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Executive summary

Auckland Council is developing a plan for how it invests in play: Takaro – Investing in play. The plan will clarify the council’s vision for play, and will provide decision-making and evaluation tools to help the council to invest in ways which best meet the future play needs of Auckland’s diverse communities.

A discussion document setting out key issues was released for public feedback in May 2017. We received 82 public submissions, in addition to feedback from mana whenua representatives, 21 local boards, and five council advisory panels.

Members of the council’s People’s Panel were also surveyed about their views on play; attracting 2,675 responses.

The council would like to thank everyone who took the time to provide feedback.

Overview of your feedback

Overall, you supported the proposal to create an investment plan for play. You welcomed the council taking a fresh look at why and how it invests. Many of you supported the development of investment criteria to help prioritise what we collectively value when weighing investment options.

You also supported monitoring and evaluation to help us understand whether our investments are meeting community needs.

You welcomed the council working with a range of partners, including schools, iwi and the private sector, to expand the public play network and better realise community aspirations.

You want play everyone to have a chance to play

You told us that everybody has the right to play. You asked that council continue to invest in play for young children, but to also to provide more play opportunities for other ages and abilities, including girls, older children, youth and the elderly.

You highlighted that modern lifestyles do not always make it easy to travel far to access play opportunities. You described that you are seeking more flexibility in how and where you access play, and that you value the chance to play close to home.

Many of you supported the council addressing regional inequity by prioritising investment in low socio-economic communities. However, you also emphasised the need to respond to population growth and intensification, and to meet the different play needs of urban and rural communities.
The council should develop a more sophisticated understanding of risk

You highlighted that children learn best when they are challenged to navigate risk and complexity, but that the design of public play spaces can be too formulaic, and lacking any sense of risk, excitement or challenge.

You asked that council get better at distinguishing between positive and negative risk. You asked that the council permit children and parents to take greater personal responsibility for choosing to engage in play activities with an element of known risk. However, you also saw a clear role for council in protecting the public from hidden hazards through good maintenance, and prudent investment in shade, signage and fencing.

You want to build on existing successes

You gave many examples of what you already love about our public play spaces. Some of you saw the potential for Tākaro – Investing in play to spread best practices across the region in a way which complements and strengthens local board’s existing open space network planning.

You want access to a more diverse play options

You asked that council provide a diverse range of differently-sized and equipped play spaces within communities.

You also proposed that council expand its investment in promoting flexible, challenging and creative modes of play; including nature play, adventure play, as well as play events, services, and temporary open space activations. You described how these types of play could fill gaps in provision, and meet unmet demand.

Investment must be responsive to local needs

You identified play spaces as being a source of identity and pride to your communities. You highlighted that communities have a strong stake in the design, delivery and maintenance of local play areas, and that decisions for how, where, and what to invest in, are best made locally.

You emphasised that individual communities have different play needs. You warned against creating a regional policy which might impose a ‘cookie-cutter’ or ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach across all play spaces. You urged council to create an investment approach which sensitive to local demography and environments, and which allows delivery approaches to differ between local board areas.

What we suggest as the way forward

Based on your feedback, we will now develop a draft of Tākaro – Investing in play. We propose that it will have three main components:
- **A formal policy statement** setting out the vision, aims and scope of investment, hierarchy of provision, investment principles, position on safety and risk, and approach to partnerships.

- **A decision-making framework**, setting out a menu of different types of play, assessing the capacity of each to support different local outcomes, and facilitating comparison of the relative strengths and weaknesses of investing in different modes of play.

- **A monitoring and evaluation framework** measuring the sufficiency of play provision across Auckland, and assessing the beneficial impact of new investments.

We will seek public feedback on the draft in 2018 before it is put to the governing body for adoption.
1. About Tākaro – Investing in play

As a council, one of our key responsibilities is to provide Aucklanders with opportunities to play. Traditionally, we have done this by installing play equipment in public parks.

However, Auckland is currently undergoing a period of unprecedented growth. Our population is changing more rapidly than ever before. Public attitudes and expectations towards play are also changing rapidly.

In this context, it is important that the council should have the right tools to enable it to decide how and where to invest in play over the next 20 years, so as to deliver improved outcomes to as many Aucklanders as possible. Our answer is to develop a strategic investment plan, Tākaro – Investing in play, which will set out the council’s investment approach and priorities for play.

In July 2017, the council released a discussion document as the first step in developing Tākaro – Investing in play. A copy document can be found on Shape Auckland http://shapeauckland.co.nz.

The purpose of the discussion document was to share information on the challenges and opportunities associated with meeting the future demand for play, and to test ideas and to gauge opinions on a range of alternative investment possibilities.

The key messages in the document were that:

- the council invests in play because it delivers a range of health, social, environmental and economic outcomes
- current provision of play is not meeting the needs of all Aucklanders
- creating an investment plan for play would help the council to assess alternative investments to deliver better value to Aucklanders
- there are opportunities to support a wider, more flexible, more exciting range of play experiences than we currently do

This report summarises the feedback received in the first round of consultation. All feedback will inform the development of a draft Tākaro – Investing in play.
2. Getting your views

Engagement on the discussion document took place between 29 May and 23 September 2017. A range of engagement activities were undertaken to encourage the public and organisations to get involved and have their say.

- **Email and online submissions**: public views were collected through the council’s *Shape Auckland* website.

- **Local board engagement**: Staff held workshops on the discussion document with local board clusters. Six boards sought individual follow-up workshops. All 21 boards provided formal feedback by way of resolution.

- **Mana whenua engagement**: Mana whenua views were collected at a regional hui on parks and open space.

- **Advisory panel workshops**: Workshops were presented to the council’s Young People’s, Disability, Seniors, Ethnic, and Pacific People’s Advisory Panels.

- **Online survey**: Members of the council’s People’s Panel were invited to complete a survey on future investment in play.

Table 1 below provides a list of workshops and meetings that council staff attended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local board cluster workshops</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>19 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>19 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>26 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow up workshops</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(by request)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitematā</td>
<td>18 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>20 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>26 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>03 Aug.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>08 Aug.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>16 Aug.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: List of workshops
3. Who provided feedback

Public submissions on matters raised in the discussion document

The council received the following public feedback on the topics raised in the discussion document:

- 82 online or email submissions from members of the public
- 21 resolutions from local boards
- 1 workshop with mana whenua
- 5 workshops with council advisory panels.

Of the 82 online submissions, 63 were from individuals and 19 came from groups or organisations.

Of individual submitters that provided demographic information (73%):

- 80% were female, 18% male, and 2% gender diverse
- 22% were over 45 years of age, 30% were 35-44 years of age, 26% were 25-34 years of age and 14% were less than 15 years of age
- 44% identified themselves as European, 6% as Māori, 2% as Pasifika, 3% as Asian, 3% as African/Middle Eastern/Latin, and 42% as ‘Other’.
- 18% were from the southern local board areas, 39% were from central, 30% were from north and 14% were from the west.

Figure 1: Breakdown of submissions by ethnicity of submitter
The People’s Panel survey

Alongside the discussion document, the council also invited members of its People’s Panel to complete a public survey gauging attitudes to play.

The People’s Panel is an ‘electronic panel’ made up of members of the public who voluntarily share their views with council through online surveys.

A survey on play was distributed to 19,689 panelist members between 7 August 2017 and 17 August 2017. The survey was completed by 2675 panellists, a 13.5% return rate.

Of individual submitters that completed the survey:

- 64% were female and 36% male
- 55% were from households with children
- 6% were 15-24 years of age, 11% were 25-34 years of age, 20% were 35-44 years of age and 64% were over 45 years of age
81% identified themselves as European, 13% as Asian, 8% as Māori, 7% as Pasifika, 2% as African/Middle Eastern/Latin, and 2% as ‘Other’¹.

Figure 4: Breakdown of survey responses by ethnicity of respondent

Figure 5: Breakdown of survey responses by age of respondent

Figure 6: Breakdown of survey responses by local board area

¹ Some respondents identified with multiple ethnicities.
4. What you told us

Your responses provided us with a wide range of views and insights. Overall it showed general support for Tākaro – Investing in play. As we analysed the feedback, the following key themes emerged.

**Investment in play can help support a range of outcomes**

Feedback recognised that investment in play can be used to support a wide range of outcomes. Submitters consistently emphasised the personal health and wellbeing benefits of play most strongly. However, they also highlighted capacity of play spaces to foster community identity and social cohesion. Submitters also recognised that play investment could be aligned with achieving environmental or economic outcomes, by attracting people to visit areas of natural or commercial significance.

**Play is for all ages and abilities, together**

Feedback emphasised that there is a growing population whose would like the opportunity to play, but whose needs are not currently being met. Submitters suggested that council needs broaden the scope of its investment beyond children under eight years of age. Submitters called for greater investment in older children, youth, adults, seniors, and those with disabilities.

In addition to meeting the individual play needs of a wider range of ages and abilities, feedback emphasised a desire for play spaces which caters to different family structures and mixed-age groups, and which supports play between different generations.

**Bring play closer to where people work and live**

Difficulty in accessing relevant play opportunities was a major theme. Lack of relevant local provision, inability to travel and lack of knowledge of existing regional provision were seen as major barriers.

Feedback called for the council to:

- address instances of under provision
- improve public awareness of regional play opportunities
- provide more play close to where people live and work by:
  - creating more neighbourhood and doorstep play spaces
  - improving access routes to play spaces
  - integrating play provision into the wider public realm
  - giving the public licence to improvise their own play in streets and public spaces.
Provide a mix of different-sized play spaces

Feedback agreed that it is not desirable or practical for every play space to be the same size, or offer the same experience. Feedback supported the council using a hierarchy model to deliver a diversified network of play, with a mix of destination, neighbourhood and doorstep play spaces serving each local area.

Make play spaces safe, welcoming and socially inclusive

Feedback emphasised the importance of play spaces as community hubs, capable of strengthening local identity and social inclusion. In order to fulfil this potential, submitters emphasised that the design of play spaces must support physically accessibility, and celebrate the unique stories and culture of the local area.

Play spaces also need to be equipped with the right mix of ancillary facilities to meet local demographic needs, including toilets, fences and shade as appropriate.

Make play more varied and more challenging

Feedback suggested that existing play provision is too structured, generic, and sanitised, and that the council should address this by investing a greater variety of play.

In particular, feedback emphasised strong unmet demand for unstructured, challenging modes of play including nature play and adventure play. Feedback showed a strong belief that these modes of play can be implemented in ways which are low cost, inclusive, adaptive to change and providing healthy exposure to challenge and risk.

Align investment with local needs

Feedback emphasised that the council should not seek to introduce a single ‘cookie-cutter’ approach to play provision across the entire region.

Submitters pointed out that demand for play and associated ancillary facilities will necessarily vary from community to community, depending on population composition, geography and existing play access. Feedback from rural areas tended to put greater emphasis on the value of structured play spaces, while urban submitters choose to emphasize nature play.

Communities with rapidly changing populations and low social cohesion may benefit from the versatility, and interactivity of temporary play activations.

Submitters emphasised that empowering local communities to have greater voice in the design, delivery, maintenance and renewal of play spaces would make investment more responsive.

