I hereby give notice that an ordinary meeting of the Whau Local Board will be held on:

Date: Wednesday, 18 April 2018  
Time: 6.00PM  
Meeting Room: Whau Local Board Office  
Venue: 31 Totara Avenue  

New Lynn

Whau Local Board
OPEN AGENDA

MEMBERSHIP

Chairperson  Tracy Mulholland  
Deputy Chairperson  Susan Zhu  
Members  Derek Battersby, QSM, JP  Catherine Farmer  Duncan Macdonald, JP  Te’eva Matafai  David Whitley

(Quorum 4 members)

Glenn Boyd  
(relationship Manager)  
Local Board Services (West)

Riya Seth  
Democracy Advisor

12 April 2018

Contact Telephone: (09) 826 5193  
Email.riya.seth@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz  
Website: www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz

Note: The reports contained within this agenda are for consideration and should not be construed as Council policy unless and until adopted. Should Members require further information relating to any reports, please contact the relevant manager, Chairperson or Deputy Chairperson.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TABLE OF CONTENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Declaration of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Confirmation of Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Leave of Absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ward Councillor’s Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Deputations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Public Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Extraordinary Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Notices of Motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Auckland Transport Update - April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Whau Local Board Community Grants Programme 2018/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Approve the public notification of the intention to revoke the Reserves Act 1977 status over Saunders Reserve, 26 Saunders Place, Avondale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Motu Manawa Walkway Stages Two and Three Strategic Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Delegation for formal local board views on notified resource consents, plan changes and notices of requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Local Transport Capital Fund: options for distribution and size of the fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Consideration of Extraordinary Items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome

Apologies

At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.

Declaration of Interest

Members are reminded of the need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision making when a conflict arises between their role as a member and any private or other external interest they might have.

Specifically members are asked to identify any new interests they have not previously disclosed, an interest that might be considered as a conflict of interest with a matter on the agenda.

The following are declared interests of the Whau Local Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Organisation / Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Mulholland</td>
<td>New Lynn Business Association – Business Associate/Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Zhu</td>
<td>Chinese Oral History Foundation – Committee member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Chinese Garden Steering Committee of Auckland – Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Battersby</td>
<td>Whau Coastal Walkway Environmental Trust – Trustee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Lynn Tennis Club – Patron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Lynn Gardens – Patron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tag Out Trust – Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Lynn Bowling Club - Patron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avondale RSA - Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Farmer</td>
<td>Avondale-Waterview Historical Society – Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blockhouse Bay Historical Society – Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portage Licensing Trust – Trustee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blockhouse Bay Bowls – Patron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forest and Bird organisation - Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan Macdonald</td>
<td>Avondale Business Association – Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avondale Community Society – Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avondale RSA – Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avondale-Waterview Historical Society - Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avondale Jockey Club – Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te’eva Matafai</td>
<td>Pacific Events and Entertainment Trust - Co-Founder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miss Samoa NZ - Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malu Measina Samoan Dance Group - Director/Founder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pasifika Festival ATEED - Samoa Village Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aspire Events – Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Whitley</td>
<td>Rosebank Business Association - Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pathways to the future - Past trustee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REINZ - Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Whau Local Board:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Wednesday, 28 March 2018, as a true and correct record.

5 Leave of Absence

At the close of the agenda no requests for leave of absence had been received.

6 Acknowledgements

At the close of the agenda no requests for acknowledgements had been received.

7 Ward Councillor's Update

An opportunity is provided for the Whau Ward Councillor to update the board on regional issues he has been involved with since the last meeting.

8 Deputations

Standing Order 3.20 provides for deputations. Those applying for deputations are required to give seven working days notice of subject matter and applications are approved by the Chairperson of the Whau Local Board. This means that details relating to deputations can be included in the published agenda. Total speaking time per deputation is ten minutes or as resolved by the meeting.

At the close of the agenda no requests for deputations had been received.

9 Public Forum

A period of time (approximately 30 minutes) is set aside for members of the public to address the meeting on matters within its delegated authority. A maximum of 3 minutes per item is allowed, following which there may be questions from members.

At the close of the agenda no requests for public forum had been received.

10 Extraordinary Business

Section 46A(7) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“An item that is not on the agenda for a meeting may be dealt with at that meeting if-

(a) The local authority by resolution so decides; and

(b) The presiding member explains at the meeting, at a time when it is open to the
public,-

(i) The reason why the item is not on the agenda; and

(ii) The reason why the discussion of the item cannot be delayed until a subsequent meeting."

Section 46A(7A) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (as amended) states:

“Where an item is not on the agenda for a meeting,-

(a) That item may be discussed at that meeting if-

   (i) That item is a minor matter relating to the general business of the local authority; and

   (ii) the presiding member explains at the beginning of the meeting, at a time when it is open to the public, that the item will be discussed at the meeting; but

   (b) no resolution, decision or recommendation may be made in respect of that item except to refer that item to a subsequent meeting of the local authority for further discussion."

11 Notices of Motion

There were no notices of motion.
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. This report:
   a) Responds to Whau Local Board (the Board) resolutions;
   c) Provides updates to the Board on the status of its transport capital fund projects and brief updates on other Auckland Transport (AT) projects of interest to the board.
   d) Provides general information on AT’s activities in the Board area.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. In particular, this report:
   a) Provides a progress update to the Board on its current transport capital fund projects, along with financial information indicating how much budget the board has remaining in this political term.
   b) Provides updates to the Board on how it can provide input into the Regional Land Transport Plan.
   c) Responds to Board resolutions regarding evening gating of Endeavour Street, Blockhouse Bay.
   d) Notes consultation information sent to the Board for feedback and decisions of the Traffic Control Committee as they affect the Board area.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Whau Local Board:

a) receive Auckland Transport’s April 2018 update report.

Horopaki / Context

Local Board Transport Capital Fund

3. The Whau Local Board has approximately $550,000 per annum of discretionary funding for transport related capital projects.

4. The Local Board’s current Local Board Transport Capital Fund projects are summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whau Bridge</td>
<td>This is part of the New Lynn to Waterview shared path.</td>
<td>The Board were updated at a workshop on 11 April.</td>
<td>$2,000,000 (expended from last terms budget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The contribution by the Whau Local Board is for a footbridge that is 3.5m wide and 76.5m long.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP)

5. The most important strategic project at this time is a development of the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). It is a plan for how transport delivery agencies (Auckland Transport, New Zealand Transport Agency, Kiwi Rail) intend to respond to growth and other challenges facing Auckland over the next 10 years. It includes a 10-year prioritised delivery programme of transport services and activities. Essentially, it is a budget for Auckland’s transport expenditure.

6. It is a statutory plan describing how these agencies intend to respond to growth and other challenges facing Auckland over the next ten years. It will include a ten-year, prioritised, delivery programme of transport services and activities. Auckland Transport prepares the draft RLTP jointly with the New Zealand Transport Agency.

7. Details of the process are as follows:
   - RLTP consultation will begin on Monday, 23 April 2018 and close on Sunday, 6 May 2018.
   - Members from all 21 local boards have been invited to an information, question and answer session on Monday, 23 April 2018.
   - Each local board will have an opportunity to give verbal feedback on the plan to representatives of the Regional Transport Committee (the decision makers for RLTP) on Monday, 30 April 2018.
   - There will be a number of public information sessions and the Board will be informed of these as soon as details are confirmed.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Responding to Resolutions

8. The ‘Resolution’ is recorded below in bold. Auckland Transport’s response is below the ‘Resolution’ in normal font

Resolution number CP2018/01357

9. request Auckland Transport develop options for consideration at a local board workshop in March for the late night visitor management of the carpark at the end of Endeavour Street at Blockhouse Bay Beach.

