



To: Waiheke Local Board

From: Direction Matiatia Inc

Subject: MATIATIA COMMUNITY SURVEY – ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONS 5 AND 11 COMMENTS

Date: 27 October 2017

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. This report advises the Waiheke Local Board on:

- (a) The main findings of the comments made by respondents to Questions 5 and 11 of the Matiatia Community Survey from the analysis by Lisa Henley PhD, of Stats Geeks Consultants.
- (b) A non-quantitative categorisation into some themes of examples of comments received under the two Questions. This provides an easier read and understanding of some sentiments which underpin the respondent preferences as made in the survey.
- (c) Outlines the state of current knowledge / information and some gaps requiring filling.
- (d) Outlines a set of actions to advance Phases 3 and 4 - Preparation of a Draft Long Term Plan (Master Plan) and Testing with Local Board.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. An independent analysis of the 1,100 plus comments made under Questions 5 and 11 of the survey has now been completed (paragraphs 13 to 15 and Appendix 1).

3. Drawing on the analysis, a qualitative categorisation of some examples of comments into particular themes is contained in Appendices 2 and 3 and is explained in paragraphs 16 to 49.

4. An approach to releasing both the analysis of comments and the comments in their raw form as captured directly by Survey Monkey is proposed in paragraphs 50 to 52.

5. The analysis of the survey results and the survey comments provides essential information on what the community:

- (a) Wants - some better facilities, namely
 - Increased parking
 - Improved public transport services
 - An efficient and safer keyhole
 - A visitor centre
- (b) Does not want - residential and visitor accommodation.
- (c) Is equivocal about - the need for commercial development and recreational, historical and cultural activities perhaps indicating they need to be quantified and defined in greater detail to achieve community consensus support.
- (d) Wants - the grassland and general natural environment protected in any development at Matiatia.

6. The survey results and analysis provides a strong basis to now begin the drafting of the Master Plan, notwithstanding that there are still some identified information gaps (paragraphs 58 and 62).

7. Prior to beginning preparation of the Master Plan, 2 pre-requisite actions are recommended to the Project Management Committee as necessary to prevent planning in a vacuum:

(a) Approval or amendment of a set of principles in Appendix 4 to guide the Master Plan preparation (paragraphs 63 to 65).

(b) Urgently meet with Panuku to appraise it of the survey results and establish what plans it has for its land at Matiatia (paragraphs 66 and 68).

8. A project plan for Phases 3 and 4 is contained in Appendix 5. It is recommended that the Project Management Committee considers this plan. It is also recommended that an overall completion date of 15 June 2018 be set for all the core partners to the project to work to (paragraphs 69 and 70). The completion date for the first action in the project plan is 30 November 2017 hence the need for expediting Local Board consideration of this report and its recommendations on page 13.

BACKGROUND

9. On 8 August the Local Board considered a report by DMI of 4 August 2017 on the Community Survey on Planning Matiatia's Future. The report conveyed the initial statistical results (graphs) and the significant comments in raw form made by respondents under Questions 5 and 11 of the survey.

10. As a result of the meeting, the statistical results and graphs to Questions 1 to 10 were released together with an explanation of the results.

11. It was agreed that DMI would arrange for further independent analytical work on the results, particularly the comments made under Questions 5 and 11 and report back.

12. It was also noted that DMI would prepare a new 'Areas of Responsibility' framework for consideration by the Project Management Committee on progressing the project. This was further touched upon at the Board workshop on 14 September.

LISA HENLEY'S ANALYSIS

13. Lisa Henley (LH) has completed an independent analysis of the 534 comments made under Question 5 relating to car parking and the 578 of 'free' comments made under Question 11. Altogether, 70 pages of comments were analysed.

14. The LH analysis is contained in Appendix 1. The analysis is based on a statistical application programme R which applies a number of text mining techniques. This avoids accusation of bias in the next two sections and in Appendices 2 and 3 which categorise respondent's comments under Questions 5 and 11 into some themes.

15. To the uninitiated, the understanding of and appreciating the statistical applications applied to the comments may be difficult. However, notwithstanding the significant text variation and subjects covered in the 1,100 plus comments made, the analysis compliments the preference trends from the initial survey results and draws out concerns and suggested solutions.