Support regional equity and fairness

Feedback showed strong desire for investment to support fair and equitable access to play at a regional level. However, there were mixed views as to how this should be
achieved. Some supported allocating investment based on population basis, while others suggested prioritising low-income communities and addressing legacy provision gaps.

The underlying desire to deliver a universal standard of play provision exists in tension with desire to enable different investment approaches in different local board areas.

Investment needs to be financially sustainable

Feedback recognised the need for the council to improve the efficiency of its investment in response to future demand. Submitters emphasised that the council should prioritise modes of play which are future-focused and adaptable, have low all of life costs, and offer popular replay value. Suggestions included emphasising the value of smaller play spaces, and increased investment in unstructured play and play activations and programmes.

Equip investment decision-makers with relevant tools and data

Feedback noted that the design, delivery and renewal of play spaces sit within the remit of local boards. Local boards emphasised the need for care in the development of a regional plan, to allow flexibility in local implementation.

Feedback supported the council equipping local boards with new tools and frameworks to allow them to understand the trade-offs between competing investment options, and to optimise community outcomes at any level of funding. This should include trade-offs between investment in core play, and investment in theming or ancillary facilities such as shade sails.

Feedback suggested the council should monitor and evaluate the performance of its investments. This should involve collecting data on the utilisation of play spaces, the sufficiency of provision, and the performance of recent investments. This data should inform future investment decisions.

Make use of partnerships to leverage opportunities and resources

Feedback agreed that the council should make greater use of partnerships to leverage funding and to unlock private play facilities for public use. The most common suggestion was for the council to partner with schools to provide play areas which serve both students and the wider community. However, public-private and philanthropic ventures were also welcomed.
5. Your feedback on individual questions

This section analyses feedback on each of the specific issues contained in the discussion document.

In some instances, the discussion document asked several questions on a single topic. These questions have been grouped together for analysis purposes as the feedback tends to overlap.

Responses to questions were grouped together:

1) feedback from the public (including online and email submissions, and the results of the People’s Panel survey)
2) feedback from local boards resolutions
3) feedback from hui with mana whenua
4) feedback from workshops with council advisory panels.

Not all submitters provided feedback on every question. Discussion at hui and workshops often focused on a more targeted list of questions that reflected the interest of the audience. Appendix 1 provides a list of the additional questions discussed in workshops.

5.1 The value of play

Related question:
Q1. Which benefits of play are the most important?

“We believe that promoting health and well-being as well as community engagement and social cohesion are all great value benefits of outdoor play. Social and community benefit and physical and mental health benefits are equally important and very closely related. Benefit for individuals improves benefit for the community and vice versa.”

Local board submission

All groups recognised that investment in play can deliver health, social, environmental and economic benefits.

All groups saw fostering individual health and wellbeing as the most important benefit of outdoor play. Feedback emphasised the ability of play to inspire physical activity, relieve stress and stimulate creativity.
All groups saw social interaction and community-building as the second most important benefit of play. Feedback highlighted the capacity of play spaces to bring people together, and to shape local identity and physical sense of place.

Awareness of other potential environmental and economic benefits of play was more limited. Feedback from mana whenua, advisory panels and local boards recognised the capacity of play to foster respect for the natural environment and to attract customers to nearby businesses.

5.2 Investment approach

Related questions:

Q2. Should council investment target a particular demographic group, such as young children, or should it seek to cater to all ages, abilities and backgrounds equally?

Q3. Should the council prioritise investment in areas of high socio-economic deprivation over other areas?

“Make playgrounds for all ages and abilities.”

Public submission via Shape Auckland

“There should be a range of spaces catering to the diverse needs of the community. They should be within easy reach in local neighbourhoods.”

Public submission via Shape Auckland

“Children from low socio-economic households need all the opportunities they can get to grow into happy, healthy, responsible, hard-working and well-adjusted adults. Coming from a disadvantaged background they lack many opportunities to grow and develop.”

Public submission via Shape Auckland

Overall, feedback supported expanding the scope of investment to cater to all ages and abilities, and prioritising investment in communities with higher socio-economic deprivation.

Scope of investment

Feedback from all groups indicated that the council’s focus on play for children below eight years of age is too narrow.

Submitters suggested that the council should broaden its scope of investment to cater to all ages and abilities, including children above eight years of age, youth, ethnic minorities, the elderly, and persons with mobility, intellectual, developmental and neurological disabilities.
Feedback from some local boards and public submissions suggested retaining some priority for investment in children’s play, because of the large public benefits that can accrue from investing in the first three years of life.

Feedback from advisory panels noted that any increase in play provision for youth and adults would need to be supported by public education and outreach.

Scale of investment

Feedback from all groups emphasised that the council should provide a mix of differently-sized play spaces across neighbourhoods.

Feedback from mana whenua, advisory panels and local boards tended to support the introduction of the hierarchy of play provision described in the discussion document. This would classify play spaces into three categories: doorstep, neighbourhood and destination play spaces, based on size, sophistication, and user catchment area.

Within the hierarchy model, feedback from mana whenua, advisory panels and local board particularly emphasised the importance of neighbourhood and doorstep play. These were seen as better at delivering the health and wellbeing benefits of play directly to where people live. They were seen as being more cost-effective than destination play spaces, and providing opportunities to improve the utility of pocket parks.

By contrast, public submissions tended to emphasise the importance of destination play spaces as being the most inclusive of all ages and abilities, while acknowledging that it is not possible for all play spaces to be destination play spaces.

Some local boards questioned the how the hierarchy model would impact on their existing planning documents.

Distribution of investment

Feedback from submitters generally recognised that the current distribution of play spaces across the region is uneven, and that future play investment should be fair and equitable. However, submitters disagreed on whether either equity of outcome or equity of access should be prioritised.

Equity of outcome

Submitters from all groups, including approximately 30 per cent of local boards, and 46 per cent of public submitters, recognised that prioritising investment in lower socio-economic communities would benefit the region.

Submitters noted that low household incomes limit children’s access free or commercial play opportunities across the wider Auckland region. This restricts their ability learn and develop in the ways that children in higher socio-economic do.
Ensuring free, local public play spaces in these communities would help redress disparities in development outcomes.

Submitters noted that socio-economic deprivation is concentrated in local board areas with large youth populations, and that these areas are also under-provisioned for play.

Many local boards supported greater investment in areas of high socio-economic deprivation over other areas, provided it did not result in reallocation of existing budgets or play space renewal funding. Instead, new funding should be allocated to support any new investment priorities.

***Equity of opportunity***

Approximately 30 per cent of local boards and 28 per cent public submitters argued against prioritisation based on socio-economic measures. These submitters suggested that future investment should be prioritised based on population density and demography. This would ensure the council makes proportionate investments in response to legacy inequities, intensifying urban neighbourhoods, greenfield development and rural areas, based on projected user demand.

Some local boards noted that differences in local budgeting priorities between local board areas are likely to perpetuate differences in play provision, but that this is not necessarily a reason for concern.

***People's Panel***

Panellists were asked ‘in the future, who should the council build play spaces for?’

Of the 2675 respondents, the 71% selected ‘for everybody’, 54% favoured ‘older kids’ (8-14 years), 50% choose ‘younger kids’ (2-7 years), 34% choose ‘those with disabilities’ (34%), 32% chose ‘young adults’ (15-24 years), 27% ‘adults’ (25-64 years), and 12% ‘catering to particular cultures’.
5.3 Safety and risk

Relevant questions:
Q4. What is an acceptable level of risk in play?
Q5. Where does the council’s responsibility to manage risk end and personal responsibility begin?
Q6. What happens if something goes wrong? How should the council respond?

“It is too conceptually safe. You’ve got to let the people who are playing take some ownership of their environment and the parameters of their play. Swings and slides don’t cut the mustard.”

Public submission via Shape Auckland

“If you are building playgrounds you are building facilities to attract children. You have a duty of care to keep them from the traffic.”

Public submission via Shape Auckland

The importance of risk

Overall, feedback from advisory panels, local boards and public submissions agreed that exposure to risk and challenge is a healthy and necessary part of play, but that council risk-aversion has resulted in a shortage of challenging play spaces.

Feedback tended to agree that:

- the presence of some risk is integral to fun, satisfying play experiences
- children seek out risk at a young age in order to test their limits and gain confidence and independence
- learning about risk through play equipping children to better manage risk in throughout their adult lives
- minor play-related injuries are a normal part of childhood.

Submitters noted that urban intensification is encroaching on children’s ability to engage in challenging or risky outdoor play at home. This means that there is a growing need for council to provide this type of play in public.

The role and responsibility of council

Submitters drew a distinction between two different types of risk:

- Benign risk: the presence of risk is obvious to the child, allowing them to judge whether or not to proceed.
- Hazardous risk: the presence of risk is not obvious to a child.
Most submitters affirmed council’s responsibility to protect the public from hidden hazards, but suggested that the council should adopt a more permissive stance toward benign risks.

With regard to benign risk, submitters suggested that the council should:

- design play spaces to be as safe as necessary, not as safe as possible
- not attempt to eliminate benign risks by ‘dumbing down’ the design of play spaces
- permit children and parents to take greater personal responsibility for choosing to engage in play activities with an element of known risk (for example, climbing a tree)
- increase investment in types of play which provide opportunities for children to learn how to navigate risk in a safe environment, such as facilitated adventure play and nature play
- provide guidance on appropriate use of play equipment (for example, by posting age-limits on some equipment), but recognise the importance of active parental supervision in avoiding incidents.

With regard to hazardous risk, submitters emphasised that the council has a duty to minimise these. This should include ensuring that play equipment meets national safety standards, that play spaces are kept clean and free from contamination, and that there are appropriate barriers between playgrounds and adjacent environmental hazards such as busy roads.

Feedback from local boards also emphasised the need for the council to take care in distinguishing between its responsibilities in respect of benign and hazardous risk and to be transparent about any changes to risk management policies.

Responding to incidents

When responding to incidents, most feedback urged the council to avoid blanket or kneejerk responses. Each incident should be investigated separately to determine its specific cause, before determining a proportionate response.

**People’s Panel**

Submitters were asked – should we change how much risky/challenging play we allow for? 75% agreed that council should provide more opportunities for risky play.
5.4 Inclusiveness

Relevant question:

Q7. How can council provide a play network that welcomes and accommodates all ages, abilities, and cultures?

“Gaining independence through play is a crucial benefit for those with disabilities”

Advisory panel submission

Feedback provided a wide variety of suggestions for how public play spaces could be made more welcoming and inclusive.

1) Make it easier for the public to identify relevant play spaces

Feedback from public submissions highlighted the difficulties some families experience in identifying play spaces, events or programmes which met their specific needs. Better promotion and marketing of play spaces and events would fix this.

Some submitters proposed the creation of a smartphone application or online directory. This could allow the public search for play spaces using a range of criteria, including location, diversity of play facilities, age appropriateness, accessibility or the presence of specific ancillary facilities such as toilets, shade or fences.

2) Improve maintenance standards

Feedback from advisory panels and public submissions cited poor maintenance as a major barrier to enjoyment of existing play spaces.

3) Discourage anti-social behaviour

Feedback from advisory panels, local boards and public submissions noted the importance of discouraging anti-social behaviour around play spaces. There was broad agreement that ‘Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design’ (CPTED) principles should be consistently applied in the development of new play spaces.