10. Auckland Transport responded to the Local Board workshop on 4 April 2018. The findings were that is was a public nuisance, not a transport/parking related issue.

11. On request, AT investigated evening closure of the road. Whilst there is a process (s342 of LGA’74), AT legal suggest Endeavour Street, Blockhouse Bay would not meet the criteria and active police enforcement is the only option.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

Consultation Items

12. The Board’s views are considered during consultation on proposed project schemes. The following project proposals were consulted and feedback sought by the Board in February 2018 and March 2018:
   - Clearway - Ash Street, Avondale
   - Variable Message Sign - Blockhouse Bay Road, Blockhouse Bay
   - Installations of new Bus Layover, Margan Ave, New Lynn
   - Installations of new bus stops, Great North Road, New Lynn
Traffic Control Committee report


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street/Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark Street, Rankin Avenue, Memorial Drive</td>
<td>Permanent Traffic and Parking changes Combined</td>
<td>Carried</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

14. No specific issues with regard to impacts on Maori are triggered by this report and any engagement with Maori will be carried out on an individual project basis.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

15. With regards to transport the Whau Local Board’s only budget implications are related to the Local Board Transport Capital Fund. The current financial status of the Local Transport Capital Fund is recorded below.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

16. No significant risks have been identified.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Felicity Merrington, Elected Memebr Relationship Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Jonathan Anyon, Manager Elected Member Relationship Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whau Local Board Community Grants Programme 2018/2019

File No.: CP2018/03716

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report


Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. The Auckland Council Community Grants Policy was implemented on 1 July 2015. The policy guides the allocation of local, multi-board and regional grant programmes to groups and organisations delivering projects, activities and services that benefit Aucklanders.

3. The Community Grants Policy supports each local board to review and adopt their own local grants programme for the next financial year.

4. This report presents the Whau Local Board Community Grants Programme 2018/2019 for adoption (see attachment A).

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation

That the Whau Local Board:

a) adopt the Whau Local Board Community Grants Programme 2018/2019.

Horopaki / Context

5. The Auckland Council Community Grants Policy was implemented on 1 July 2015. The policy guides the allocation of local, multi-board and regional grant programmes to groups and organisations delivering projects, activities and services that benefit Aucklanders.

6. The Community Grants Policy supports each local board to review and adopt their own local grants programme for the next financial year. The local board grants programme guides community groups and individuals when making applications to the local board.

7. The local board community grants programme includes:
   - outcomes as identified in the local board plan
   - specific local board grant priorities
   - which grant types will operate, the number of grant rounds and opening and closing dates
   - any additional criteria or exclusions that will apply
   - other factors the local board consider to be significant to their decision-making.

8. Once the local board community grants programme for the 2018/2019 financial year has been adopted, the types of grants, grant rounds, criteria and eligibility with be advertised through an integrated communication and marketing approach which includes utilising the local board channels.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

9. The new Whau Community Grants Programme has been workshopped with the local board and feedback incorporated into the grants programme for 2018/2019.

10. The new grant programme includes:
   - new outcomes and priorities from the Whau Local Board Plan 2017
   - the same number of grant rounds for 2018/2019, as are available in 2017/2018.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

11. The Community Grants Programme has been developed by the local board to set the direction of their grants programme. This programme is reviewed on an annual basis.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

12. All grant programmes respond to Auckland Council’s commitment to improving Māori wellbeing by providing grants to organisations delivering positive outcomes for Māori. Applicants are asked how their project aims to increase Māori outcomes in the application process.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

13. The allocation of grants to community groups is within the adopted Long term Plan 2015 - 2025 and local board agreements.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

14. The allocation of grants occurs within the guidelines and criteria of the Community Grants Policy and the local board grants programme. Therefore, there is minimal risk associated with the adoption of the grants programme.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

15. An implementation plan is underway and the local board grants programme will be locally advertised through the local board and council channels. Targeted advertising and promotion will be developed for target populations, including migrant and refugee groups, disability groups, Māori and iwi organisations

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Whau Local Board Grant Programme 2018/2019</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Authorisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marion Davies - Community Grants Operations Manager</td>
<td>Shane King - Operations Support Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whau Local Board Grants Programme 2018/2019

Our Local Grants Programme aims to provide contestable and discretionary community grants to local communities.

Outcomes sought from the local grants programme

Our grants programme will be targeted towards achieving the following outcomes, as outlined in our local board plan:

- Well-planned towns, facilities and housing
- Great neighbourhoods with strong community connections, capacity and voices
- It’s 20 minutes to all we need by walking, cycling and public transport
- Enhanced natural environment
- Strong local businesses and more quality local jobs
- Celebrating our creative edge in our streets, neighbourhoods and communities
- Our heritage is known, protected and our stories are shared

Our priorities for grants

The Whau Local Board welcomes grant applications that align with one of more of the following priorities and deliver initiatives and activities to achieve the Whau Local Board plan.

Well-planned towns, facilities and housing

- Our towns and neighbourhood centres are busier, cleaner and safer
- Whau has a network of great community buildings, sports fields and parks
- More people are more active more often

Great neighbourhoods with strong community connections, capacity and voices

- Our towns and neighbourhood communities are stronger
- Māori leaders, Pasifika, Chinese, Indian and other ethnic and resettled communities contribute to the Whau’s future
- Our children and young people are supported to learn and be active
- Mana whenua and mataawaka are acknowledged and their needs and aspirations are widely known
- Celebrate our diverse communities and their heritages
- Our most in need have a place to go for help

It’s 20 minutes to all we need by walking, cycling and public transport

Whau Local Board
• Increase awareness of our local links

Enhanced natural environment
• The water quality of our rivers and streams is improving
• More of our parks, coasts and waterways are being restored
• Whau is living more sustainably
• Know, grow, protect and manage better our urban trees and green areas

Strong local businesses and more quality local jobs
• Our local businesses are stronger and more successful
• Whau is growing more new local business and quality jobs
• Our local businesses have access to more skilled local workers now and in the future

Celebrating our creative edge in our streets, neighbourhoods and communities
• Whau’s communities can access and participate in arts activity
• Whau is known for its robust and flourishing creative economy
• Art and culture is celebrated in our place-making

Our heritage is known, protected and our stories are shared
• We celebrate and support protection from a strong research foundation
• Gather and share historical knowledge
• Preservation of our places and stories

Lower Priorities
We will consider applications for other services, projects, events and activities outside the current priorities, however these will be considered a lower priority.

The Whau Local Board will consider the following activities as lower priorities:
• administration and salary costs
• events which charge an admission fee
• applicants that have already received one successful grant application within the current financial year
• where the applicant has a considerable cash surplus (relative to the amount applied for), unless they can verify that it is a tagged reserve and cannot be used as a contribution towards the submitted project
• applicants who have not considered other sources of funding for their project

Investment approach
The Whau Local Board will allocate budget annually to support the local grants programme which will be divided into three approaches:

Whau Local Board
Quick Response Grants: for grants $500 to $2,000
Local Grants: Generally for grants $2,000 to $5,000

Match funding
The Whau Local Board will prioritise grants with a strong “match funding” approach i.e. where groups can demonstrate significant community contribution in time, cash and/or in kind services.