QUESTION 5 – PARKING AND BETTER TRANSPORT – COMMENT THEMES

16. Drawing on Lisa Henley’s (LH) analysis to inform the categorisation of respondent’s comments in Appendix 2, several themes have emerged which could contribute to the development of a sustainable parking and improved public transport solution as part of the development of a Master Plan for Matiatia.

17. At the outset, it is important to note and understand that the categorisation of respondent’s comments in Appendix 2 is simply to provide the Local Board / reader with a concentrated flavour of similar comments rather than necessitating the of reading all 534 comments which are not in ‘topic’ or ‘point’ order and then trying to build a picture. Also important is that the categorisation in Appendix 2 is qualitative and not quantitative in nature. The categorisation into several themes does not represent an order of importance or priority solution. This is because some of the 789 respondents to Question 5 and the 797 respondents to Question 6 may support or not support a theme but simply didn’t say so by making a comment. E.g. the most popular comment is not necessarily the one supported the most, just the one explicitly mentioned the most and therefore potentially the most obvious or easiest to think of. Furthermore, Appendix 2 does not include every comment made.

Increased Parking – Car Parking Building

18. 63 percent of respondents to Question 5 of the survey wanted increased parking at Matiatia.

19. The most common suggestion was for a car parking building (multi-story / underground) as demonstrated in the LH analysis in Figures 2 and 3. This is also consistent with the Word Cloud diagram which showed the dominance of a car parking building in DMI’s initial report to the Local Board on the survey results. From Figure 1 of the LH analysis there was some expression by respondents that such a building would be expensive.

20. Appendix 2 shows examples of the many comments respondents made suggesting the building of a multi-story / underground car park building. Some respondents simply suggested such a building while others were more specific in suggesting where it should be built such as; the front carpark; the Owhanake / Upper carpark; the rental car / commercial area or the grassland.

21. Generally, there was little suggestion as to how to pay for the development of a car parking building. Some suggestions of funding included wharf taxes, private equity, and council. Likewise, while there were a few suggestions of user pay for parking in such a development, others suggested it should be free.

Increased Parking – Other Solutions

22. A number of other ideas for increasing parking were suggested by respondents. From the LH analysis in Figures 1, 2 and 3, these ideas largely revolved around:

- Improving utilisation and efficiency of current car parks through redesign e.g. sealing and marking of the Owhanake car park.
- Expansion of current car parking areas, such as Owhanake and parts of the front carpark.
- The re-designation of new land for car parking – non-parking side of Ocean View Road, the grassland and the rental car / commercial land.

23. Appendix 2 contains examples of comments suggesting how to increase car parking categorised under the following headings: front car park; Owhanake / Upper car park; rental car / commercial area; grassland area; Ocean View Road and redesign / reconfigure existing car parks.

24. It is evident from the examples of comment that frequent crossover of solutions occurs whereby individual comments contain several suggestions on how to achieve increased parking at Matiatia. This is further commented on later in this section.

Parking - Decrease or Stay the Same and Improved Public Transport and Park and Ride.

25. 37 percent of respondents to Question 5 either wanted parking at Matiatia decreased (9.63%) or to stay the same (27.63%).

26. To decrease parking the LH analysis Figure 5 Bi-gram network illustrates the solution themes of encouraging ride sharing, improved / increased public transport services and park and ride facilities elsewhere and not just at Matiatia.

27. For parking to stay the same the LH analysis Figure 7 Bi-gram network illustrates that improved and more frequent public transport was the strongest solution theme. Others included car pools, shuttle buses, park and rides and express buses.

28. Appendix 2 categorises some examples of comments relating specifically to parking at Matiatia either decreasing or staying the same. Those comments did suggest solutions consistent with the LH analysis.

29. However, many other respondents also made comments on improving public transport and facilities such as park and ride, carpooling etc. Examples of these are included in Appendix 2 under the heading Better Public Transport / Park and Ride. It is reasonable to suggest that many of these comments were made by respondents as part of their solution to parking issues at Matiatia or as current public transport users. Likewise, they are probably reflective of the 797 responses to Question 6 where 39.65% 'strongly agreed' and 38.38% 'agreed' that they were interested in other transport options (park and ride from the upper carpark and / or better public transport options) if they were convenient and cost effective to travel on Waiheke to and from Matiatia.