4) Address gaps in the regional play network

Feedback from some public submissions, advisory panels and local boards reiterated the need for new destination play spaces and splash pads in the southern and western local board areas to match provision levels in other parts of the region.

5) Increase the variety of play experiences

Feedback from mana whenua, advisory panels, local boards and public submissions strongly suggested the council should increase the variety of play experiences it provides.

The most popular suggestions for were to invest more in adventure play, nature play and pop-up play activations.
In addition, feedback also suggested a large number of specific play investments targeting particular demographic groups:

- for young families: adjustable or twin-seat equipment which enables parents and infants to play together
- for young children: more learn-to-ride facilities; more opportunities for getting wet, dirty and noisy, and for enjoying street play events
- for older children: investment in technology-enabled play experiences
- for youth: more skate parks and bike tracks, more pop-up engagement activities, investment in female-friendly social hang-out spaces adjacent to active youth play spaces
- for adults and seniors: more outdoor exercise equipment, larger more challenging play structures, integration of play into the public realm
- for those with disabilities: greater investment in play equipment recognising different types of mobility, intellectual, developmental and neurological disabilities.

Feedback also identified nature play, sensory play, and facilitated pop-up play as being more inclusive of different ages and abilities, and good at supporting intergenerational interaction.

6) Cluster investment together

Some feedback from advisory panels, local boards and public submissions advocated for the clustering together of play opportunities in close proximity to each other connected by transport links or greenways. This would create micro networks or trails of play spaces, providing a diverse range of play for mixed-age family groups, while improving the utilisation of all play spaces within the cluster.

Feedback also suggested the co-location of play near other popular community facilities, such as sports fields or courts, walking tracks and exercise areas.

7) Provide some age-specific play spaces

A few public submissions suggested that the council invest in some niche play spaces specifically targeted to deliver high quality play experiences to a single age-group. Supporters of this approach argued that making all play spaces equally inclusive would be difficult and expensive, and risked diminishing the quality of play by spreading resources too thinly.

8) Identity and place

Feedback from advisory panels, local boards, and public submitters called for the design of play spaces to reflect the history, identity and natural environment of the local community. This would strengthen communities’ sense of ownership of their local play spaces, improving utilisation.
It was suggested that this could be done through the bespoke theming of play equipment, games and art, use of multi-lingual signage, planting and landscaping.

Many submitters particularly emphasised the importance of mana whenua participation in play space development. Use of Māori design principles, Māori place names, signage and theming can help protect cultural knowledge, and promote intergenerational and cross-cultural learning for Māori and non-Māori.

Some submitters noted that investment in bespoke theming of play equipment would consume resources which could otherwise be spent enhancing the core play experience. These submitters suggested that theming of play spaces should focus on landscaping, planting, colour choices, panelling and signage, rather than modifying playground equipment.

9) Accessibility

Feedback emphasised that paths, access ways and parking areas within play spaces need to be physically accessible to those with limited mobility, including prams and wheelchairs.

Feedback suggested that the council’s universal design principles should be consistently applied in the development of play spaces.

10) Improve connections between play spaces

Feedback from all groups emphasised investment in greenways and transport links to connect communities to local play spaces, and to link neighbouring play spaces together.

11) Invest in supporting facilities

Feedback from all groups emphasised the importance of ancillary facilities in making play spaces comfortable and inviting. Suggestions included sheltered resting spaces, fencing to protect young children, covered gathering areas, toilet facilities, changing rooms, barbeque and picnic areas, shade, drinking fountains and accessible signage paths and parking.

12) Embed play in the public realm

Public feedback supported the council bringing play out of parks and into the wider public realm, through the use of playful urban design in greenways, streets and plazas. This would make play accessible to people who did not have time to visit a dedicated play space in a park. Suggestions focused on the use of landscaping, public art, and fixed or moveable furniture and street games.
5.5 Partnerships

Related question:

Q8. What opportunities do you see for partnerships between council and private providers of play?

Feedback from all groups supported the council taking a partnership approach to extend the play network.

Submitters identified a wide range of entities the council could potentially partner with. Of these, education organisations, including early childhood education centres and schools, enjoyed the strongest level of support. Partnerships with existing community groups were also strongly favoured. Other potential partners included transport and utility operators, church groups, and aged-care facilities.

Submitters envisaged that partnerships could encompass access to land, capital investment, operational funding or support. These included:

- extending public access to private land
- philanthropic funding of play equipment
- community funding and maintenance of play spaces
- corporate sponsorship of play spaces or programmes
- cost sharing arrangements (including capital investment, maintenance, advertising, staffing)
- leasing public land to private operators (for example, to build and operate a adventure play park, or destination play spaces)
- contracting private providers to employ and train play workers.

Many public submitters saw communities playing a role in approving the development of local partnership projects.

Feedback from mana whenua emphasised the importance of recognising mana whenua as existing partners, and of expanding the opportunities participation of mana whenua in space play development.

Feedback showed that some local boards are already partnering with local community groups to develop and maintain play spaces. These local boards see opportunities to partner with other organisations, including schools, sports clubs, businesses, philanthropic organisations.

Many local boards expressed a desire for greater clarity on how to optimise the design of partnerships, as well as on the division of roles, responsibilities and resources between partners. Some questioned whether council procurement policies
might act as barriers to local partnerships. Some expressed particular interest in using partnerships with developers to improve provision of play in greenfield areas.

Some local boards noted that the council is already reviewing its approach to delivering community facilities through partnerships, and that this work be taken into account.

Some also questioned whether use of partnerships could lead to commercialisation or privatisation of public spaces. Providing for community oversight in the approval of local partnerships was suggested as the best way to mitigate such risks.

5.6 Investment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related question:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q9. What criteria should underpin Auckland’s investment in play?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback from all groups tended to support the criteria outlined in the discussion document.

Among public submitters, ‘inclusivity’ and ‘diversity’ received the greatest levels of support, followed by ‘fairness’ and ‘equity’.


Feedback from mana whenua emphasised ‘equity’, ‘inclusivity’, ‘diversity’ and ‘evidence-based’.

In addition submitters also suggested a number of additional possible criteria:

- **outcomes-based**: Investment prioritises play provision options which can make the greatest contribution towards the intended outcome
- **rights-based**: Investment protects children’s right and ability to play in public, including by involving children in design, delivery and maintenance of play spaces
- **quality of play**: Investment prioritises options which deliver strong replay value over novelty
- **future-focused**: Investment prioritises flexible provision options, which are adaptable to changing population needs
- **sustainable**: Investment prioritises play options which are environmentally sustainable
- **value for money:** Investment priorities play options which have a low whole of life cost including maintenance, staff, parts, warranties.

### People's Panel

Submitters were asked what three values the council should prioritise when investing in play:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Including everyone</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal access</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of play</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development outcomes</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social cohesion</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs based</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local focus</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on core play</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.7 Nature play

Related questions:

Q.10 Should we encourage and provide for nature play?

Q.11 Where should we provide for nature play?

Q12. How accepting do you think the wider community would be to lowering maintenance standards to provide for nature play in some parks?

"[We need] nature-based play utilising our reserves and beautiful non-manicured outdoor spaces. Kids, especially city kids, have the right to play as their parents used to do, climbing trees and building huts!"

*Public submission via Shape Auckland*

A majority of feedback from mana whenua, advisory panels, local boards and public submissions supported greater investment in nature play. Reasons for doing so included:

- a belief that nature play delivers greater educational and entertainment value than other forms of play
- a wish to celebrate Auckland’s existing natural environment
- a desire for urban dwellers to re-connect with nature
the desire for ‘unfussy’ public places which permit climbing, exploring, digging, and hut building and messy play

- a desire to see more sustainable materials used in the manufacture of play spaces
- a desire for access to seasonal experiences with leaves, seeds, nuts, blossoms.

Feedback from advisory panels supported the capacity of nature play to cater to all ages and abilities. Local boards value nature play as a tool for providing environmental education to the community and the importance of integrating play spaces with ecological connections.

Despite strong support across all groups, feedback found differing expectations as to what should comprise. Collectively, submitters identified a spectrum of opportunities, including:

- inviting public exploration of existing natural wilderness
- naturalising the look and feel of existing parks through landscaping and maintenance changes
- creating permanent play structures out of natural materials
- other structured spaces with a connection to nature, such as community gardens.

Those submitters promoting play in existing nature areas saw this as a way to offer authentic experiences at a low cost. Those favouring a park-based approach emphasised the importance of delivering nature play to urban areas with limited access to nature.

There was little feedback on where or how nature play areas should be established. Collectively, submitters identified a spectrum of possible options:

- anywhere in any public park or open space
- only enclosed parts of public parks
- only in urban or suburban areas with poor access to nature
- only in pre-existing nature areas, such as in regional parks
- only in enclosed parts of pre-existing nature areas.

There was no clear consensus between submitters over which of these options the council should prioritise. Enclosed environments were seen as offering less authentic nature experiences, but valued for their ability to be cleaned, maintained and inspected for hazards, and to prevent damage to natural eco-systems.
The greatest single concern regarding nature play was that it could degrade the appearance of parks. 59 per cent of public submissions opposed any lowering of maintenance standards to facilitate nature play.

Many did not see maintenance standards as related to nature play provision. Some expressed concern that maintenance reductions to facilitate nature play might lead to overall reductions in park maintenance.

Feedback from local boards and advisory panels reiterated public submitters concerns. Both emphasised the importance of educating the public about nature play and related changes to maintenance practices. Local board feedback suggested that maintaining a clear distinction between wild and manicured areas would assist public acceptance.

Feedback from both local boards and advisory panels noted that some modes of nature play may generate additional maintenance and health and safety requirements. For example, additional monitoring of water quality standards in streams and rivers, and providing for drainage of winter-use nature spaces.

\[\text{People’s Panel}\]

65% of respondents would like the council to invest more into nature play. 83% were accepting of allowing the creation of organic natural play spaces in some parks.

5.8 Water play

Related question:

Q13. Should we encourage and provide more opportunities for water play? If so, in what form?

There was limited feedback on the topic of water play. Public submissions from play experts suggested the council should prioritise investment in simple, natural forms of water play, such as sand trays, pools and sluices. These were seen as having several advantages over investment in splash pads, including being educational, inclusive of different ages and abilities, relatively inexpensive to operate, and being accessible year round.

There was limited feedback on where water play should be provided. Some submitters raised equity concerns about the relative shortage of water play areas in southern local board areas. Others suggested that that water play should be prioritised for areas with poor access to natural water ways or beaches, or aligned with environmental education programmes.

Feedback also identified restoration of natural waterways and improving access to public swimming pools as alternatives to investing in additional water play spaces.
5.9 Temporary play activations

Related questions:
Q14. In what situations should the council prioritise play activations?
Q15. What priority should be given to investment provision of temporary play experiences over permanent play assets?

“Permanent play equipment can be expensive, if temporary play experiences are more affordable they may allow more areas, more people to experience them”

Public submission via Shape Auckland

“Whilst it’s good to see variety through pop-up play areas, you want to be able to provide the basics on a permanent basis. Temporary play equipment should be used to introduce new experiences into areas where people might not normally get to experience certain things.”