Application dates
Grant rounds for 2018/2019 will be as follows:

Quick Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018/19 grant rounds</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round one</td>
<td>27 August 2018</td>
<td>21 September 2018</td>
<td>24 October 2018</td>
<td>1 October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>24 September 2018</td>
<td>19 October 2018</td>
<td>28 November 2018</td>
<td>1 December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round three</td>
<td>22 April 2019</td>
<td>17 May 2019</td>
<td>26 June 2019</td>
<td>1 July 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018/19 grant rounds</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round one</td>
<td>25 June 2018</td>
<td>3 August 2018</td>
<td>26 September 2018</td>
<td>1 October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>18 February 2019</td>
<td>29 March 2019</td>
<td>22 May 2019</td>
<td>1 June 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-board funding
We will work with the neighbouring local boards to deliver multi-board funding. The applicant will need to clearly demonstrate how the proposal benefits people and communities in the Whau area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018/2019 Multi-board grant rounds</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Decision made</th>
<th>Projects to occur after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round one</td>
<td>18 June 2018</td>
<td>17 August 2018</td>
<td>26 September 2018</td>
<td>1 October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round two</td>
<td>21 January 2019</td>
<td>22 March 2019</td>
<td>22 May 2019</td>
<td>1 June 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accountability measures
In addition to the measures in the community grants policy the Whau Local Board requests that all successful applicants as far as possible provide photographs of the activity funded.
Approve the public notification of the intention to revoke the Reserves Act 1977 status over Saunders Reserve, 26 Saunders Place, Avondale

File No.: CP2018/05194

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To approve the public notification of Auckland Council’s intention to revoke the Reserves Act 1977 status over Saunders Reserve.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. In 2000 the former Auckland City Council granted a 15 year community ground lease to the West End Rowing Club Incorporated for the building of its clubrooms on Saunders Reserve. The lease commenced 19 August 2003 being the date of practical completion and will fully expire on 18 August 2018. The rowing club wishes to continue leasing part of Saunders Reserve.
3. Saunders Reserve is held in fee simple by Auckland Council and described at Lots 26 and 27 Deposited Plan 112772. Lot 26 is an unclassified local purpose (esplanade) reserve with Lot 27 being an unclassified recreation reserve. Both Lots are subject to the Reserves Act 1977.
4. Part of the clubrooms and car cark occupy Lot 26. An unclassified esplanade reserve does not allow this activity. The balance of the clubrooms occupies Lot 27. An unclassified recreation reserve will limit some of the fundraising activities undertaken by the club.
5. This report recommends the public notification of Auckland Council’s intention to revoke the Reserves Act status over Saunders Reserve.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Whau Local Board:

a) approve the public notification of Auckland Council’s intention to revoke the Reserves Act status over Saunders Reserve described as Lots 26 and 27 on Deposited Plan 112772 under section 24 (1) of the Reserves Act 1977;
b) delegate to the Whau Local Board Chair to appoint a panel to consider submissions or objections received, and for the panel to reach a decision.

Horopaki / Context
Saunders Reserve
6. Saunders Reserve is described as Lots 26 and 27 Deposited Plan 112772, comprising 5780 and 5008m² respectively. Lot 26 is an unclassified local purpose (esplanade) reserve with Lot 27 being an unclassified recreation reserve. Both Lots are held in fee simple by Auckland Council and are subject to the Reserves Act 1977 (Attachment A).

West End Rowing Club Incorporated
7. Located on Lots 26 and 27 are the West End Rowing Club Incorporated clubrooms and the council owned car park. In 2000 the former Auckland City Council granted a 15 year community ground lease to the club for the building of its clubrooms. The lease
commencement date was on practical completion being assessed as 19 August 2003. The lease will fully expire on 18 August 2018. The rowing club wishes to continue leasing part of Saunders Reserve.

8. The rowing club was registered as an Incorporated Society on 24 September 1983. Its objectives are to:
   - participate in the sport of rowing
   - foster and encourage excellence in the sport of rowing.

9. The rowing club was established in 1884 and based in a building set into the cliffs of St Mary’s Bay. The demand of urban sprawl, motorway extensions and expansion of Westhaven Marina has seen the club relocate its base on three occasions since being established. The three relocations were:
   - from the cliffs of St Mary’s Bay to the edge of the motorway at Westhaven Marina
   - from the edge of the motorway at Westhaven Marina to a position further down the marina
   - from the marina to its current location at Saunders Reserve.

10. The rowing club has a competitive membership of more than 200 athletes. This membership comprises of rowers from three affiliate schools; Baradene College of the Sacred Heart, Saint Peter’s College and Mount Albert Grammar School, Masters men and women and club squads of men and women.

**Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice**

11. The esplanade reserve status of Lot 26 has a very specialised purpose under the Reserves Act and is solely to protect the adjoining watercourse and provide access along it. The purpose does not contemplate buildings, car parks or any commercial activity occupying the land.

12. The recreation reserve status of Lot 27 does not allow fund raising and other commercial activities such as weddings and parties currently being undertaken by the club. This is because Section 54 (1) (d) of the Reserves Act directs that any commercial activity “must be necessary to enable the public to obtain the benefit and enjoyment of the reserve or for the convenience of persons using the reserve”. Must is the operative word.

13. While fund raising is an essential requirement of the club to maintain both its clubrooms and its objectives, many of these activities are not of a recreational nature and do not augment the public’s enjoyment of the recreational function of Lot 27 and are therefore in breach of the Reserves Act.

14. As the clubrooms and car park occupy part of the esplanade reserve and some of the club’s activities are not permitted under the Reserves Act it is recommended to revoke the Reserves Act status under section 24(1) of the Act.

15. Once revoked, Lots 26 and 27 would be held by the council in fee simple under the Local Government Act 2002 and continue to be administered by the council under that Act. A lease could then be granted by the council to the club under the 2002 Act authorising the same activities to continue as before. Lots 26 and 27 would still be protected and the club’s activities would become legitimate and compliant under the more accommodating 2002 Act.

16. Public notification of the intention to revoke the Reserves Act status over Saunders Reserve is required under Section 24 (2) (b).

17. The application by the rowing club for a new community lease will not be reported until after the public notification process to revoke the Reserves Act status has been completed.
Whau Local Board
18 April 2018

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

18. Council staff sought input at a local board workshop on 8 November 2018 and 4 April 2018 regarding revocation of the Reserves Act status and proposed new community lease.

19. The Whau Local Board is the allocated authority to revoke the Reserves Act status over the reserve.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

20. Engagement was undertaken from December 2017 through to March 2018 with 13 iwi groups identified as having an interest in land in the Whau Local Board area.

21. Engagement involved:
   - a presentation at the North West Mana Whenua Forum held at Orewa on 6 December 2017
   - detailed information on the reserve, the rowing club.
   - Invitation to iwi representatives to hui and for a kaitiaki site visit to comment on any spiritual, cultural or environmental impact with respect to the proposal
   - On 1 March 2018 a kaitiaki representative of Te Kawerau Iwi Tribal Authority and Settlement Trust attended the site and met with council staff and club representatives for the purposes of providing an assessment on the cultural, heritage and environmental aspects of the proposal by council. The assessment concluded that:
     i) There were no concerns regarding the revocation of the Reserve Act status over the land so that in future the land will be held under the Local Government Act 2002;
     ii) Support is given for a new lease to the rowing club for the following reasons:
        - there will be no significant changes to the building
        - the West End Rowing Club serves the local community
        - the reserve is still open to public
        - the mauri of the water is important to the rowing club
        - there are no long-term plan for expansion
        - there is a commitment by the club to the cleanliness of the water
        - the club has built and paid for the pontoon
        - the club has made upgrades to the original building.

22. Responses were received from three other iwi groups with no objections or concerns raised.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

23. The costs of public notification of the intention to revoke the Reserves Act status will be borne by Auckland Council’s Community Facilities Department.