Summary

30. Together, the LH analysis and the categorisation of examples of respondents' comments in Appendix 2 provide a clearer picture of the dominant preferences made under:

- Question 5 – 63% indicated parking at Matiatia should be increased;
- Question 6 - combined 73% ('strongly agree' / 'agree') their interest in other transport options – park and ride and better public transport; and
- the issues faced and suggested solutions to solve them.

31. While several solution themes emerged for increasing parking, it is unlikely that any one theme on its own would provide the ultimate solution. Such a solution is more likely to demand action on a mix of themes over time including action on public transport and associated amenities such as park and ride facilities and the keyhole.

32. Accordingly, there appears to be an appreciation by many respondents that any long term sustainable solution to increased parking will require an integrated approach involving several components.

QUESTION 11- GENERAL COMMENT THEMES

33. Drawing on the LH analysis to inform the categorisation of respondent's comments in Appendix 3, several themes have emerged which could contribute to the development of solutions or improvements to facilities and services at Matiatia and or protect its natural character and environment.

34. The same rationale and provisos stated in paragraph 17 for Appendix 2 apply also to Appendix 3. The theme categorisation is qualitative in nature and does not represent an order of priority or importance. Not all 806 respondents to the survey made a comment under Question 11 either to support or not a broad theme. The Appendix also does not include every comment made.

Parking / Public Transport / Cycles / Transport Hub

35. Consistent with the survey results and comments under Questions 5 and 6, Appendix 3 contains examples of many respondent's comments under Question 11 describing Matiatia as a transport hub and suggesting increased parking, improved public transport – shuttles, park and ride, etc. – as necessary facilities and service improvements. The LH analysis in the Figure 9 Word Cloud demonstrates the prominence of terms such as 'carpark', public transport', 'bus' following the word 'improve'. In Figure 11, terms such as 'improved public transport', 'park and ride', 'carpark building', 'rental cars' are similarly prominent. The issue of double decker buses is also raised – largely in a negative sense as reflected in some comments

36. Figure 10 of the LH analysis draws on comments reflecting concern about improved car parking facilities for the elderly, the disabled, parents with babies and young children and those with Hospital and medical appointments. Examples of such comments also suggest improved monitoring and management of such parking facilities.

Terminal Facilities and Keyhole Operation

37. Obviously, with Matiatia being described as a transport hub by many respondents in their comments, there were many suggestions for improvements to the terminal and keyhole.

38. Under Question 8(f) respondents were asked if Matiatia should have improved ferry terminal buildings. The results were somewhat equivocal - together, only 36.93% 'strongly agreed' or 'agreed' while 41.12% were 'neutral' and jointly 21.95% 'strongly disagreed' or 'disagreed'. Nonetheless, as examples of comments illustrate, some suggested improvements ranged across – lighting improvements, greater protection from the weather elements, better signage and announcements, better toilets, and improved management around queuing, boarding and disembarking, and freight handling. Some of these concerns also feature in the Figure 10 Word Cloud of the LH analysis.

39. Under Question 8(e) respondents were asked if Matiatia should have improved keyhole pedestrian and transport facilities. There was solid support for improvements with 42.68% 'agreed' and 41.92% 'strongly agreed'. The examples of comments show the main concerns and suggested solutions relate to safety issues for pedestrians at the drop-off / pick-up; cyclist safety and facilities; dealing with wide range of vehicles in the keyhole – buses (including double decker), taxis, shuttles and private cars etc; and the narrow congested footpath. Some of these concerns also feature in the Figure 10 Word Cloud of the LH analysis although not prominently. A few respondents raised boat ramp launching facilities. Also, some commented on ferry operations including the suggestion for ferries to also operate from Kennedy Point to relieve pressure on Matiatia.

Tourists

40. Question 4 asked if changes should be made at Matiatia to allow for better facilities and to handle rising tourism. Over 75% of responses either 'strongly agreed' or 'agreed'. It is not possible to delineate the Question 4 preferences between better facilities generally and change to handle rising tourism. The LH analysis in Figure 10 Word Cloud also depicts the term 'tourists' reflecting sentiment for improved facilities. In this regard, the matter of a visitor centre is cover separately below.

41. Some comments illustrated in Appendix 3 under the above 2 themes included general references to tourists largely relating to their movement through Matiatia as a transport hub. However, the Appendix also separately includes some comments which are reasonably specific to 'tourist' / 'tourism'. These comments express a range of sentiments about the need: for Waiheke to plan strategically for what it wants from tourism; for residents to have priority over tourists; to cap tourist numbers; control / limit Fullers tourism operations (double decker buses) etc., Others are more positive recognising the value of tourists; suggesting better signage and information services etc. A few suggested a tourist / visitor tax or levy to contribute to infrastructure costs.