Public submission via Shape Auckland

Feedback generally supported the use of activations to deliver play, but was divided over whether it should be prioritised over investment in permanent play assets.

Amongst public submissions, 46 per cent supported investment in temporary play activations being given equal or greater priority than investment in permanent play assets, while 51 per supported prioritisation of investment in permanent play assets.

The most common reason to favour increased investment in temporary play was its ability to move and change in response to changing community demand. It was also perceived as being:

- cheap to implement
- better able to deliver novel play experiences
- flexible and responsive to the needs of specific demographic groups
- able to deliver play close to where people live
- better at supporting imaginative, open-ended, intergenerational play.

Those who prioritised permanent play valued the certainty of access which it provides, and its ability to provide specific types play experience, such as climbing or swinging, which would be difficult to replicate in a temporary format.

Feedback from advisory panels tended to support increased investment play activations on the basis that they can be customised to cater to different demographics.
Feedback from mana whenua emphasised the possibility of empowering communities to develop and deliver their own spontaneous play initiatives. This should involve improving access to resources and removing compliance barriers.

Feedback from local boards generally supported greater use of play activations, but did not envisage activations surpassing permanent play as the primary mode of provision. Local boards who favoured temporary play valued it as a means of connecting with marginalised populations.

There was no clear consensus over the best situations in which the council should use play activations. Suggestions included:

- to test new play experiences
- to fill gaps in existing play provision
- to add to the diversity of play available in Auckland
- to bring play closer to where people live
- to improve utilisation of existing play spaces, parks and public spaces
- to deliver play in areas where permanent play spaces cannot be established
- to encourage play in different seasons and weathers
- to build public capacity to plan and operate community-led neighbourhood play events
- to connect with marginalised communities
- to support local festivals and events
- to support local economic activity by drawing people into town centres, or by creating employment opportunities for professional play workers

While generally supportive of investing more in play activations, local boards signalled that current budgets may be insufficient to increase temporary play. Temporary play activations are currently funded from local board operational budgets, whereas permanent play spaces are funded from capital budgets.

Submitters noted that some types of temporary play activations benefit from access to permanent ancillary facilities, such as access to electricity, drinking fountains, toilets, changing rooms and seating. This may limit where they can be deployed.

**People’s Panel**

54% support the provision of mostly permanent and a little temporary play equipment. 24% believe that the council should invest in equal permanent and temporary play equipment and only 11% want only permanent equipment.
5.10 Adventure play

Related question:
Q16: Does Auckland need an adventure playground?

"[The key to adventure play] is mostly just letting kids have some actual autonomy, some creative voice in the process of their own play. It just feels different because it's in the midst of a bunch of junk and old mattresses and a tree swing over a stream instead of some nicely painted monkey bars and a slide and a basket swing on a patch of mown grass."

Public submission via Shape Auckland

Feedback from all groups showed strong support for investment in adventure play.

42% of public submitters thought that council should encourage more adventure play. Feedback identified adventure playgrounds as learning environments for valuable life skills, such as creative problem solving and risk management.

Feedback generally suggested that adventure playgrounds should cater to all ages, some responses commented that these play spaces should be targeted to where the predominant youth population is situated.

Feedback from mana whenua, advisory panels and local boards which supported adventure playgrounds did so because they perceived them as being socially inclusive, and mentally and physically challenging.

Despite broad support for the benefits of adventure playgrounds, there was no consensus as to how they should be implemented.

As with public submitters, feedback was divided between those that favoured the model of supervised, enclosed play areas proposed in the discussion document, where children are permitted high autonomy use hand tools and loose parts to create, modify their play environment. These submitters valued adventure playgrounds as spaces where children have free reign to explore creativity and risk in a controlled environment.

Others associated adventure play with any form of play involving risk or challenge, sometimes conflated with nature play, or with large climbing structures found in destination playgrounds. Some submitters tended to advocate for a looser idea of ‘adventurousness’, not dependent on a designated location. These submitters associated adventure play with imagination, challenge and risk, as well as permission for the public to improvise their own play in public spaces (for example, hut building or tree swings).

People’s Panel

60% of respondents indicated they would like the council to invest in adventure play.
5.11 Supporting infrastructure

Q17. Which are the most important supporting facilities which council should provide at play spaces?

"At a fenced playground [children] are free to run around and enjoy themselves because their parents do not have to shadow their every move."

Public submission via email

“Tap water should be accessible, appealing and available in all play areas...improving the availability of water, particularly for children and young people living in areas of high socio-economic deprivation could displace sugar-sweetened beverage consumption.”

Public submission via email

Feedback from the advisory panels, local boards, and public submissions emphasised the importance of supporting infrastructure in making play spaces safe, accessible and inclusive.

Public submissions identified accessible toilets (33%) as the single most important piece of supporting infrastructure, followed by fencing (18%), shade (16%), and barbeque or picnic facilities (14%).

Submitters also identified a large number of other supporting facilities including:

- adult and baby changing facilities
- seating
- drinking fountains
- covered areas for activities such as tai chi
- CCTV cameras
- lighting
- bike track facilities
- parking, including accessible parking to allow for wheelchairs, prams
- electrical outlets
- wireless internet
- accessible pathways, wheelchair-friendly play surfaces
- outdoor games.

Fencing

Submitters who supported fencing did so on the grounds that it is needed to separate young children from hazards such as nearby roads. Proponents argued that fencing enables children to exercise independence within a bounded area.
Proponents of fencing disagreed that strategic landscaping or planting represented a viable alternative to fencing. Submitters also disputed the cost of fencing, and the council’s preference for fencing entire parks over single play spaces.

Some submitters suggested that fencing should be targeted towards communities with large numbers of very young children. The use of investment criteria could help identify instances where fencing is most needed.

A small number of submitters opposed fencing play spaces. These submitters raised concern that fencing isolates play area from wider park, and argued that parental and community supervision should suffice.

Shade

While a significant number of public submitters indicated that shade is important, there was no consensus as to why. Reasons included:

- concerns about children getting too hot, or play equipment overheating
- comfort of accompanying adults
- protection from ultraviolet protection
- protection from rain and other adverse weather.

Few expressed specific preferences as to how shade should be provided. Shade sails, building permanent structures and planting more trees were all identified as options. There was no consensus in favour of any one option.

Submitters who opposed investment in shade saw sun protection as the responsibility of parents and caregivers.

**People’s Panel**

Submitters were asked to name four additional facilities which make a playground visit more enjoyable:

- Toilets: 76%
- Benches/seating: 67%
- Shade: 64%
- Grassy areas: 51%
- Rubbish and recycling facilities: 42%
- Picnic facilities: 28%
- Fencing around play area: 25%
- BBQ facilities: 11%
6. What we suggest as the way forward

Your feedback has provided us with valuable insights about how to develop Tākaro – Investing in play to support the best outcomes for play across the region.

Appendix 1 summarises submitter’s key suggestions for the council to address, as well as the council’s initial responses.

In some instances your feedback highlighted tensions between achieving multiple competing goals. These include:

- a desire to support regional equity, but also to respect local diversity and avoid a single universal approach
- a desire to make play spaces more open and accessible, yet also more secluded and enclosed
- a desire to make play more challenging while not compromising safety
- a desire to invest more in both fixed and temporary play
- a desire to invest more in play space theming and ancillary infrastructure without compromising investment in core play.

Based on your feedback, our next step will be to develop a draft plan. We propose that it will have three main components:

- A formal policy statement setting out the vision, aims and scope of investment, hierarchy of provision, investment principles, position on safety and risk, and approach to partnerships
- A decision-making framework defining the different modes of play, assessing the capacity of each to support different local outcomes, and facilitating comparison of the relative strengths and weaknesses of investing in different modes of play
- A monitoring and evaluation framework measuring the sufficiency of play provision across Auckland, and assessing the beneficial impact of new investments.

As Tākaro – Investing in play is intended to serve as a strategic document; it is possible that some issues raised in consultation feedback will be addressed through the subsequent development of operational guidelines, rather than the plan itself.

Public consultation on the draft of Tākaro – Investing in play will take place in mid-2018.
## Appendix 1: Initial responses to submitters

The table below summarises submitters’ key suggestions for the council to consider in its drafting of *Takaro – Investing in play*, as well as the council’s initial responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested actions from consultation feedback</th>
<th>Auckland Council’s response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide play closer to where people live, work and socialise</td>
<td>Agreed – Feedback highlighted a number of opportunities to make play more assessable to those who cannot travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make it easier for the public to find play opportunities which meet their particular needs</td>
<td>Agreed – The council will review how it publicises the existence of play spaces and play events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide play for all ages and abilities</td>
<td>Noted – The plan will consider the merits of expanding the scope of investment to support a wider range of ages and abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support a hierarchy of differently sized, equipped, and located play spaces</td>
<td>Agreed – The plan will propose a hierarchy of provision as to support local board open space planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritise socio-economic equity, while catering to growth</td>
<td>Noted – Feedback identified a tension between prioritising equity outcomes, or supporting regional growth. The plan will need to balance these two objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a more sophisticated approach to risk</td>
<td>Agreed – The plan will aim to permit greater public exposure to ‘benign’ risk, while continuing to guard against hazardous risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve high maintenance standards for play spaces</td>
<td>Noted – Feedback indicated a low tolerance for reduced maintenance of play spaces, unless the rationale can be clarified. The plan will not propose a general reduction in maintenance standards, but will consider how maintenance practices can impact on the delivery of nature play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review its adherence to</td>
<td>Noted – The council will support the consideration of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applicable national play safety standards</td>
<td>accessibility standards as part of best practice play provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require that play spaces are designed to be physically accessible</td>
<td>Noted – The council will support the consideration of accessibility standards as part of best practice play provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the design of play spaces to celebrate local history and culture</td>
<td>Noted – The council will consider how the design of play spaces can support local identity, while recognising that there may be a trade-off between investment in theming and investment in core play equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The design of play spaces should celebrate Māori culture and identity</td>
<td>Noted – The council will consider how the design of play spaces can support Māori culture and values, including through the application of the council's Te Aranga principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide guidance on the use of partnerships to extend the public play network</td>
<td>Agreed – The plan will clarify the council's for delivering play through the use of partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use criteria to guide future investments</td>
<td>Agreed – The plan will propose investment criteria as a tool to support local board decision-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather data on the quality and sufficiency of investment</td>
<td>Agreed – The plan will include a monitoring and evaluation framework, which will inform investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritise the creation of mixed-use play spaces</td>
<td>Noted – Adopting a hierarchy of play will help guide investment in mixed-use play spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate play spaces near other community, play, recreation and leisure opportunities</td>
<td>Noted – The council consider providing guidance on the location of play spaces, in the context of the hierarchy of play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expand provision of nature play and adventure play, and pop-up activations</strong></td>
<td>Agreed – The plan will include a menu of play investment options, including nature play, adventure play, pop-up activations, as well as traditional structured play spaces. The menu of options will set out the relative merits of each type of play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prioritise investment in small, natural water play opportunities over large splash pads</strong></td>
<td>Noted – investment in water play installations with demonstrated high efficiency is likely to be encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase the flexibility and efficiency of play investments</strong></td>
<td>Agreed – the plan will consider the flexibility and efficiency of different types of play investment in the development of its menu of play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expand the provision of technology-based play</strong></td>
<td>Noted – The council will consider the inclusion of technology based play options as part of its menu of investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expand the provision of play in the wider public realm</strong></td>
<td>Noted – The council will consider the inclusion of technology-based play options as part of its menu of investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide more ancillary infrastructure, such as fencing and shade</strong></td>
<td>Noted – The plan will provide guidance to support local board decision making on investment of ancillary infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delegate development of detailed play investment planning to</strong></td>
<td>Noted – The plan will consider how to promote regional equity, while recognising the delegated authority of local boards to determine local play provision in their areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarify how the policy will support local decision-making and planning</strong></td>
<td>Noted – The plan will recognise the delegated authority of local boards to determine local play provision in their areas. The plan will aim to feed into local boards existing open space network planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarify the funding implications of the plan</strong></td>
<td>Noted – As a strategic document, the plan does not propose any immediate change to funding levels. It may inform bids for new local funding under the Long-term Plan and Annual Plan processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Additional questions

During local board workshops, members were asked to comment on the following questions:

- Which benefits of play are the most important?
- Should council investment prioritise a particular segment of population?
- Should council prioritise investment in areas of high deprivation over other areas?
- What is an acceptable level of risk in play?
- Where does the council’s responsibility to manage risk end?
- How can the council provide a play network that welcomes and accommodates all?
- What are the opportunities for partnerships between the council and private providers of play?
- Should the council encourage and provide for nature play?