24. The cost of a panel, appointed to hear objections or submissions received following the public notification process will be borne by Auckland Council’s Local Board Services.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

25. The portion of the clubrooms and car park that occupies Lot 26 being the esplanade reserve is not permitted under the Reserve Act and is in breach.
26. In addition the fundraising activities undertaken in the clubrooms that occupy both Lot 26 and 27 are not permitted by the Reserves Act because they are not of a recreational nature and do not augment the public enjoyment of the recreational function of Lot 27 and are in breach of the esplanade function of Lot 26.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

27. Public notification of council’s intention to revoke the Reserves Act status over Saunders Reserve will be published on the Auckland Council Website and placed in both the New Zealand Herald and the Western Leader.
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Approve the public notification of the intention to revoke the Reserves Act 1977 status over Saunders Reserve, 26 Saunders Place, Avondale

Attachment A: Site Plan of Saunders Reserve, 26 Saunders Place, Avondale

Revocation of the Reserves Act status over Saunders Reserve described as Lot 26 and Lot 27 on Deposited Plan 112772 outlined in blue
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek endorsement of the high level plan for stages two and three of the Motu Manawa Walkway in the Whau Local Board area.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The Motu Manawa Walkway is a proposed connection spanning the perimeter of the Motu Manawa Inlet, providing a safe off road coastal route for walkers and cyclists and raising the profile of the Motu Manawa-Pollen Island Marine Reserve, a significant feature of the area.
3. Funded by the Whau and Albert-Eden Local Boards for delivery in 2018, stage one of the Motu Manawa Walkway connects Heron Park to Holly Street through coastal marine area. Both boards are looking to build on this investment in order to complete the walkway in the longer term.
4. This report considers next steps for the walkway through the Whau Local Board area, presenting a high level proposed route and a staged approach for delivery.
5. Investment into stages two and three of the Motu Manawa Walkway will result in significant benefits for the local and wider community, including improved walking and cycling connections and improved recreation opportunities. It would also lead to increased community awareness of the special environment and history of the inlet.
6. Further investigation and design work is required prior to the future construction of the next stages of the walkway.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Whau Local Board:

a) receive and endorse the high level plan for stages 2 and 3 of the Motu Manawa Walkway as presented in Attachment A to this report.

Horopaki / Context
7. The Motu Manawa-Pollen Island Marine Reserve protects 500 hectares of the inner reaches of Auckland's Waitemata Harbour. It includes the intertidal mudflats, tidal channels, mangrove swamp, saltmarsh, and shell banks surrounding Pollen and Traherne Islands and throughout the Motu Manawa Inlet.
8. The majority of land neighbouring the marine reserve is public open space in the form of Esplanade Reserves or Parks, and is managed in part by the Whau Local Board (down the length of the Rosebank Peninsula) and in part the Albert-Eden Local Board (down the length of Waterview). The vast majority of this open space is currently inaccessible.
9. The Motu Manawa Walkway is a proposed connection through public open space and coastal marine area, which upon completion will span the entire perimeter of the Motu Manawa inlet. The project aims to provide a safe off-road coastal route suitable for both walking and cycling, while also raising the profile of this outstanding natural feature of
Auckland. The Motu Manawa Walkway is a key consideration in both the Whau Greenways Plan 2016 and the Albert-Eden Greenways Plan 2013.

10. In a joint initiative, the Whau and Albert-Eden Local Boards funded delivery of an initial segment of the walkway to be delivered in 2018, connecting Heron Park to Holly Street through coastal marine area. This section of the walkway is referred to as stage one in this report.

11. Following the decision to construct stage one, the Whau Local Board allocated OPEX funding as part of the PSR FY17/18 Work Program to consider and identify next steps for delivery of the larger walkway.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

12. Parks Services staff undertook a strategic assessment to identify the benefits of improving walking and cycling services along the Rosebank Peninsular. This study included analysis of the optimal route to meet community outcomes.

13. A preferred high level route alignment was identified for the walkway which, if delivered, will form a continuous coastal walkway from the Heron Park to the North Western Motorway (SH16) Cycleway (see Attachment A).

14. Delivery of the Motu Manawa Walkway will result in numerous benefits to the local community, visitors to the area, and for the environment. These benefits are summarized below:

- Improved safe local walking and cycling connections and expansion of the active transport network through the Whau Local Board area. Provision of safe walking and cycling options for the community leads to improvements in health and wellbeing, and helps to decrease the numbers of cars on our roads.

- The Motu Manawa walkway project will link to the wider walking and cycling network at Waterview and SH16. This will provide regional recreational benefits and increase active transport options for all Aucklanders.

- Improved public access to the marine reserve will increase community knowledge and respect for the natural environment, and provide opportunities for historical, cultural and environmental education.

- Better access to the marine reserve will enable improvements in water quality and in the marine and terrestrial ecology of the inlet. This will be achieved through removal of rubbish, restoration planting and storm water filtration.

- A completed recreation loop around the Motu Manawa Inlet would become a feature for the area, encouraging visitors from all over Auckland.

15. Many of the identified benefits will assist other agencies and organisations to meet their goals, including Auckland Transport (AT), the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA), and the Rosebank Business Association. This presents an opportunity for partnerships in the future delivery of the walkway.

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

16. Both the Whau and Albert Eden Local Boards are planning for future investment in the Motu Manawa Walkway, and are actively working towards the target of a connected walkway which facilitates movement between Waterview and Avondale and further afield.

17. The Whau Local Board funded investigation into stages two and three of the Motu Manawa Walkway as part of their Parks Sport and Recreation OPEX Work Programme in June 2017.
18. This project was workshopped with the Whau Local Board to discuss details of the approved work programme on 12 July 2017, to update on progress of the walkway investigation on 8 November 2017, and to seek feedback on 14 February 2018.

19. The Whau Local Board was supportive of the high level alignment and the suggested staged delivery of the walkway. The board have indicated that they would like to progress this project into the investigation and design stage in FY18/19.

20. Investment into stages two and three of the Motu Manawa Walkway will help to meet objectives from the Whau Local Board Plan 2017, including:
   - More people more active more often.
   - Build more paths to local facilities and public transport.
   - Increase awareness of local links.
   - More parks, coasts and waterways being restored.
   - Preserve local places and stories.

21. In addition, investment would deliver upon outcomes identified in the Whau Open Space Network Plan 2017 and the Whau Neighbourhood Greenways Plan 2014, both which list the Motu Manawa Walkway as a priority project.

22. Any further investigation and design work carried out on stages two and three of the Motu Manawa Walkway will be workshopped with the local board, with opportunities for input at all stages of the project pipeline.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

23. Mana Whenua were engaged to discuss potential next steps for the Motu Manawa Walkway. The investigation was discussed at the North-West Park, Sports and Recreation Kaitiaki Forum on 28 June 2017. Comments received at this time were that Mana Whenua desire ongoing involvement in this project, particularly during investigation and design for the walkway. Te Kawarau a Maki indicated a desire to undertake a Cultural Impact Assessment and to assist in archeological reporting as the project develops further.

24. The Motu Manawa Inlet is of cultural significance to Māori. Its waters weave together a landscape of diverse cultural sites, and would have once been an important gathering ground for kai moana.

25. Mana Whenua act as kaitiaki (guardians) of the environment in this area, and as such any developments should look to minimize any adverse impact to the environment.

26. Mana Whenua will be engaged during Investigation and Design to provide further input, including a cultural impact assessment and archeological report if required.

27. Ongoing engagement with Mana Whenua reinforces their position of partners and kaitiaki (guardians) of the inlet, and reflects Auckland Council’s desire to deliver the vision of the world’s most liveable city, including a Māori identity that is Auckland’s point of difference in the world.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

28. Continued funding from the Whau Local Board will be required to enable investigation and design for the next stage of the Motu Manawa Walkway. The Community Facilities proposed work programme for FY18/19 includes $50,000 of LDI Capex to progress design and investigation work, should the Whau Local Board formally approve this allocation in June 2018.

29. Physical works for next stages of the walkway will require further capital funding. There is currently no certainty that funding will be available through the Long Term Plan. Therefore, future delivery might be reliant on further LDI Capex allocation. This project will be discussed
further with the Whau Local Board during a workshop of the future capex programme later in 2018 to identify funding options for delivery.

