DRAFT

## Evaluation of the pilot project

91. A formal evaluation provides an opportunity to document and reflect on what is working, what is not working, and how things can be improved.
92. An evaluation of the Waiheke Local Board pilot is proposed. The purpose of the evaluation is to:
  - a. Document the changes associated with the pilot, in terms of the nature and extent of the board's decision making power, and the organisational support provided by Auckland Council and CCOs.
  - b. Identify areas for improvement and 'course corrections' as the pilot progresses.
  - c. Measure and report on the outcomes and impacts resulting from the pilot.
  - d. Provide recommendations relating to the continuation of pilot initiatives within the Waiheke Local Board area following the conclusion of the pilot, as well as roll-out to other local board areas across the region.
93. The evaluation will be conducted in an open, collaborative and transparent manner, and will be guided by the following principles:
  - a. **Involve stakeholders:** Key stakeholders will be involved throughout the process, informing what is valued and measured, and given an opportunity to contribute their views and experiences.
  - b. **Impartiality and independence:** The evaluation will be robust, impartial and independent, and will be led by Auckland Council's Research and Evaluation Unit.
  - c. **Understand what changes:** The evaluation will focus on articulating how change is created by the pilot (positive and negative, intended and unintended) and will evaluate the nature and extent of this change using multiple sources of evidence. Where feasible the evaluation will collect data at multiple time points to understand how change develops as the pilot progresses.
  - d. **Be transparent:** Decisions relating to the evaluation priorities, data collection, analysis and communication approaches will be clearly articulated.
94. The evaluation will use a range of methods to ensure trustworthy findings, including:
  - a. Logic modelling workshops with elected members and council staff to clarify what the pilot involves and how it is expected to bring about the desired outcomes.
  - b. A longitudinal research design, where data are collected at multiple time points throughout the pilot, to understand causal impacts over time.
  - c. The use of both primary and secondary data sources (where possible).

- d. The use of both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods (e.g. surveys, focus groups and interviews).

#### 95. Deliverables

- a. Logic models for each distinct component of the pilot, outlining the current issues and opportunities for improvement, proposed changes to resourcing or support, and the impacts these changes are assumed to bring about.
- b. A formal evaluation plan that outlines the guiding evaluation questions, priorities, data collection methods, timelines and deliverables.
- c. An agreed number of 'course correction' mini-reports and presentations at key pilot milestones (TBD) that provide updates on the progress to date and opportunities for changes and improvements.
- d. An overall report near the end of the pilot that summarises all findings to date and provides recommendations in relation to continuation and scale-up.

DRAFT

---

Find out more: **phone 09 301 0101**  
or visit **[aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/](http://aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/)**