During advisory panel workshops, members were asked to comment on the following additional questions relating to accessibility and inclusion:

- Where do you play the most? At home? On in street? At the park? What stops you from playing in public spaces?
- How can the council provide play spaces that welcome and accommodate all?
- What types of play opportunities would be more inviting to youth, seniors, with disabilities, people from different cultural backgrounds?
- What kinds of ancillary facilities make a playground visit more enjoyable?

During the hui with mana whenua, representatives were asked to comment on the following questions:

- What value do you see in the development of an investment plan?
- What principles or criteria should council consider when investing in play?
- What new types of play do you see value in?
- What opportunities do you see for partnerships with council on the provision of play?
- What would best practice engagement with mana whenua on play look like?
Memo
19 December 2017

To: His Worship the Mayor, Councillors, Local Board members, Independent Māori Statutory Board members
Executive Leadership Team

cc: Koro Dickinson, Manager, Global Partnerships and Strategy

From: Niels Meinderts, Global Partnerships and Strategy Advisor

Date: 19 December 2017

Subject: Update on the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership

Summary

1. This memo provides a brief update on New Zealand’s involvement in the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP) and why it is relevant to Auckland Council.

2. The new Government remains supportive of New Zealand’s trade agenda in CPTPP but is keen to reassure the public that Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) exist to facilitate export growth and not impinge on future Government decision making. On 5 December Trade Minister David Parker and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) held a public outreach event on the CPTPP in Auckland. The event was part of a broader effort to rebuild public support for trade liberalisation with greater transparency, broad-based stakeholder engagement, and rethinking the scope and ambition of FTAs.

3. Should a deal be reached on CPTPP, National Party support will be needed to get the implementing legislation through Parliament as the Green Party has confirmed they will not support the deal. MFAT officials expect the CPTPP agreement to be signed in the ‘first quarter of 2018’.

From TPP to CPTPP

4. The twelve¹ participating Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP) countries concluded the Agreement in November 2015, and signed it in Auckland in February 2016. The subsequent decision by the new United States (US) Administration in January 2017 to not become a Party meant the TPP could no longer enter into force.

5. Over the course of 2017, officials from the remaining 11 signatories have negotiated a revised deal that incorporates much of the TPP into what has been coined the CPTPP.

6. Trade Ministers, including New Zealand’s David Parker, met in the margins of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) meeting in Da Nang in early November 2017 to finalise the new deal.

7. The core elements of the new CPTPP were agreed upon in Da Nang, however four issues required further technical work and discussion – all of which were ‘not unsolvable’ according to New Zealand’s Chief Negotiator Vangelis Vitalis, who is expecting countries to be able to sign the CPTPP agreement in the ‘first quarter of 2018’.

---

¹ New Zealand, Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, Singapore, Viet Nam and the United States.
What has changed?
8. According to Minister Parker, a number of the most controversial parts of the TPP in the new Agreement have been suspended, but there will be no change to the goods market access outcomes contained in the original TPP. The CPTPP suspends 20 provisions from various chapters of the original TPP, many of which were compromises made to the US during negotiations, particularly in the intellectual property space.²

9. The CPTPP will for the first time provide New Zealand preferential market access into Japan, the world’s third-largest economy, as well as Canada, Mexico and Peru. Minister Parker said in Auckland last week that the deal also continues to uphold the unique status of the Treaty of Waitangi; and preserves New Zealand’s right to regulate in the public interest.

Why is the CPTPP relevant to Auckland Council?
10. The CPTPP is relevant to Auckland Council both in terms of its potential to be a catalyst for further economic development in Auckland and the potential to impact on future Council decision making processes, planning and costs. These issues are outlined below.

11. Economic development - 198,000 jobs are dependent on exports in the Auckland region. Improving tariff free access to international markets is of significant benefit to Auckland’s exporting businesses as it enables them to compete on an even playing field overseas – it is estimated that NZ$20.3 million of tariffs will be saved annually by the Auckland region alone through CPTPP.³

12. Right to regulate - In 2013, Auckland Council’s former Regional Development and Operations Committee (2013 Committee) provided a number of recommendations to TPP negotiators, to protect Auckland Council’s ability to regulate and develop public policy in the interests of ratepayers.⁴ This included a request to ensure Council can continue to adopt procurement policies that provide for a degree of local preference; or to require higher health and safety, environmental protection, employment rights and conditions, or community participation in procurement policy. Both Minister Parker and MFAT officials have emphasised that the Government’s right to regulate has been adequately protected under the CPTPP. It is also important to note that local government currently remains exempt from the Government Procurement (GP) Chapter of CPTPP. The ability to negotiate expanded coverage of the GP Chapter to cover local government contracts has been delayed from a three year period in TPP, to at least five years after CPTPP’s date of entry into force.

13. Costs of increasing intellectual property protection - Under CPTPP copyright protection has been reduced from what was 70 years in TPP, back to 50 years, effectively re-enforcing the current status quo in New Zealand. The Government’s TPP impact assessment had estimated that the long-term cost of the extension of copyright from 50 to 70 years would have been NZ$55 million per year to New Zealand consumers. This would have increased projected copyright costs for Auckland Council’s libraries, but has been averted under the CPTPP.

14. Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) – The 2013 Committee also recommended that negotiators ensured the TPP did not give overseas investors or suppliers any greater rights than domestic investors and suppliers, through an ISDS clause in TPP. The ISDS provision in TPP that would have allowed overseas investors to sue the central government (and potentially local governments indirectly) for breach of an investment agreement or an investment authorisation has been narrowed in scope under CPTPP.

---
³ MFAT estimate.
According to leading law firm, Chapman Tripp, investors will only be able to sue governments in relation to the obligations set out in the Investment Chapter of CPTPP itself. These are tightly bounded, making it very difficult to mount a successful action against a Government on matters of public interest such as health or the environment.

15. New Zealand has retained the reciprocal agreement with Australia that ISDS clauses will not apply between them. According to Minister Parker similar agreements with the other countries in CPTPP will be sought and ISDS will no longer be pursued in future trade agreements by the current Government.

16. Ban on non-resident ownership of existing homes – On 31 October 2017 Prime Minister Ardern announced that “The Government would introduce an amendment to the Overseas Investment Act to classify housing as ‘sensitive’ and introduce a ‘residency test’ for purchasing existing housing stock”. According to Minister Parker, the proposed changes would need to be introduced prior to New Zealand agreeing on CPTPP as they would otherwise breach the agreement. The necessary Bill was presented to Parliament on 14 December 2017 after which Land Information Minister Eugenie Sage said “for practical purposes, it will mean that foreign buyers will not be able to buy residential property unless they are either increasing the number of residences and then selling them or converting the land to another use”.

17. Tax on water exports - According to Chief CPTPP Negotiator Vangelis Vitalis the Government’s promise to charge exporters of New Zealand water a ‘royalty’ in their coalition agreement could not be applied as an export tax. Vitalis told the Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Select Committee on 28 November that while the CPTPP protected the Government’s right to create policy around water, an export tax on water would breach it - and several other FTAs. He suggested any controls on water could perhaps be managed instead under the Resource Management Act (RMA). For example, the RMA allows the Minister for the Environment to prepare National Policy Statements on water use – to guide local authorities.

Next Steps

18. We understand CPTPP negotiators will meet again in the ‘next few months’ to address the four issues to be finalised. MFAT officials expect the CPTPP agreement to be signed in the ‘first quarter of 2018’.

19. The implementing legislation passed for TPP will not apply to CPTPP and so new legislation will have to be passed. The Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Select Committee are currently scrutinising the CPTPP and Parliament will consider the necessary legislative changes needed to give effect to the agreement in early 2018. Recognising the high level of public interest in the CPTPP, MFAT has in the meantime begun publishing relevant material on its website.  

20. Looking ahead, Auckland Council staff will regularly report back on the CPTPP’s progress and maintain Council’s close working relationship with MFAT (covered by an MOU signed in 2016 between Auckland Council and NZ Inc.) to ensure Auckland’s interests are represented.

21. Any immediate enquiries can be directed to Council’s Global Partnerships and Strategy unit: Niels Meinderts, Advisor (niels.meinderts@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz; 021 508 114).

December 2017
Global Partnerships and Strategy Unit
Auckland Council

----

Memorandum

To: Chair and Members of the Environment and Community Committee
Subject: Update on progress to become a friendlier city for all Aucklanders
From: Kataraina Maki, General Manager, Community and Social Policy

Purpose

1. To provide an update on progress towards Auckland becoming a friendlier, more inclusive city for all.

Key messages

- Work is progressing to look at how Auckland can be a friendlier city for all Aucklanders.
- A key step is including belonging and participation as an outcome area in the Auckland Plan refresh.
- We are also engaging directly with diverse Aucklanders to identify what makes them feel they belong and the enablers and barriers to inclusion.
- Insights from this along with other research on Auckland’s diverse populations will be used to inform council’s policy, plans and service delivery.
- We will report to the committee in 2018 on key findings and proposed next steps.

Staff asked to investigate how to make Auckland a friendlier city for all

2. On 1 September 2016 the Regional Strategy and Policy Committee considered a proposal to become a member of the World Health Organisation’s Global Network of Age-Friendly Cities and Communities.
3. The committee resolved not to join the network, but asked staff to progress the intent of the framework (to become a friendlier city for a range of populations, including older people) through council’s existing strategy and policy framework and report back (REG/2016/92).
4. A copy of the full resolution is attached.

Belonging and participation is a key outcome area in the Auckland Plan refresh

5. The Auckland Plan sets the high level strategic direction for all of council’s activities. Ensuring there are outcomes in the Auckland Plan that focus on creating a friendlier, more inclusive city is therefore critical.
6. As part of the Auckland Plan refresh, we have provided policy input and subject matter expertise on diversity and inclusion including technical papers on ethnic diversity and Auckland’s older population.
7. Fostering an inclusive Auckland where everyone belongs and improving health and wellbeing for all Aucklanders are now strategic directives in the draft Auckland Plan refresh.