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

30. Lack of support from residents and businesses neighbouring the walkway could delay delivery of the project and impact upon the preferred route and construction methodology. Businesses which are encroaching on public open space along the proposed route are identified as a potential issue. This could be mitigated via a thorough communications and engagement strategy during design and delivery of the walkway.

31. The Department of Conservation manage the coastal marine area, and future delivery of the walkway would require their approval. This could be mitigated through thorough assessment of the ecological impacts of the walkway, best practice during design and construction, and environmental offset through planting and restoration where appropriate.

32. Given this is a long term project, lack of continued funding could delay delivery of the walkway. This could be mitigated by following the staging recommendations from the feasibility report, whereby each section provides a complete connection and adds value to the network without reliance on future investment.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**

33. Investigation and design for Stage 2 of the Motu Manawa Walkway is included in the proposed Community Facilities FY18/19 Work Programme. If approved, staff will work with the Whau Local Board to progress this project and assess opportunities for funding of the delivery phase.
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Delegation for formal local board views on notified resource consents, plan changes and notices of requirement

File No.: CP2018/04478

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek that the Whau Local Board delegates the responsibility of providing formal views on resource consents, notified plan changes and notices of requirement to a local board member.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Local board feedback can be provided on notified resource consents, plan changes and designations. Written feedback needs to be provided prior to the submission closing date (usually 20 working days after public notification). This feedback is included in the planner’s report verbatim and local boards are also able to speak to their written feedback at the public hearing. Views should be received by the processing planner or reporting consultant by submission closing date to ensure the content can be considered in planning reports.
3. This report explores options to enable local boards to provide their views in a timely way. Local boards normally provide their formal views at business meetings. Because local board reporting timeframes don’t usually align with statutory timeframes, in most instances formal reporting at a business meeting will not allow local feedback to be provided by submission closing date.
4. Providing formal local board views by way of a delegation to a local board member is considered the most efficient way of providing formal local board views. This is because the delegate can provide views within the regulatory timeframes and because no additional reporting is required when new applications of interest are notified.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Whau Local Board:

a) delegate the authority to a Local Board Member, to prepare and submit local board views and speak those local board views at any hearings on:
   - Notified resource consents
   - Notified plan changes
   - Notices of requirement.

Horopaki / Context

Notified Resource Consents
5. Local boards are able to provide input into the determination of applications that may be notified. Local boards, via their appointed Resource Consents Leads, input into a wide range of resource consents that are received by the council and that trigger the matters of particular interest to local boards.
6. Local views and preferences are also able to be provided, once a decision of notification is made, and local boards can then submit further feedback to any notified resource consent
application within their local board area. This feedback is then included in the planner’s report verbatim for the hearing and for the consideration of the commissioners who determine the outcome of the resource consent application.

7. Local boards are also able to speak to their written feedback at any notified resource consent hearing. Local boards are taking this opportunity up more often and it is considered important to ensure any feedback is authorised by the local board and a delegation is in place for the Resource Consent Lead to authorise them to speak on behalf of the local board at hearings.

Notified Plan Changes and Notices of Requirement

8. The Auckland Unitary Plan was made “Operative in Part” in November 2016. As plan changes and notices of requirement can now be received and processed by council, there are opportunities for local boards to provide their views and give feedback on notified applications.

9. For council-initiated plan changes and notices of requirement, staff will seek local board views prior to notification for proposals where there are issues of local significance. For private plan changes and notices of requirement submitted by non-council requiring authorities, local boards may not have any prior knowledge of the application until notification.

10. Local boards can provide written feedback on notified applications. Written feedback needs to be provided prior to the submission closing date (usually 20 working days after public notification). Local boards can subsequently present their feedback to support their views at any hearing.

11. It is important that options are explored to enable local boards to provide their views in a timely way and a delegation to ensure timely feedback is desirable. At present the local board views must be confirmed formally and statutory timeframes are short and do not always align with local board reporting timeframes.

12. Local boards may want to add the responsibility for plan changes and notices of requirement feedback to the resource consent lead role. This will broaden the responsibilities of the role to enable feedback on notified plan changes and notices of requirement to be provided. Alternatively, local boards may want to develop a separate planning lead role and each local board has the flexibility to make appointments that best suit their needs.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Options considered

13. Options available for local boards to provide their views into the hearings process have been summarised in Table 1.

14. Local boards normally provide their formal views at business meetings (option 2). Because local board reporting timeframes do not usually align with statutory timeframes, in most instances formal reporting at a business meeting will not allow local feedback to be provided by submission closing date. Views must be received by the processing planner or reporting consultant by the submission closing date to ensure the content can be considered in planning reports.

15. Providing formal local board views by way of a delegation to one local board member (option 5) is considered the most efficient way of providing formal views. This is because no additional reporting is required when new applications of interest are notified.
### Table 1: Options for local boards to provide their formal views on notified applications (resource consents, plan changes, notices of requirement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No formal local board views are provided</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Local board views will not be considered by the hearings commissioners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Formal local board views are provided at a business meeting | ● All local board members contribute to the local board view  
● Provides transparent decision making | ● Local board meeting schedules and agenda deadlines are unlikely to align with statutory deadlines imposed by the planning process |
| 3. Formal local board views are provided as urgent decisions | ● Local boards can provide their views in a timely way that meets statutory deadlines | ● Decisions are not made by the full local board  
● Urgent decisions may not be accompanied by full information and the discussion may be rushed  
● Not transparent decision-making because the decisions do not become public until after they have been made |
| 4. Formal local board views are provided by separate and specific delegation for each application which the local board wishes to provide their views | ● Delegations can be chosen to align with area of interest and/or local board member capacity | ● Local board meeting schedules and agenda deadlines required to make each separate delegation are unlikely to align with statutory deadlines imposed by the planning process  
● Decisions are not made by the full local board |
| 5. Formal local board views are provided by way of delegation to one local board member (preferred option) for all applications | ● Delegate will become subject matter expert for local board on topic they are delegated to  
● Local boards can provide their views in a timely way that meets statutory deadlines  
● Any feedback can be regularly reported back to the local board | ● Decisions are not made by the full local board |

**Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views**

16. This report seeks a delegation to a local board member for resource consents, plan changes and notices of requirement, to allow local boards to provide feedback in accordance with agreed timeframes on notified resource consents, plan changes and notices of requirement.
17. Any local board members who is delegated responsibilities should ensure that they represent the wider local board views and preferences on each matter before them.

**Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement**

18. A decision of this procedural nature is not considered to have a positive or negative impact for Māori.

19. The Resource Management Act 1991 requires that council consult with Mana Whenua of the area who may be affected, through iwi authorities, on draft plan changes prior to their notification. Council must also consider iwi authority advice in evaluations of plan changes.

20. For private plan changes, council seeks that the applicant undertakes suitable engagement with relevant iwi authorities, and where necessary will undertake consultation before deciding whether to accept, reject or adopt a private plan change.

21. For notices of requirement, council serves notice on Mana Whenua of the area who may be affected, through iwi authorities. Requiring authorities must also consult with the relevant iwi as part of the designating process.

**Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications**

22. A decision of this procedural nature is not considered to have financial implications on Auckland Council.

**Ngā raru tūpono / Risks**

23. If local boards choose not to delegate to provide views on notified applications, there is a risk that they will not be able to provide formal views prior to the submission closing date and may miss the opportunity to have their feedback presented and heard at a hearing.

**Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps**

24. Delegated member of the Whau Local Board will operate under the delegations of the Whau Local Board once they have been adopted.

**Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments**

There are no attachments for this report.