Visitor Centre

42. Question 8(a) of the survey asked if Matiatia should have a visitors centre. Respondents gave solid support for such a facility – 40.58% 'agreed' and 30.03% 'strongly agreed'. In the Figure 11 Bi-gram network of the LH analysis the term 'centre, is linked to 'information', 'visitor' and 'Oneroa'. In regard to the latter, there are some comment examples in Appendix 3 suggesting that a visitor centre may be best placed in Oneroa. There are also some examples where respondents prefer a visitor centre at the terminal.

Preservation of Matiatia's Natural Character and Environment / Limit Development

43. The response to Question 7 of the survey was overwhelmingly clear that in considering or undertaking any development at Mataitia the protection of the natural environment and ecology is paramount - 52.93% of respondents considered it was 'extremely important' and 25.97 said it was 'very important' and for 15.11% it was 'moderately important'. The LH sentiment analysis in Figure 8 highlights positive words from comments such as 'improve', 'beauty', 'protect', 'sustainable', 'protection', 'enjoy', 'enhance', 'clean', and 'attractive' which could be attributed to preserving Matiatia's natural character and environment. The Figure 11 Bi-gram network refers to Matiatia as a 'gateway' and links 'beauty', 'natural' and 'environment' plus reference to 'green space'.

44. In relation to particular facilities, under Question 8 of the survey respondents showed little support for: residential building development- 57.77% 'strongly disagreed' and 29.40% 'disagreed'; the provision of visitor accommodation – 54.92% 'strongly disagreed' and 27.59% 'disagreed'; and an events centre – 45.71% 'strongly disagreed' and 24.97% 'disagreed'. For facilities such as cultural centre, space for light commercial activities, and recreational, historical and cultural activities the range of responses were inconclusive. The lack of reference to such facilities in the LH analysis under both Figures 9 and 11 would tend to imply that there was little support in the comments for such facilities.

45. While there is very high recognition (85.52%) that for Ngati Paoa and other Mana Whenua parts of the land at Matiatia are Wahi Tapu, this did not feature strongly in the comments under Question 11.

46. Examples of comments in Appendix 3 assist explain the above survey results and support the LH analysis. Many respondents commented generally along the following line or with some variation thereof – any development at Matiatia must respect the area's natural features, environment, ecology, marine and wildlife, and areas of cultural and Wahi Tapu significance. Another common line through many of these comments was that Matiatia is a transport hub / gateway and not a destination and therefore it should not be built up with residential and visitor accommodation, retail and other commercial developments. One respondent summed this up with the proverbial 'Matiatia Let it Be'.

47. Of course as the survey results show, some respondents favoured more development at Matiatia. Under Question 8, in the case of residential accommodation - 0.90% 'strongly agreed' and 2.82% 'agreed'. For visitor accommodation – 2.43% 'strongly agreed' and 5.62% 'agreed'. For an events centre – 3.33% 'strongly agreed' and 8.45% 'agreed'. As already mentioned while overall support for light commercial – retail / hospitality, a cultural centre and cultural, recreational, historical activities was inconclusive, there was still some reasonable support for those facilities and activities. Likewise, under Question 7 nearly 6% of respondents felt that the in considering any development the natural environment and ecology was only 'slightly important' or 'not important at all'. Similarly, under Question 8(j) - 2.50% of respondents 'strongly disagreed' that Matiatia green open space particularly around the foreshore and 1.50% 'disagreed'. Appendix 3 provides examples of comments from respondents which suggest that Matiatia would benefit from the development of particular facilities or amenities.

Summary

48. Obviously the comments made under Question 11 were more wide ranging than those under Question 5. Many of them re-enforced the dominant preferences and comments already discussed under Questions 5 and 6 relating to increased parking and better public transport arrangements. They also, together with the LH analysis, re-enforced preferences and provided suggested solutions to issues flowing from Question 4 regarding change at Mataitia to allow for better facilities; Question 8 as to what some of those facilities should or should not be; Question 7 relating to the importance of the natural environment and ecology when considering development; and recognition under Question 9 that areas of Matiatia are Wahi Tapu.