Work is underway to identify what makes Aucklanders feel included (‘Investing in Aucklanders’ project.)

8. We are also undertaking a project (with a working title of ‘Investing in Aucklanders’), to identify what helps Aucklanders feel like they belong.
9. Using an “appreciative enquiry” [strengths-based] approach, we are to engaging with a diverse range of Aucklanders about their experience of Auckland, to understand what belonging and inclusion means to them, and to identify enablers and barriers to this.
10. The engagement phase began on 25 September 2017 with a combined demographic advisory panels workshop. This was attended by 45 panel members and by Councillors Casey, Filipaina and Hills in their roles as panel liaison councillors.
11. Over the last two months we have held over 20 workshops in local communities with more planned through December.
12. These workshops have reached a diverse range of people including school students, Chinese, Indian and Pacifica communities; and many older Aucklanders including a group of older muslim men and women. Sessions have also been held across Auckland to ensure a geographic spread.
13. Many of the people who have attended these workshops told us they have never engaged with the council before. Hearing the voices of those we don’t normally reach is a key objective of the project.

Research on various demographic groups has been completed and is being used to inform policy

14. Council’s policy work on inclusion and diversity is underpinned by research. Recent research has looked at the:
   • quality of life of older Aucklanders (a report with key findings from this research will be circulated to all councillors shortly)
   • challenges and opportunities for rainbow communities
   • social impacts of ethnic diversity
   • current status of children and young people in Auckland
   • Auckland Māori children under five and their whānau.
15. These reports are available on the council’s Knowledge Auckland website1.
16. This research will be used to help inform council policies, plans and the way services are delivered to support positive outcomes for Auckland’s diverse communities and demographic groups.

Next steps

17. In March/April 2018 we will hold a ‘walk through’ to present the key insights from the community workshops. Councillors will be invited to attend this along with advisory panel members, local board members, council staff and community participants.
18. Staff will formally report the findings and the proposed next steps to the Environment and Community Committee within the first half of 2018.
19. It is anticipated that the next stage will involve using the findings alongside other research to inform policy, planning and service delivery.
20. This could include specific actions as well as testing new ways to design and deliver services to create a more inclusive and friendly environment for everyone, including older Aucklanders.

1 http://www.knowledgeauckland.org.nz/
Attachment 1 – Regional Strategy and Policy Committee Resolution – 1 September 2016

Resolution number REG/2016/92

MOVED by Chairperson GS Wood, seconded by Cr LA Cooper:

That the Regional Strategy and Policy Committee:
   a) agree that Auckland Council is committed to the intent of the WHO Age-friendly Cities and Communities Framework for Aucklanders aged 65 years and over.
   b) agree that many Auckland populations could benefit from the intent of the WHO Age-friendly Cities and Communities Framework:
      i) to be friendly, and to tap into each population’s potential and contributions to improve their wellbeing; and
      ii) that there are shared issues across populations, as well as those which are unique to each.
   c) agree to progress Option 1: Utilise existing council strategic frameworks and processes to progress the intent of the Framework (a more friendly city for a range of populations, including older people) for consideration by the incoming Council.
   d) direct staff through the delegations of the Chief Executive to start implementing Option 1 by identifying issues and opportunities to progress the intent of the Framework across a range of populations and report back to the appropriately delegated committee.

CARRIED
Memo

21 December 2017

To: His Worship the Mayor, Councillors, Independent Maori Statutory Board Members, Executive Leadership Team
Cc: Jacques Victor, GM - Auckland Plan Strategy & Research
From: Koro Dickinson, Manager Global Partnerships and Strategy

Subject: Global Engagement Activity Update – January 2018

Summary

The purpose of this memo is to outline Auckland Council’s key upcoming global engagement activity during the month of January 2018. It notes key activity undertaken last month and outcomes achieved through this activity.

Action: for information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Key Activity – January 2018</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 Jan</td>
<td>Visit by a US political delegation for transport and strategy briefing</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Jan</td>
<td>Visit by Australian Indigenous Business delegation focusing on Maori economic development</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Jan</td>
<td>Global Partnerships and Strategy (GPS) Unit briefing with Hamish Macmasters - New Zealand (NZ) Ambassador designate to Iran, Pakistan and Afghanistan</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Activity - December 2017

The following is a list of key global activity facilitated by GPS and outcomes achieved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1-2 Dec    | Visit by Mr. CHEN Zhiying, Executive Vice Mayor of Guangzhou.             | Auckland | • Reinforced the strong Guangzhou – Auckland relationship and the success of the recent Tripartite Summit.  
|            |                                                                          |          | • Discussion with Councillor Clow and ATEED regarding areas of collaboration. |
| 1 Dec      | Auckland Council and ATEED combined presentation to NZ Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) staff. | Auckland | • Briefed Auckland's interests and global engagement strategy to the off-shore based MFAT 15-member staff group.  
|            |                                                                          |          | • Deepened mutual understanding on effective collaboration between Auckland and MAFT off-shore offices. |
| 3-4 Dec    | Mayor Goff and delegation including Deputy Mayor Cashmore, Councillors Collins and Watson, and Chief of Strategy, Jim Quinn attend the NZ-China Mayoral Forum. | Wellington | • Increased Auckland’s knowledge of NZ-China relationship and its significance, particularly in education, tourism and primary industry sectors.  
|            |                                                                          |          | • Acknowledged the intention to promote 2019 as NZ-China Year of Tourism.  
<p>|            |                                                                          |          | • NZ companies were able to promote their interest in doing business with China. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Dec</td>
<td>Roundtable discussion with Mr. Krzysztof Szczerski - Secretary of State and Chief of the Cabinet of the President of Poland.</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Opportunity to prepare for the visit of the Polish President Andrzej Duda to Auckland in 2018, meet the Polish expat community in Auckland, and learn about Polish interests in upcoming EU-NZ Free Trade Negotiations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dec</td>
<td>Auckland Council Group Dialogue with Ms. Bonnie Glaser, Director of the China Power Project - Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington DC.</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Discussion on China’s international strategic agenda and influence in the Asia-Pacific region both at the national and regional levels. Discussion of potential cooperation opportunities within the frame of US-NZ-China relationship, particularly at city-to-city level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dec</td>
<td>Visit by Volunteer Services Abroad (VSA) Communications Director to focus on South Auckland Pasifika initiatives and facilities.</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Engagement facilitated between VSA and Emeline Afeaki-Mafie'o, an award winning Pacific social entrepreneur. Discussion on future collaboration with Auckland and how the VSA may contribute to business and social capacity building work in Tonga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Dec</td>
<td>GPS met with MFAT’s Martin Harvey to provide input on upcoming EU-NZ FTA negotiations.</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>GPS will be following negotiations closely to ensure Auckland Council’s interests represented and implications identified well in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Dec</td>
<td>The NZ Deputy Consul General to Los Angeles, designate, Murray Bruges met with Auckland Council.</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Briefings with Jim Quinn, John Duncan, John Mauro and David Norman focused on consulate contributions that could help inform Auckland’s strategy and priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Dec</td>
<td>GPS facilitated Jim Quinn’s meeting with MFAT on Smart Cities and Singapore.</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Discussion on potential and possibility for Auckland around any NZ ‘Enhanced Partnership’ with Singapore. Discussed what Auckland is doing to become a ‘SMART’ city. Discussion around advantages of Auckland’s current city-city connections with Singapore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Dec</td>
<td>Conference call with Fernanda Massaccesi, Director of the International Relations team of the City of Buenos Aires (BA) Argentina.</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Discuss potential opportunities for city to city collaboration to leverage direct Air NZ Auckland-BA flight three times a week Brief on C40 event in BA in 2018 linked to the G20 Summit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next steps

- The Global Partnerships and Strategy Unit will provide an update on key global activity each month.
- Requests for additional information or enquiries about the information listed above can be directed to Tao Chen, Advisor Global Partnerships and Strategy: tao.chen@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz Mobile: 021 853 948.)
Memorandum

29 November 2017

To: Chair and Members of the Environment and Community Committee

Subject: Older Aucklanders: A Quality of Life Status Report 2017

From: Katarina Maki, General Manager, Community and Social Policy

Purpose

1. To inform the committee about a new summary report on the quality of life of older Aucklanders.

Key messages

- Auckland is a great place to live for many older people.
- Some older Aucklanders, particularly those on limited means, face more challenges and are concerned about issues such as safety and housing.
- The research will inform how Auckland can be a more inclusive city through its policy, planning and service delivery functions.

Summary report presents findings in an accessible way

2. A summary report (attached) of Older Aucklanders: A Quality of Life Status Report 2017, highlights key findings about the quality of life of older Aucklanders. It provides information in an accessible and engaging way, using infographics, visuals, and plain English that make it user-friendly to a range of audiences.

3. The full findings are published in a technical report (TR 2017/014) available on Knowledge Auckland (Auckland Council’s Research and Evaluation webpage).

Council will use the research to inform policy, planning and service delivery

4. We will use the research to inform policy, planning and service delivery to help create a more age-friendly environment where older Aucklanders feel included and can thrive.

5. The summary report will be circulated to local boards and the wider council family (including CCO’s) so that the findings can be used to inform their planning and services.

6. The findings of the research have already been shared with the Seniors Advisory Panel.

We will continue to monitor progress

7. Staff will monitor the quality of life domains of older Aucklanders to help track changes over time.
Older Aucklanders: A Quality of Life Status Report 2017

Te Hunga Kaumātua ake o Tāmaki Makaurau: he pūrongo mō te koungahou o te pae oranga 2017

Summary report

Find out more:
visit aucklandcouncil.govt.nz
or phone 09 301 0101
Introduction
Kupu Whakataki

Older people are a taonga (treasure), contributing to Auckland’s economic and social fabric, nurturing younger generations and sharing their knowledge and wisdom.

Older Aucklanders need a city that enables them to live happy and healthy lives, as full participants in creating their futures.

Auckland Council recognises the contributions, as well as the challenges, that an ageing population can bring. Auckland Council has a clear directive in the Auckland Plan to “recognise and value the contribution of older people to the community”1. The council’s Seniors Advisory Panel plays a key role in this. It provides insight on issues that are important to older Aucklanders in relation to the council’s regional strategies, policies, plans and bylaws. The panel also advises the council on how to engage effectively with older Aucklanders.

This report is an executive summary of Older Aucklanders: A Quality of Life Status Report. It presents an overview of the social and economic status of ‘older Aucklanders’, defined as people aged 65 years and over and living in Auckland. It provides a snapshot of the diversity of older Aucklanders, with some key insights to guide future research and policy development.

Me mahi tahi tātou mō te oranga o te katoa.
We should work together for the wellbeing of everyone.

---

1 Auckland Plan, 2012.

2 Older Aucklanders: A Quality of Life Status Report 2017 – Summary
About the report
E pā ana ki tēnei pūrongo

The Older Aucklanders: A Quality of Life Status Report 2017 outlines findings across eight broad domains or themes that contribute to high quality of life and wellbeing: housing; neighbourhood; transport; social connectedness; health and care; status in society; culture and identity; and economic standard of living.