**Ngā kaihaina / Signatories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Carol Stewart - Senior Policy Advisor, Local Board Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Anna Bray - Policy and Planning Manager - Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louise Mason - GM Local Board Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenn Boyd - Relationship Manager Henderson-Massey, Waitakere Ranges, Whau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Transport Capital Fund: options for distribution and size of the fund

File No.: CP2018/04657

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. This report seeks formal feedback from the local board on options for the future size and underlying distribution methodology of the local transport capital fund (LTCF) and on the proposal to increase advisory support for the fund from Auckland Transport staff.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. In September 2017, the Governing Body agreed in principle to an increase to the local transport capital fund as an outcome of the governance framework review. Staff were directed to undertake further work with Auckland Transport and local boards on the size of the increase, and the distribution methodology.

3. The LTCF was established in 2012 and currently sits at $10.8 million. It is allocated on a pure population basis. Two options for the size of funding increase have been modelled, an increase of $6 million and an increase of $10 million.

4. Staff have also modelled three different distribution options: the current population model, a model applying the Local Boards Funding Policy, and a model that includes a mix of a fixed level of funding per board, along with a variable rate determined by the Local Boards Funding Policy.

5. Each of the options has been assessed against a set of criteria. The pure population model is not supported by staff, while each of the other two models has merits. On balance, staff recommend that the Local Boards Funding Policy be applied to the distribution of the LTCF, with an additional amount of $10 million being added to the fund. Feedback is sought from local boards on their preferences.

6. It is also recommended that Auckland Transport have funding allocated to provide an increased level of support to local boards in developing and assessing local transport projects.

7. Final decisions will be made by the Governing Body as part of the 10-year budget process in May.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Whau Local Board endorse:

a) an increase to the local transport capital fund of $10 million per annum (inflation adjusted) from 1 July 2018

b) the distribution of the entire local transport capital fund to be made according to Auckland Council’s Local Boards Funding Policy from 1 July 2018

c) Auckland Transport receiving additional funding to provide an increased level of support to local boards in developing and assessing projects for the local transport capital fund.

Horopaki / Context

8. The local transport capital fund (LTCF) was established by resolution of the Strategy and Finance Committee [SF/2012/40] in April 2012, in order to provide local boards with access
to funding for local transport projects that had strong local significance, but which were unlikely to be prioritised through the regional transport planning process.

9. The establishment of the fund is consistent with the government’s original policy intent that local boards would have a role in funding local transport projects out of a dedicated local budget [CAB Minute(09) 30/10] and that “local boards will have an advisory role with respect to transport services and a budget for the transport elements of ‘place shaping’”.

10. The objectives of the fund are to:
   - ensure locally important transport projects are given appropriate priority
   - provide local boards with more direct ability to influence local transport projects.

11. Projects must be deliverable, meet transport safety criteria and not compromise the network. Auckland Transport retains the responsibility for delivering projects delivered through this funding and the budget remains with Auckland Transport. Depreciation and consequential operating expenditure are also the responsibility of Auckland Transport, as is the core administration of the fund.

12. The fund was initially set at $10 million per annum (since adjusted for inflation, and now sitting at $10.8 million) and is currently split between the local boards on the basis of population, excepting Waiheke and Great Barrier Island local boards, which receive two per cent and one per cent of the fund respectively. The population figures that the distribution is based on have remained at 2012 levels.

13. At the Governing Body meeting of 28 September 2017, at which the recommendations of the Governance Framework Review Political Working Party were considered, it was agreed [GB/2017/117] that officers would report back to the governing body through the 10-year budget process on options for significantly increasing the LTCF, as well as providing an assessment of options for allocating the additional funding.

14. This report provides options for the quantum of the proposed increase, the method of allocating the proposed increase among the twenty one local boards and issues relating to the administration of the fund. Workshops have been held with each local board to discuss these proposals and now formal feedback is sought through business meetings. Final recommendations will be made to the Governing Body in May.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

15. Issues with the local transport capital fund identified through the governance framework review were grouped under three key themes:
   - the overall size, or quantum, of the local transport capital fund
   - the methodology underpinning its distribution among local boards
   - the administration and support provided by Auckland Transport to local boards in relation to developing options and projects for consideration.

Quantum of funding

16. When the LTCF was initially established at $10 million, the figure was not based on any specific assessment of need, but more on the recognition that smaller, local projects that had a strong place shaping component were unlikely to be funded according to Auckland Transport and NZTA’s prioritisation formulas.

17. While the fund took some time to get established, it is now delivering valuable transport related outcomes for communities across Auckland. The LTCF spend forecast in 2016-17 financial year was $17 million, as boards have been able to accumulate funding across

---

1 Cabinet paper: *Auckland Governance: Regional Transport Authority* Steven Joyce, Minister of Transport 2009
2 Based on Statistics NZ 2011 population estimates
years to put towards more significant projects. It has delivered 286 projects over the five year period.

18. The LTCF contribution to these many local projects has also been complemented through the input of additional funds from Auckland Transport (as well as NZTA subsidy) with the value of the work they have delivered to their communities being substantially leveraged through this additional funding.

19. Staff have modelled the impact of the proposed increase on individual local boards according to a range of distribution models. In doing so, two different levels of increase have been used – the $10 million figure, initially proposed by Auckland Transport, and a lower figure of $6 million.

20. Neither figure is based on specific needs assessment, but Auckland Transport is of the view that a baseline of approximately six hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year is desirable to give individual boards the resources to support significant local projects. This would require an increase of at least $6 million per annum.

21. Boards that have had access to higher levels of funding have generally found it easier to leverage that to attract NZTA subsidies and additional Auckland Transport funding, for example for projects that are being brought forward as a result of LTCF investment. Successful examples include the Half Moon Bay ferry terminal, the Mt Albert Station Bridge and the Māngere Future Streets project.

Distribution methodology

22. This section provides modelling of three distribution options applied to two levels of overall increase (sub-option A being an increase of $6 million, and sub-option B being an increase of $10 million). The options are:

- Option 1: status quo – simple population based distribution of both the existing fund and any additional funding
- Option 2: applying the current Local Boards Funding Policy to the distribution of the fund
- Option 3: a model that provides for a fixed level of baseline funding for all boards, as well as a variable component based on the Local Boards Funding Policy.

Population based distribution

23. In 2012, the governing body elected to distribute the first iteration of the LTCF purely on a population basis, following consultation with local boards. The distribution has not been adjusted to account for population distribution changes since the fund was established.

24. We have modelled (Appendix A) the option of applying the population based distribution methodology, based on Statistics NZ 2017 population estimates. As you will see from the modelling, the impact on boards with higher populations is the most significant, in terms of an increase in funding, especially if the additional amount is $10 million.

25. Under this model, however, if the additional amount is $6 million, six boards would still fall short of the $650,000 baseline figure identified by Auckland Transport as being desirable to enable the delivery of viable local transport proposals.

Applying the Local Boards Funding Policy to the LTCF

26. Following the establishment of the LTCF, work was undertaken to develop the current Local Boards Funding Policy, as required under the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009. This policy was adopted in 2014, and uses an allocation methodology incorporating three factors: population (90 per cent), deprivation (five per cent) and land area (five per cent). This funding policy is currently applied to locally driven initiatives funding, including the local capital fund, but was not retrospectively applied to the LTCF.

---

3 There was no formal local board funding policy in place at this time
27. The development of the funding policy involved significant consultation and engagement with local boards prior to final adoption. There are no current plans to review the policy.

28. We have modelled (Appendix B) the option of applying the Local Boards Funding Policy to the distribution of the LTCF. The modelling has been applied to the existing fund and the additional amounts of $6 million and $10 million. The modelling is also based on 2017 population estimates.