49. At some risk of being accused of bias, the overarching theme that could be drawn from the LH analysis and the comments in Appendix 3 is that:

Matiatia is commonly seen as a transport hub / gateway for residents, commuters, visitors and tourists and not as a destination. Nonetheless, Matiatia should have the necessary facilities to be an efficient, attractive and convenient transport hub / gateway. This includes sustainable parking, improved public transport facilities and services, some improvements at the terminal, a safer and better managed keyhole for all, improved information facilities for visitors and tourists and more efficient ways for them to quickly pass through Matiatia. The value that tourists and visitors add to the local economy is acknowledged, but also so is the pressure they place on Matiatia's current facilities and infrastructure sometimes to the detriment of residents and Matiatia's natural character. AT and Fullers need to better manage and co-ordinate the interface between the interests of residents and commuters and those of tourists and visitors vis-à-vis ferries, buses (including double decker) and tourist operators. Any changes and development of facilities must be made in a sustainable manner to maintain and enhance the natural character and environment of Matiatia as an attractive gateway and also respect its cultural value to Ngati Paoa and Manu Whenua. There is little desire for other types of development such as residential housing, visitor accommodation and commercial.

RELEASE OF QUESTIONS 5 AND 11 COMMENTS ANALYSIS

50. It was agreed with the Local Board on 8 August that only the survey results and graphs together with an explanatory statement would be initially released publically. The explanatory statement advised that the final results would be released following deeper analysis including the comments under Questions 5 and 11 in unattributed form.

51. The question is what should be publically released now that the comments have been independently analysed and also qualitatively categorised into broad themes for easier comprehension? DMI's view is that Appendices 1, 2, and 3 should be released with an appropriate explanatory statement. This would allow an easier read and appreciation of the general favour of the 1,100 plus comments. While it would not include the text of every comment made the documents are likely to be appreciated by interested people and the media.

52. There will be some people who want to see all the comments in their raw and uncategorised form as directly captured by Survey Monkey. DMI will facilitate this by placing the comments on our website. This will also allow people interested in reading the text of those comments simply referenced to in Appendices 2 and 3 to do so.

CURRENT STATE OF KNOWLEDGE / INFORMATION

53. This section outlines the current knowledge and information base available to commence preparing a draft of the Master Plan. It is DMI's view that the analysis of the survey results and comments now provides a solid basis to actually begin drafting the Master Plan. Although there are

still some information gaps identified below which need to be filled. It is expected that most of these gaps can be filled quickly.

Business Lab Reports

54. The two reports produced by Business Lab provide pertinent information and direction for preparing the Master Plan. The reports are the result of a literature search, a number of key stakeholder interviews and workshops, the Interested Parties Workshop and the Values Workshop.

Survey - Community's View

55. The survey results and the survey comments analysis provide essential information on what the community:

- (a) Wants - some better facilities, namely
 - Increased parking
 - Improved public transport services
 - An efficient and safer keyhole
 - A visitor centre
- (b) Does not want - residential and visitor accommodation.
- (c) Is equivocal about - the need for commercial development and recreational, historical and cultural activities perhaps indicating they need to be quantified and defined in greater detail to achieve community consensus support.
- (d) Wants - the grassland and general natural environment protected in any development at Matiatia.

Auckland Council 2018- 2028 Long Term Plan

56. It is understood that Local Board / Auckland Council consideration is being given to 'Option 4 – Budget Constrained Staged Approach' to Matiatia for the 2018 / 2028 Auckland Council Long Term Plan LTP (Document – Matiatia FY 2018-2028 of 29 June 2017). This Option includes \$1.5M for storm water issues and \$8M for remedial parking improvements to address likely cultural site issues and move the majority of carparks from the foreshore to the Owhanake car park but with full site development requiring further alternative funding. This Option acknowledges that there is not sufficient environmental, transport, known cultural issues or regional benefits to justify greater investment at this time. Further development would be self-funded by

'a) utilising optimisation policy of partial sale of land for residential or commercial use. b) targeted rate potentially on business that benefit from visitors. c) wharf levy or site specific revenue raising charges. d) central government tourism funding (for visitor infrastructure).'

57. Under this Option and following an agreed Master Plan in 2018, the transport (parking) reconfiguration is scheduled for 2021 and Panuku land reconfiguration in 2025. Such work will be subject to signed off Business Cases beforehand.