These domains complement the goals of the New Zealand Positive Ageing Strategy but are focused on Auckland, unique in New Zealand because of our large, multi-cultural and predominantly urban population. The domains, indicators and measures used in this report were selected through a multistage iterative process, which included:

- a literature review on the determinants of well-being among older people (Auckland Council technical report TR2016/047)
- a review of domains and indicators in the New Zealand government’s Positive Ageing Strategy and the World Health Organisation’s Age-friendly Cities material
- external stakeholder consultation with subject matter experts (including Auckland Council’s Seniors Advisory Panel) on draft domains and indicators
- data collection from existing sources (the Census of Population and Dwellings, and other official statistics) and from a survey commissioned by Auckland Council in 2016 of 846 people 65 years old and over.

Key insights
Mātauranga Matua

The findings presented in the report highlight the diversity of the lived experience of Auckland’s older population.

A quarter of New Zealand’s older population lives in Auckland
In 2013, there were 163,161 people aged 65 and over living in Auckland, accounting for 11 per cent of our total population, and a quarter (27%) of the national count of older people.

Auckland’s older population is projected to continue growing
Over the next 20 years, not only will there be more people living in Auckland but there will be increasing numbers of older people. The number of older Aucklanders is projected to more than double in the two decades between 2013 and 2033, reaching a total of 353,600. This means an increasing proportion of Aucklanders will be aged 65 and over.

Older Aucklanders are diverse
Auckland is the most diverse multi-cultural city in New Zealand, and older Aucklanders are a part of that diversity. Older Aucklanders are an ethnically and culturally diverse group, albeit predominantly European. In 2013, just over three quarters (78%) of older Aucklanders identified with a European ethnicity. The next largest group were those classified under the broad Asian category (12%), followed by Pacific peoples (6%), and Māori (4%).
Greater ethnic diversity in younger age groups means that in the future, older Aucklanders will be even more ethnically diverse. Older Aucklanders also have multiple overlapping identities, e.g. cultural, linguistic, religious, spiritual, sexual orientation and gender identities.

**Auckland is a great place to live for many older people**

The 2016 survey of Older Aucklanders found the majority of respondents:

- rated their health as being good or excellent
- belonged to one or more social groups
- had not felt lonely or isolated in the previous 12 months
- agreed they got on with the people in their neighbourhood
- felt safe in their home at night.

**There are some concerns, particularly for people with limited means**

This report highlights the importance of acknowledging that older Aucklanders are not a cohesive, homogenous group.

For example:

- in 2013, 22 per cent of people aged 65 and over lived in areas of relative socio-economic disadvantage (decile 8, 9 or 10 areas)
- almost one in five respondents to the survey of Older Aucklanders felt that older people are not valued in our society
- perceptions of safety drop as income levels drop. Just over half (53 per cent) of those on incomes of $20,000 or less reported feeling safe compared to 68 per cent of those on incomes of $100,000 or more.

**Levels of home ownership among Aucklanders aged 65 and over are decreasing**

Levels of home ownership among Aucklanders aged 65 and over are decreasing – 72 per cent in 2001, 70 per cent in 2006 and 67 per cent in 2013. This is 10 per cent lower than the rest of older New Zealanders outside of Auckland (77 per cent). Greater numbers of older Aucklanders are renting, often from private landlords.

**Housing is an area to watch**

The majority of older Aucklanders are currently in suitable housing situations. However, more than 7000 older Aucklanders are living in crowded situations. 2

Almost 20 per cent of respondents to the survey told us they did not think their housing costs were affordable, and that they could not afford to heat their homes properly during winter.

These issues may intensify as the older population grows and home ownership decreases.

**Full report provides a good baseline for the future**

The full Older Aucklanders quality of life status report 2017 provides a useful foundation upon which Auckland Council can continue to track the status of older Aucklanders, and can respond to the substantial demographic shifts over the next few decades.

Generally older Aucklanders are doing well but there are also a few areas to watch. We must consider changing needs, aspirations and wellbeing as our older population rapidly grows, and becomes more diverse.

It will be valuable to reflect on the quality of life of older people again in three to five years.

---

2Statistics New Zealand (2013), customised data.
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Population overview
He tirohanga tatauranga ā-iwi whānui

All over the world the number of people aged 65 and over, as well as the proportion of national populations who are in these older age groups, is increasing.

Auckland is no different, with demographic trends showing that Auckland will be home to significantly more older people over the next few decades.

The demographic phenomenon of population ageing is occurring across New Zealand. It has several drivers, including improvements in life expectancy and longevity combined with a decline in birth rates. This decreases the proportion of the population that is young and increases the proportion that is old.

This group spans several life stages.

The number of older Aucklanders has been increasing over the last few decades. This growth has been particularly large in the 65-74 year age group, jumping from 62,820 in 2006 to 95,190 in 2013. This is related to the baby boom cohort (often referred to as those born between 1946 and 1964) reaching age 65, and will also be a result of net immigration from other parts of New Zealand and overseas.

Auckland was home to 165 people aged 100 and over.  

Other than herding into retirement villages (usually not the best long-term economic option) there is very, very little - in fact, no other option - or incentive for the older age group to stay in Auckland.

Respondent to the survey of Older Aucklanders, female, 65-69

---

1Statistics New Zealand, Census 2013.
Statistics New Zealand population projections (medium series) suggest that the number of older Aucklanders will more than double in the two decades between 2013 and 2033, reaching a total of 353,600. Such significant proportionate growth is not anticipated in any other age group and is unprecedented in New Zealand history.

As the map shows, large numbers of older Aucklanders live in areas on the edges of the isthmus, on the northern coast, and on the edge of the urban area, including Whangaparaoa peninsula and Waiheke.

**Distribution of older Aucklanders by Census area unit (2013)**

*Data source: Statistics New Zealand, Census 2013*
How are older Aucklanders doing?
He pēhea te noho a te hunga kaumātua ake o Tāmaki Makaurau?

Domain 1: Housing
Older Aucklanders live in a range of housing situations.
In 2013, a quarter lived on their own and 44 per cent were in a household that was defined as couple-only. A small proportion (5%) lived in crowded situations (i.e. requiring extra bedrooms). Levels of home ownership among older Aucklanders are higher than the rest of the adult population, although they are gradually decreasing over time.

67%
65yrs+
owned or partly-owned the dwelling they lived in.

39%
15-64yrs
owned or partly-owned the dwelling they lived in.¹

Around one in five (17%) of respondents to the survey disagreed that their housing costs were affordable.

The increasing cost of housing makes it difficult to downsize, as does the lack of smaller single level home units.

"Respondent to the survey of Older Aucklanders, male, 65-69"

¹Census 2013, Statistics New Zealand
Domain 2: Neighbourhood

Neighbourhoods can provide older Aucklanders with a healthy and supportive living environment. This includes the physical environment, as well as the socio-cultural aspects of community engagement and support. We asked respondents to the survey of Older Aucklanders a few questions about their neighbourhoods.

“I feel lucky to be financially secure, living in a comfortable apartment, when so many people live in poverty and cannot afford things like visits to the doctor or dentist.”

Respondent to the survey of Older Aucklanders, male, 65-69

60% felt there was a sense of COMMUNITY in their local area.

79% amenities such as shops and parks.

74% public facilities such as the library or community hall.

77% services such as the dentist or doctor in their local area.
Domain 3: Transport

Mobility and being able to get around the city easily are vital to an active and healthy life. Most older Aucklanders are eligible to use the SuperGold card for free travel on public transport services. This is particularly beneficial for people on fixed incomes, as well as those who do not wish to or can no longer drive.

Respondents to the survey of Older Aucklanders who had used public transport in the previous 12 months

- 83% felt it was safe
- 75% felt it was affordable
- 69% found it easy to use

"Failing eye sight restricts my ability to drive at night. Reduced walking already means I can’t walk as far or as often as I would like. I prefer to not drive in/through Auckland unless it is absolutely necessary. Traffic density is off-putting."

*Respondent to the survey of Older Aucklanders, female, 80-84*

"It is extremely important to me to be able to continue using the SuperGold card/Hop card, especially for travel after 3pm for medical appointments and community activities. Due to times of appointments and meetings and distances of travel required around Auckland, if the times of use for the SuperGold card/Hop card changed this would have a significant impact on my life, health and finances."

*Respondent to the survey of Older Aucklanders, female, 65-69*
Domain 4: Social connectedness
Mental, emotional and spiritual wellbeing among older Aucklanders is enhanced by meaningful social connections.

“I have...a very good and happy family who visit often and phone me every day, having good friends, and a wonderful church community.”

Respondent to the survey of Older Aucklanders, female, 80-84

Respondents to the survey of Older Aucklanders said that they...

- 80% belonged to one or more social networks or groups
- 20% did not belong to any of the social group options that were provided.
  Across all age groups (however, those aged 85 and over were slightly over-represented)
- 72% those who had access to the internet, used it every day
- 77% were visited by family or friends as often as they would like
- 70% trusted people they dealt with regularly

Age Concern (as well as other agencies working with older people) report that loneliness is a very real issue for some older members of society, leading to depression and anxiety.

25% of respondents to the survey said they had sometimes felt lonely and isolated in the previous year.

Older Aucklanders: A Quality of Life Status Report 2017 - Summary
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Domain 5: Health and care

As people age, health needs can become more immediate and there tends to be a greater reliance on the healthcare system.

In 2015, there were more than 3000 public hospital discharges and 102 deaths related to falls among Aucklanders aged 65 and over. More than half of these deaths were among people aged 85 and over.

The Older Aucklanders survey told us that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRESS</th>
<th>7%    had experienced stress that had a negative effect on them in the previous 12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOCTOR</td>
<td>17%   had postponed or put off a visit to the doctor or their GP in the previous year in order to keep costs down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td>80%   rated their level of health as good or excellent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domain 6: Status in society

The expression of positive attitudes and behaviours towards ageing and the aged within broader New Zealand society underpins a sense of belonging and inclusion.

- felt they had been discriminated against in the previous 12 months because of their age
- felt that older people are valued in Auckland
- felt that they had the opportunity to play a role as an elder in their family or wider community
- felt that older people were not valued in Auckland.

Large proportions (83%) of older people eligible to vote did so at the 2014 central government elections.

Data on voting is not available for local elections. However, Auckland Council data suggests that at the 2016 local government elections older people were highly represented among those who stood for elected roles.

“...is that my husband has dementia. I know there is a lot of support and help out there which I wouldn’t have in a small place. So that’s another plus for living in Auckland and being 75 yrs old.

Respondent to the survey of Older Aucklanders, female, 75-79
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## Domain 7: Culture and identity

It is important that diversity among older Aucklanders is recognised and responded to appropriately, starting with recognition of the benefits for older Māori to engage with Te Ao Māori (including te reo, tikanga, wahi tapu and access to whanau and hapu).

The 2013 Statistics New Zealand Te Kupenga survey found that among Māori aged 55 and over living in Auckland:

- 9% of older Māori in Auckland spoke conversational te reo in 2013
- 21% had undertaken voluntary work for a marae, hapū or iwi
- 28% felt it was very important to be engaged in Māori culture
- 41% had been to their ancestral marae in the previous 12 months
- 54% had been to a marae in the previous 12 months.