*Fixed and variable costs distribution*

29. As previously noted, Auckland Transport has the view that in order to deliver transport infrastructure of any significance, a certain level of baseline funding is desirable – around $650,000 per annum, based on practical experience.

30. Many local boards have achieved significant results with their local transport projects, but transport infrastructure is inherently costly and costs tend not to vary according to location. For example, a footbridge and walking path in Pukekohe will tend to cost the same as a comparable one in Glenfield.

31. In considering the distribution methodology for the extended fund, Auckland Transport has put forward the following factors as being relevant:

- the cost of building transport infrastructure is not directly related to the size of the population it serves
- mature areas with high populations tend to already have higher quality and better developed transport infrastructure
- the existing Auckland Transport/NZTA criteria for regional transport spending tend to favour, as would be expected, areas of high density and growth
- the physical size of an area tends to have a correlation with the need for transport infrastructure e.g. the number of settlements, town centres.

32. A distribution model based on a split of fixed and variable costs has also been modelled as an option. The methodology involves fifty per cent of the entire quantum of funding being distributed by an even split (with the exception of Great Barrier and Waiheke Island Boards which receive 1/3 and 2/3 of a single share respectively), thus giving all other local boards the same level of core funding. The other fifty per cent of the funding would be distributed according to the Local Boards Funding Policy.

33. We have modelled (Appendix C) the option of applying this fixed/variable costs model to the distribution of the LTCF.

**Assessing the options**

34. Each of the three distribution models has elements to recommend it and others that detract from it. In assessing the models, staff applied the following assessment criteria:

- transparency and ease of understanding for communities and stakeholders
- equity and fairness of outcomes across the region
- ensuring delivery of good local transport outcomes
- recognising the role of local boards as leaders of place shaping with their communities.

35. Staff assessment of the options against these criteria is set out below.

*Options 1a and 1b – population based distribution*

36. These options have been modelled on 2017 Statistics New Zealand population estimates.

37. A pure population based approach has the benefits of being objective, transparent and straightforward and means that funding received is proportionate to the number of ratepayers. It was, however, recognised at the time that this approach applied to areas of extremely low population (Waiheke and Great Barrier Islands) would result in those boards
receiving insufficient funding to achieve anything practical, hence the application of the one and two per cent formula for the island boards. A similar approach is also used in the Local Boards Funding Policy.

38. The limitations of this approach are that it does not address either the level of need in a given local board area, or the underlying cost drivers of transport infrastructure. Hence, large areas of low population density with significant roading networks and multiple population centres are funded at the same, or lower, level as smaller urban communities of interest with already well-developed transport infrastructure, but higher population density.

39. The distribution methodology is simple and transparent and easy for communities and stakeholders to understand. In terms of delivering equity and fairness, this model delivers the widest differential of funding levels across boards, with the highest funded board receiving 2.78 times the amount of the lowest funded board (excluding the island boards).

40. Option 1a also results in six boards receiving less than Auckland Transport's benchmark identified as desirable for supporting good local transport outcomes in communities. The model limits the potential for those boards to actively implement their role as local place shapers and to leverage additional investment into their projects. This model, and therefore Options 1a and 1b, is not supported by either Auckland Council or Auckland Transport staff.

Options 2a and 2b – Local Boards Funding Policy based distribution

41. This distribution method involves application of the current Local Boards Funding Policy. The policy is currently applied to distribution of funding for local activities (including local capex) to local boards and is based on the following factors: ninety per cent population\(^4\), five percent deprivation\(^5\) and five per cent land area\(^6\).

42. Applying the Local Boards Funding Policy is a simple methodology that has a clear rationale, is easily described to the community and is consistent with council’s wider approach to funding local boards. It takes account of multiple factors, delivering a more equitable distribution of funding, especially to boards with lower populations but very large land areas and roading networks.

43. Reviewing the projects that have been funded from the LTCF to date, it is clear that much of the local boards’ focus has been on “people centred” transport projects, for example pedestrian safety improvements, walkways and cycleways, footpaths and streetscape improvements. This is consistent with the principles underpinning the Local Boards Funding Policy i.e. that population is the key driver of need for the funding, but that geography and deprivation also need to be taken into account.

44. This distribution methodology even out the increase in funding across the twenty one boards. The boards with a larger land area receive more funding than under the pure population model, and all boards receive the proposed level of baseline funding, but only under the $10 million quantum increase.

45. Under this model, however, the level of funding that accrues to the more populous boards becomes very substantial in relationship to that for the smaller boards, due to the compounding impact of the distribution model. For example, the Howick Local Board would receive over $1.7 million and Henderson-Massey over $1.4 million. Despite these extremes, this option provides an arguably more equitable and nuanced distribution of funding, as well as being consistent with current funding policy.

46. Its variation between the lowest and highest level of funding is still high with the highest funded board receiving 2.57 times the amount of the lowest funded board. Under Option 2a, five boards still receive less than Auckland Transport’s desirable benchmark for delivering good local transport outcomes in communities and it limits the potential for those boards to actively implement their role as local place shapers.

---

\(^4\) Based on annually revised estimates from Statistics NZ

\(^5\) Based on Index of Deprivation provided by the Ministry of Health

\(^6\) Excluding Great Barrier and Waiheke
47. This is the preferred option on the basis of consistency with the existing funding policy, assessment against the criteria and recognition of the population focus of projects delivered using this fund. The preferred option is for the $10 million quantum as better providing for good local transport outcomes and delivering local place shaping.

Options 3a and 3b – fixed and variable cost distribution

48. This model is more complex and less transparent to communities and stakeholders than the other models. The identification of the benchmark figure is based on Auckland Transport’s experience of administering the fund over the past five years and the learning that has been gained from this, rather than in-depth financial analysis of infrastructure costs.

49. The results of this distribution are similar to those of applying the Local Boards Funding Policy, in that a similar number of local boards benefit under each model. However, it is different local boards that benefit from each model. In terms of equity and fairness, this model reduces the difference between the highest funded and lowest funded boards and also brings all boards above the $650,000 benchmark, even under Option 3a ($6m increase).

50. The model reduces the impact of population on the distribution of funding, however, which is a core component of current funding policy and the focus of the projects delivered using the LTCF. The model performs well against the criteria of enabling the delivery of good local transport outcomes and supporting the role of local boards as place shapers.

Summary of assessment of options

51. Of the three distribution models assessed, the current model of pure population distribution performed the poorest and is not recommended by either Auckland Council or Auckland Transport staff.

52. The other two models deliver mixed results against the criteria. On balance, staff recommend that the Local Boards Funding Policy distribution best meets the criteria and is consistent with current funding policy. The final recommendation to the governing body will also be informed by feedback from local boards through this process.

Administration of the LTCF

53. When the LTCF was established in 2012, it was recognised that there would be an impact on Auckland Transport as the fund administrator. While design costs are capitalised within the cost of a specific project, there are also additional costs in developing options, undertaking feasibility studies, assessing proposals and general administration.

54. It was noted at the time that if each local board proposed 3-4 projects a year that this could place a considerable burden on Auckland Transport and it was recommended that this be reviewed at the time the fund was reviewed. Given the proposed increase to the size of the fund, this issue needs to be revisited.

55. Auckland Transport’s advice on LTCF investment focusses on whether a project put forward by a local board is technically feasible, and whether it is realistic in light of the available funding from the LTCF. During the governance framework review some local board members raised concerns about the nature and quality of advice received from Auckland Transport in relation to LTCF proposals. Boards felt that advice was limited to assessing their proposal against criteria, rather than helping them identify and develop high quality proposals.