58. DMI is not aware of the current decision status of Option 4. Has the Local Board adopted it or some variation thereof for inclusion in Auckland Council's 2018-2028 LTP? Also, the Option is parking / transport orientated. If the actual long term sustainable development of Matiatia demands greater

investment beyond that allocated for the 2018-2028 LTP, will the 3-yearly review of the LTP allow for adjustments of or additions to approved projects? Otherwise, the initial scope and breadth of thinking and actual content of the Master Plan may not allow it to be 'fit for purpose' from the outset. The Master Plan should be a 'dynamic' and not 'static' document with short, medium and long term priorities.

Other Parking / Transport Initiatives

59. In conjunction with the proposed Owhanake car park initiative in Option 4, DMI understands that Watercare has advised intention to dispose of 3.6 hectares around that car park which would allow expansion of the area and that AT is looking at this.

60. DMI is also aware from discussions with Local Board advisors that there may be current AT funding available for improved 'park and ride' facilities at the Owhanake car park.

61. Finally, DMI understands that the Local Board has asked AT to defer some minor planned keyhole / front car park traffic, parking and pick-up arrangements until the survey results are known.

Information Gaps

62. There are several areas where our knowledge is imperfect. These are:

- (a) Knowledge of any scenario modelling that AT may have done on sustainable parking; park and ride; and improved public transport services and keyhole facilities requirements for the next 20 years based on projected Waiheke population growth, public transport passenger growth, and tourism / visitor growth and demand. Information from such modelling would assist answer land requirement questions such as:
 - Will an expanded Owhanake car park using the surrounding 3.6 hectares of Watercare land and be sufficient?
 - Will areas of Panuku land owned land still be required – rental car / commercial land?
 - Will redesign and reconfiguration of existing car parks suffice without requiring extra land?
 - Will a multi-storied car park be required?
 - Can the carparks adjacent to the foreshore be transferred to Owhanake?
 - Will the current keyhole require major redesign and or some components shifted to the current front car park area?
- (b) What the final outcomes of the AT ILM workshops will be and when and how they can be integrated into the development of the draft Master Plan. DMI understands that AT may be reporting on this to the Local Board in late October.
- (c) What the intentions or plans are of the Panuku Auckland Developments Board (and ultimately the Auckland Governing Body) for Panuku's land at Matiatia?
- (d) What the status of the Waiheke Local Board Gateway Project List is? There are 32 projects on the list. Some projects have been completed, however, there are several that include reference to 'Masterplanning vision'. It would be helpful to have an update of the Project List including timing and funding arrangements.

- (e) The result of Ngati Paoa’s consultation on the Matiatia Cultural Values Assessment is still awaited. Although, at the Local Board workshop on 14 September, a ‘placeholder’ approach was suggested to apply to land at Matiatia known to be of cultural value or Wahi Tapu to Ngati Paoa and Mana Whenua to allow progress with the Master Plan development.

PROPOSED ACTIONS TO ADVANCE PHASES 3 & 4 – PREPARATION OF DRAFT LONG TERM PLAN AND APPROVAL FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

63. While the information gaps identified in the previous section need quick filling, there are two other key pre-requisites to avoid planning in a vacuum.

Set of Guiding Principles

64. As mentioned in paragraph 55 the community has given a clear indication as to what it wants to see or not see in Matiatia’s long term sustainable development and management. There is also a close accord between the community’s view and the 3 key themes that came out of the 2 earlier Business Lab reports. Building on this information, the development of a set of overarching principles is proposed to guide and underpin the development of the Master Plan. A set of principles was developed with the community to guide development of the 2009 Matiatia Directional Plan.

65. The table in Appendix 4 contains a proposed new set of overarching principles for initial consideration by the Project Management Committee. For comparison, the 2009 principles are also included. It is evident from the survey results that the community’s view may have changed towards a less developed Matiatia since the 2009 Directional Plan. This has produced a shorter list of principles. However it is emphasised that the proposed principles are simply a ‘starter for 10’. It is expected that they will be amended / augmented before finally approved. In developing the new principles, some of the work from the ILM workshops has also been drawn upon.