Auckland’s multi-cultural society is reflected in the older age groups (albeit not to such a large extent as in younger age groups). Samoan, Yue, northern Chinese and Hindi languages are the most commonly spoken languages among older Aucklanders after English (approximately 3000 in each language group).

Almost half (48%) of respondents to the survey of Older Aucklanders agreed that their culture was an important part of their identity, particularly those who identified with an Asian ethnicity (72%).

A majority (83%) of those who strongly identified with a religion or spiritual group agreed they were able to regularly participate in spiritual events, activities and traditions that were meaningful to them.

Many older Aucklanders raised in New Zealand, and elsewhere, have lived through a time when diversity and difference from mainstream western European values was not recognised or celebrated. This may have had deep and lasting impacts on how they view themselves and others, and can impact on their experience in healthcare and support systems.
Domain 8: Economic standard of living

Movement into older age can be a challenging time financially, for example due to lowered income in retirement, additional costs of housing, healthcare or support, or the requirement to financially support other family members.

People aged 65 and over in paid employment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Paid employees</th>
<th>Self employed (without employees)</th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Unpaid family worker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the 2013 Census, 8 in 10 Aucklanders aged 85 years or over said they had undertaken unpaid activities, including household work or childcare in the four weeks prior to census day.

Older Aucklanders contribute significantly to Auckland’s economy and society through their unpaid labour and volunteer work, including caring for family members. While this can keep people connected it is also essential they are adequately supported.

The median personal income among people aged 65 and over was $20,900 in 2013, compared to a median of $29,600 for the overall population aged 15 and over. Over half (58%) of older Aucklanders who stated an income source on their census form listed more than one source. Eighty-five per cent reported they received an income from NZ Superannuation or a veteran’s pension.

Almost 35,000 older people (22%) lived in areas rated 8, 9 or 10 (most deprived) on the NZ Deprivation Index.

Concerned that rates and water bills continue to escalate beyond pension increases with little opportunity to trade down property for releasing capital (unless move away from Auckland where medical support services are available).

“Respondent to the survey of Older Aucklanders, male, 65-69”
Final thoughts
Whakaaro mutunga

Auckland is a great place to live for many older people and there is much to celebrate. However as the full report and this summary report signal, there are some areas of concern that may grow as our older population increases.

Auckland will be home to substantially larger numbers, and greater proportions, of ethnically and culturally diverse older people over the next few decades. These trends will bring specific challenges and opportunities across Auckland’s housing, transport, employment, healthcare, service and support systems.

This report provides a useful baseline upon which Auckland Council and others can continue to monitor and understand the quality of life of older Aucklanders.

Auckland Council will continue to work with its stakeholders to create an age-friendly environment in which older Aucklanders can thrive.
The full report from which this summary document was drawn was prepared by the Research and Evaluation Unit (RIMU) at the request of the Community and Social Policy Department within Auckland Council. It has been published as an Auckland Council Technical Report, and can be found on Knowledge Auckland:

Details of full report

Memorandum

25 January 2018

To: All elected members

Subject: Update on response to myrtle rust incursion

From: Phil Brown – Biosecurity Manager

Purpose

1. To update elected members and the Independent Māori Statutory Board on Auckland Council’s response to the myrtle rust incursion.

Summary

- There are currently 34 recorded myrtle rust sites in Auckland, including Wairua Reserve in the Ōrākei Local Board area.
- The Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) is leading the response to the myrtle rust incursion. However, Auckland Council is preparing to increase its role as it is expected that MPI will downscale their involvement in the near future.
- Auckland Council has been asked to support the national seed collection programme.
- Education materials are available to local boards and other community groups upon request.

Context

2. Myrtle rust is a fungal disease affecting plants in the myrtle family, including pōhutukawa, rātā, and mānuka. As of January 2018, there are 34 recorded sites in Auckland, including one council reserve. The table below illustrates the number of recorded sites in each local board area.

Table one: Number of recorded sites by local board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local board area</th>
<th>Number of recorded sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 34

3. The Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) remains responsible for leading the incursion response. However, Auckland Council is preparing to take on a larger leadership role.

Discussion

4. It is anticipated that an official declaration that the eradication attempt has ceased will be issued by the Minister for Biosecurity. At that point, overall responsibility for managing the incursion will transfer to landowners (including council). MPI will continue to invest in myrtle rust science. Staff are investigating the potential to establish a part-time role to coordinate council’s response to myrtle rust, particularly on council-owned land.

5. Wairua Reserve in the Ōrākei Local Board area was the first council reserve to be confirmed as having myrtle rust infected trees. MPI removed the diseased branches of three pōhutukawa to reduce the risk of further spread. No further action is required at this time.
6. Facilities management contractors have been briefed on how to mitigate any risk of further spreading the disease to other parks, and have been provided with general hygiene guidelines.

Next steps

7. At the request of MPI and the Department of Conservation, Council staff will support the collection of myrtle species seeds as part of a national programme. The seeds will be stored at the New Zealand Indigenous Flora Seed Bank based at Massey University.

8. This will aid conservation of myrtle species by ensuring species (and the genetic diversity within species) are not lost completely under a worst case scenario.

9. The Ministry for Primary Industries has been requested to provide advice to councils on future plantings, and information that can be shared with community restoration groups. Current advice to councils is not to halt the planting of myrtle species, but to diversify plantings to limit numbers of susceptible species.

10. Further information on myrtle rust can be provided to local boards and community groups on request.
Memorandum

To: Environment and Community Committee

Subject: Safeswim Programme Update

From: Barry Potter, Director Infrastructure and Environmental Services
Craig McIlroy, General Manager Healthy Waters

Purpose

1. To provide the Environment and Community Committee with an update on the upgraded Safeswim programme's performance during the first three months of its operation.

Summary

- The upgraded Safeswim programme went live on 1 November 2017. During the first three months of operation the upgraded programme performed well. Key highlights include:
  - Confirmation that Safeswim's water quality forecasts are accurate (85 to 95 per cent) at predicting pollution events through sampling.
  - 165,000 hits on the safeswim.org website compared with 12-14,000 hits per season for the previous programme.
  - Advising the public correctly and rapidly of risks to public health at Takapuna, Castor Bay and Mairangi Bay following unpredictable events that would not have been captured using the previous system.
- Areas for improvement have also been identified, including:
  - the effectiveness of signage on beaches
  - operational responses and public messaging following pollution events.
- A report will be provided to Environment and Community Committee by April 2018 outlining next steps for the programme. Working objectives for the 2018 programme are:
  - increase the scope of the programme - capturing a broader range of contaminants and extending the platform to more freshwater sites
  - increase the coverage of the programme - extending from 97 to 200 plus sites by the end of 2018.
  - identification of opportunities to leverage further value from Safeswim.

Context/Background

2. At its meeting on 14 February 2017, the Environment and Community Committee approved expenditure to upgrade the Safeswim programme in time for the 2017/2018 summer swimming season.
3. The committee also asked to be provided with regular updates on the Safeswim programme until March 2018.

4. The upgrade was completed by the end of October 2017 and the new Safeswim programme went ‘live’ on 3 November 2017.

5. The upgrade of Safeswim has ensured that Auckland Council satisfies its obligations to monitor and report on bathing beach water quality, but at the same time is able to:
   - effectively communicate health and safety risk to the public
   - highlight areas for investigation, remediation and investment
   - test the potential impact of different management interventions.

Discussion

6. The upgraded Safeswim programme has been operating for just over three months. During this time a series of summer storms and network issues have required the Safeswim programme to operate under the full spectrum of operational conditions - dry weather, sudden intense rainfall, sustained rainfall, unpredictable wastewater network failures, and dangerous swimming conditions.

7. Key achievements from the first three months of operation include:
   - The Safeswim validation sampling programme has collected up to five times more samples than the previous system would have over the same period of time. The results of this sampling confirms that Safeswim’s forecasting system is predicting exceedances of national water quality guidelines with 85-95 per cent accuracy. This is a significant improvement as the previous system was identifying less than 5 per cent of exceedances at some of Auckland’s most popular swimming beaches.
   - The media and publicity campaign associated with Safeswim’s launch made use of physical media (flyers and cards), radio and digital advertisements, and written promotional content in council-owned channels. The campaign is 75 per cent complete (concluding at the end of February 2018) and has contributed to lifting public awareness of the programme. This is illustrated by the 43 independently published articles (TV, print and digital media) on Safeswim since its launch.
   - After three months of operation the Safeswim website, www.safeswim.org.nz, has gained 165,000 hits and 90,000 users. The previous programme had 12-14,000 hits per season. Significant spikes in new users and hits were observed following independent media articles publicising water quality issues and the rate of new users visiting the site continues to grow.

8. The first three months of the programme have also generated insights into areas for improvement and opportunities for trialing new approaches.

9. Initial media coverage of the programme has been mixed. Some commentators and members of the public have questioned the appropriateness of using models to predict water quality and others have expressed concern regarding the quality of water at some of Auckland’s beaches. Recent media coverage is starting to show greater acceptance of the modelling approach and the focus of commentary is moving towards the need to tackle the problems causing poor water quality.

10. The transparency of the Safeswim programme has encouraged informed public debate, but more needs to be done to increase public understanding of the Safeswim programme, its implications and council’s response to the water quality issues it is highlighting.

11. Results of Safeswim have also highlighted areas where action is required to address water quality issues. For instance, a cross-council task force has been created to investigate the
cause of pollution incidents at Takapuna Beach - an area where substantial investment has already been made to improve water quality.

12. The first three months of the programme's operation have also revealed an urgent need to review on-beach signage around the region. Public feedback has varied from complaints that there are too many signs at beaches to not enough signage.

**Trial of Digital Signage**

13. A digital sign trial has also been conducted, with signs initially placed at Mission Bay and then extended to St Mary's Bay and Takapuna Beach. Early indications are that digital signs are effective at generating interest and awareness but that manual signs managed by Surf Lifesavers are susceptible to user error and public interference.

14. Safeswim is also partnering with Auckland Emergency Management group to trial using the digital signs at Mission Bay to convey advice about tsunami risk and preparedness.

**Next steps/implementation**

8. The Safeswim governance group - comprising representatives from Auckland Council, Watercare, Surf Life Saving Northern Region, Auckland Regional Public Health Service and mana whenua - will meet in early March 2018 to consider the performance of the programme over its first summer period, and to provide guidance on future programme development.

9. A review is being conducted by council's Research and Evaluation Unit (RIMU) independently of the project team and this will provide initial findings in early April 2018.

10. Feedback will also be sought from local boards and mana whenua on programme performance and suggestions regarding the future scope and coverage of the programme. In particular, feedback will be sought from local boards on which local sites members believe should be monitored over the following summer.

11. The Safeswim project team will report to Environment and Community Committee again in April 2018, summarising results of the independent review and feedback from local boards and mana whenua. This report will outline the next steps in the programme's development.

12. Working objectives for the next phase of Safeswim's development are:
   - increasing the scope of the programme - capturing a broader range of contaminants and extending the platform to more freshwater sites
   - increasing the coverage of the programme - extending to 200 plus sites by the end of 2018
   - exploring opportunities to leverage the platform to generate more value for Auckland ratepayers.