56. It is recommended that Auckland Transport be allocated additional opex funding in support of the LTCF to be used to develop a more systematic and responsive work programme with local boards around the application of the LTCF. This will include supporting boards to investigate and develop options for projects for consideration. A sum of $500,000 per annum is recommended to support this deliverable.
Whau Local Board
18 April 2018

Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

57. Workshops have been held with every local board and a range of initial feedback has been received. Discussion on collective views has also taken place at the Local Board Chairs’ Forum. While some local boards have given early indication of their preferred options, others have reserved the right to engage in further consideration ahead of providing formal feedback.

58. There was general support for an increase to the fund and for additional funding to be provided to Auckland Transport to provide advice on projects and mixed views on options for allocating the fund. As noted in the assessment of options, each of the options for the amount of increase and the distribution methodology affects individual boards differently.

59. Growth was raised by some boards as a factor that should be considered. Staff’s view is that the population element of each of the models addresses this as current population is the only reliable indicator of growth. Population estimates are updated and will be applied to the fund annually.

60. As noted in the assessment of options, each of the options for the amount of increase and the distribution methodology affects individual boards differently. A recent presentation to the Local Board Chairs’ Forum noted that it would be helpful for the Governing Body to have a clear preference signalled by the majority of local boards, in order to facilitate its decision making.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

61. A move away from a pure population based distribution model would take into account other factors, being deprivation and land area. Both options 2 and 3 include a deprivation component, although this is greater in option 2. This would have some positive impact on local board areas where there is a higher Māori population.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

62. The source of the additional funding is not addressed in this report, as it is being considered through the overall budget setting process in the 10-year budget. Essentially, however, there are two options that the governing body will need to consider – that additional funding comes from rates and/or borrowing, or Auckland Transport reprioritises within its existing funding envelope.

63. The proposed size of the increase to the fund (both options) is not significant enough within the overall transport budget to be able to enable transparent trade-offs at a detailed level e.g. which specific transport projects might not be funded in the Regional Land Transport Plan in a given year if the LTCF is increased.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

64. No significant risks have been identified.

Ngā korininga ā-muri / Next steps

65. Final decisions will be made by the Governing Body as part of the 10-year budget process in May. Any new funding and change to the distribution methodology will be applied from 1 July 2018.
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## Attachment A: Population based distribution modelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of local board</th>
<th>Current funding 2016-17</th>
<th>Additional $6m Option 1a</th>
<th>Additional $10m Option 1b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>$720,259</td>
<td>$1,080,595</td>
<td>$1,337,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>$417,067</td>
<td>$621,441</td>
<td>$769,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>$471,158</td>
<td>$739,198</td>
<td>$915,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>$105,370</td>
<td>$168,000</td>
<td>$208,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>$810,647</td>
<td>$1,210,227</td>
<td>$1,498,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>$649,799</td>
<td>$1,034,085</td>
<td>$1,280,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>$944,450</td>
<td>$1,486,313</td>
<td>$1,840,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>$627,735</td>
<td>$930,182</td>
<td>$1,151,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>$560,834</td>
<td>$802,530</td>
<td>$993,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>$642,681</td>
<td>$935,130</td>
<td>$1,157,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>$535,924</td>
<td>$788,676</td>
<td>$976,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrākei</td>
<td>$595,708</td>
<td>$905,444</td>
<td>$1,121,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>$594,996</td>
<td>$868,829</td>
<td>$1,075,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>$331,860</td>
<td>$539,308</td>
<td>$667,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketāpapa</td>
<td>$410,662</td>
<td>$623,420</td>
<td>$771,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>$399,986</td>
<td>$636,284</td>
<td>$787,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>$365,112</td>
<td>$646,179</td>
<td>$800,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke</td>
<td>$216,641</td>
<td>$336,000</td>
<td>$416,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>$358,706</td>
<td>$536,339</td>
<td>$664,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitēmatā</td>
<td>$508,878</td>
<td>$1,073,668</td>
<td>$1,329,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>$560,834</td>
<td>$838,154</td>
<td>$1,037,714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment B: Local Board Funding Policy distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of local board</th>
<th>Current funding 2016-17</th>
<th>Additional $6m Option 2a</th>
<th>Additional $10m Option 2b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>$720,259</td>
<td>$1,013,841</td>
<td>$1,255,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>$417,067</td>
<td>$587,208</td>
<td>$727,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>$471,159</td>
<td>$896,840</td>
<td>$1,110,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>$105,370</td>
<td>$168,000</td>
<td>$208,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>$810,647</td>
<td>$1,146,311</td>
<td>$1,419,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>$649,799</td>
<td>$973,716</td>
<td>$1,205,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>$944,450</td>
<td>$1,375,550</td>
<td>$1,703,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>$627,735</td>
<td>$876,680</td>
<td>$1,085,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>$560,834</td>
<td>$794,642</td>
<td>$983,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>$642,681</td>
<td>$901,483</td>
<td>$1,116,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>$535,924</td>
<td>$767,842</td>
<td>$950,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrakei</td>
<td>$595,708</td>
<td>$840,058</td>
<td>$1,040,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>$594,996</td>
<td>$849,392</td>
<td>$1,051,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>$331,660</td>
<td>$540,785</td>
<td>$669,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pukekāpapa</td>
<td>$410,662</td>
<td>$606,154</td>
<td>$750,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>$399,986</td>
<td>$987,963</td>
<td>$1,223,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>$385,112</td>
<td>$615,035</td>
<td>$761,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke</td>
<td>$216,641</td>
<td>$336,000</td>
<td>$416,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>$358,706</td>
<td>$565,003</td>
<td>$699,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitēmatā</td>
<td>$508,878</td>
<td>$1,008,133</td>
<td>$1,248,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>$580,834</td>
<td>$805,670</td>
<td>$997,496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment C: Fixed and variable costs distribution 50/50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of local board</th>
<th>Current funding 2016-17</th>
<th>Additional $6m Option 3a</th>
<th>Additional $10m Option 3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albert-Eden</td>
<td>$720,259</td>
<td>$932,621</td>
<td>$1,147,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport-Takapuna</td>
<td>$417,067</td>
<td>$717,591</td>
<td>$883,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>$471,158</td>
<td>$901,500</td>
<td>$1,075,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier</td>
<td>$105,370</td>
<td>$224,000</td>
<td>$277,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson-Massey</td>
<td>$810,647</td>
<td>$1,001,313</td>
<td>$1,229,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibiscus and Bays</td>
<td>$649,799</td>
<td>$913,007</td>
<td>$1,122,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howick</td>
<td>$944,450</td>
<td>$1,113,184</td>
<td>$1,371,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipātiki</td>
<td>$627,735</td>
<td>$863,985</td>
<td>$1,062,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māngere-Ōtāhuhu</td>
<td>$560,834</td>
<td>$827,659</td>
<td>$1,011,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa</td>
<td>$642,681</td>
<td>$879,294</td>
<td>$1,078,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki</td>
<td>$535,924</td>
<td>$812,212</td>
<td>$995,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōrakei</td>
<td>$595,708</td>
<td>$843,623</td>
<td>$1,040,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ōtara-Papatoetoe</td>
<td>$594,996</td>
<td>$854,332</td>
<td>$1,045,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papakura</td>
<td>$331,660</td>
<td>$698,308</td>
<td>$854,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketāpapa</td>
<td>$410,662</td>
<td>$729,517</td>
<td>$895,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>$399,986</td>
<td>$973,311</td>
<td>$1,131,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Harbour</td>
<td>$365,112</td>
<td>$732,300</td>
<td>$900,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiheke</td>
<td>$216,641</td>
<td>$448,000</td>
<td>$554,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitākere Ranges</td>
<td>$358,706</td>
<td>$714,259</td>
<td>$869,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitemata</td>
<td>$508,878</td>
<td>$930,042</td>
<td>$1,144,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whau</td>
<td>$580,834</td>
<td>$830,168</td>
<td>$1,018,748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>