Certainty of Land Requirements and Availability

66. Land owned by AT, Watercare and Panuku is critical to providing facilities at Matiatia such as:

- (a) increased parking;
- (b) improved public transport arrangements;
- (c) a more efficient and safer keyhole including any extension / reconfiguration;
- (d) a visitor centre; and
- (e) facilities with lesser community support in the survey namely light commercial, improved ferry buildings, and recreational, historical and cultural activities.

67. As mentioned, there are proposals for Auckland Council’s 2018 – 2028 LTP to include remedial parking improvements involving the front carpark and Owhanake car park. Also, the possibility of additional Watercare land being available to extend Owhanake carpark is being explored. However, in the case of Panuku, they have not participated in the project to date and also may not be aware of the community survey results. Clarification is required to:

- (a) establish what Panuku currently plans for its land long term; and

- (b) will any of that land be required and when for increased parking and improved public transport facilities based on any long term modelling that AT may have done, or for any other facilities relating to the Master Plan.

68. Therefore, DMI considers that the Project Management Committee should have urgent discussions with Panuku on the above and advise them of the survey results. This need is reinforced by the following statement in the Matiatia FY 2018 – 2028 document of 29 June 2017 which states that:

'The key challenges to moving forward are:

- *the extent of regional funding, including the return Panuku is charged with. An indication is needed to set expectation and develop a realistic masterplan.*
- *Managing local expectations on;*
 - *Transport, specifically parking – the level of inconvenience (parking further away) and or cost increase that will be acceptable to commuters*
 - *The level of, if any commercial or residential development that will be acceptable to residents.'*

Suggested Project Plan to Prepare Draft Plan

69. Appendix 5 contains a project plan setting out series of general actions to prepare a first draft of the Master Plan for community consultation. Completion of Phases 3 and 4 are set out in some detail with 'Action Responsibilities' and 'Completion Dates'. At this stage, the detailed components of a public engagement / consultation programme (Phase 5) have not been determined. DMI will work on this for Project Management Committee / Local Board consideration when approving the first draft of the Master Plan. Likewise, details of Phase 6 – Board approval of the final plan are not specified. Six weeks each for both these stages has been proposed meaning that the Master Plan would be completed by 15 June 2018.

70. DMI proposes that the project plan be referred to the Project Management Committee for consideration and implementation. DMI is very conscious that this whole planning exercise, for various reasons, is taking longer than expected and believes that the end date of 15 June 2018 should be firmly adopted by all core partners involved in the project.

RECOMMENDATIONS

71. That the Local Board:

- (a) **Receive** this report on the Analysis of the Comments made under Question 5 and 11 of the Community Survey on the Future of Matiatia.
- (b) **Note** the analysis of the comments in Appendix 1 completed by Lisa Henley PhD, of Stats Geeks Consultants.
- (c) **Note** the qualitative categorisation of examples of comments into broad themes in Appendix 2 (Question 5) and Appendix 3 (Question 11).
- (d) **Note** the combination of Lisa Henley's analysis in Appendix 1 and the comment theme categorisations in Appendices 2 and 3 help explain some of the sentiments and suggested solutions which underpinned preferences made in the survey (paragraphs 16 to 49).
- (e) **Agree** that Appendices 1, 2 and 3 be publically released together with an appropriate explanatory statement (paragraph 51).
- (f) **Note** that DMI will place the 'raw' comments, as directly collected by Survey Monkey, on its website.
- (g) **Note** that DMI considers that the initial survey results and the analysis of the comments provide a solid basis to begin drafting the Master Plan (paragraph 53).
- (h) **Note** that DMI considers the following 2 factors as important pre-requisites to begin drafting the Master Plan:
 - (i) development of a set of principles to guide the drafting process (paragraphs 64 and 65); and
 - (ii) knowledge of the extent Panuku's lands may be required for increased parking and improved public transport arrangements and what its plans are (paragraphs 66 and 67).
- (i) **Agree** that this report be referred to the Project Management Committee for its information.
- (j) **Agree** that the Project management Committee considers the proposed set of guiding principles in Appendix 4 (paragraph 65).
- (k) **Agree** that the Project Management Committee urgently discusses with Panuku future plans for its land at Matiatia (paragraph 68).
- (l) **Note** and refer the proposed project plan in Appendix 5 for Phases 3 and 4 of the project to the Project Management Committee for consideration (paragraphs 69 and 70).
- (m) **Agree** that 15 June 2018 be the completion date for the project (paragraph 70).



David Smith
Chairperson, DMI