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Feedback on:
Draft Auckland Plan Refresh 2050
9 May 2018

For clarifications and questions, please contact:
• Mary Hay, Senior Local Board Advisor - Puketāpapa Local Board

On 26 April 2018 the Puketapapa Local Board workshopped the feedback from the people of Puketapapa about the Auckland Plan Refresh 2018.

The board notes that all Outcome Areas are supported by the majority of Puketapapa submitters and has the following comments, for consideration by the Governing Body:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland Plan 2050</th>
<th>Summary of Puketapapa community feedback</th>
<th>Summary of Puketapapa Local Board feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome area 1:</td>
<td>Support: 33%</td>
<td>The board supports this Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging and</td>
<td>Do not support: 55%</td>
<td>FA1 Seek the inclusion of the concept of “learning”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation</td>
<td>Partially: 9%</td>
<td>FA2 - Support the inclusion of “soft infrastructure”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus area 1</td>
<td>Create safe opportunities for people to</td>
<td>FA4 - Support the concept of “Te Tiriti o Waitangi / the Treaty of Waitangi as the bi-cultural foundation for a multi-cultural Auckland”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meet, connect, participate in and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enjoy community and civic life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus area 2</td>
<td>Provide accessible services and social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>infrastructure that are responsive in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meeting people’s evolving needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus area 3</td>
<td>Support and work with communities to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>develop local leadership and the resilience to thrive in a changing world.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus area 4</td>
<td>Recognise Te Tiriti o Waitangi / the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treaty of Waitangi as the bi-cultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>foundation for a multi-cultural Auckland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus area 5</td>
<td>Recognise, value and celebrate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aucklanders’ differences as a strength.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus area 6</td>
<td>Focus investment to address disparities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and serve communities of greatest need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment A

#### Item 12

**Outcome area 2: Māori identity and wellbeing**

- **Support**: 26%
- **Do not support**: 17%
- **Partially**: 57%

**Focus area 1**
Meet the needs and support the aspirations of tamānaki and their whānau.

**Focus area 2**
Invest in marae to be self-sustaining and prosperous.

**Focus area 3**
Strengthen rangatahi leadership, education and employment outcomes.

**Focus area 4**
Grow Māori inter-generational wealth.

**Focus area 5**
Advance mana whenua as rangatira in leadership and decision-making and provide for customary rights.

**Focus area 6**
Celebrate Māori culture and support te reo Māori to flourish.

**Focus area 7**
Reflect mana whenua matua ranga and Māori design principles throughout Auckland.

- The board supports this Outcome

- **FA 4** - Support “Grow Māori inter-generational wealth.” but would like to see the inclusion of other cultures too

---

**Outcome area 3: Homes and places**

- **Support**: 39%
- **Do not support**: 15%
- **Partially**: 47%

**Focus area 1**
Accelerate quality development, at scale, that improves housing choices.

**Focus area 2**
Increase security of tenure and broaden the range of tenure models, particularly for those most in need.

**Focus area 3**
Improve the built quality of existing dwellings, particularly rental housing.

**Focus area 4**
Invest in and support Māori to meet their specific housing aspirations.

**Focus area 5**
Create urban spaces for the future, focusing investment in areas of highest population density and greatest need.

- The board supports this Outcome

- **FA 1** – Need to acknowledge that good transport planning is crucial to giving people housing choices, with the link between the cost of housing and the distance needed to travel for work/study.
  Dependency on private car for transport limits both transport and housing choices, and increases costs for many households.

- **FA 2** - Support “…broaden the range of tenure…” but additional wording needed to include “identification with neighbourhoods” to enable strong resilient connections.

- **FA 3**: need wording that addresses “healthy homes” specifically
### Outcome area 4: Transport and access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>Partially</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Focus area 1**
Make better use of existing transport networks, including a greater focus on influencing travel demand.

**Focus area 2**
Target new transport investment to the most significant challenges.

**Focus area 3**
Maximise the benefits from transport technology.

**Focus area 4**
Make walking, cycling and public transport preferred choices for many more Aucklanders.

**Focus area 5**
Better integrate land-use and transport decisions.

**Focus area 6**
Move to a safe transport network, free from death and serious injury.

**Focus area 7**
Develop a sustainable and resilient transport system.

- The board supports this Outcome.
- **FA 6** – amend to a “safe and shared transport network...” to reflect that every transport mode needs to share space e.g. cars and bikes; bikes and pedestrians; etc.

### Outcome area 5: Environment and cultural heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Do not support</th>
<th>Partially</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Focus area 1**
Encourage all Aucklanders to be stewards of the environment and to make sustainable choices.

**Focus area 2**
Focus on restoring environments as Auckland grows.

**Focus area 3**
Account for the past and future impacts of growth.

**Focus area 4**
Protect Auckland’s significant environments and cultural heritage from further loss.

**Focus area 5**
Adapt to a changing water future.

**Focus area 6**
Use green infrastructure to deliver greater resilience, long-term cost savings and quality environmental outcomes.

- Strong local support for this Outcome.
- The board seeks specific reference to climate change reduction.
- **FA1** – amend to “Encourage and incentivise all Aucklanders to be stewards...”
Attachment A

Item 12

Outcome area 6: Opportunity and prosperity

- Support: 56%
- Do not support: 12%
- Partially: 33%

Focus area 1
Harness emerging technologies and ensure equitable access to high quality digital data and services.

Focus area 2
Ensure regulatory, planning and other mechanisms support business, innovation and productivity growth.

Focus area 3
Advance Māori employment and support Māori business and iwi organisations to be significant drivers of Auckland’s economy.

Focus area 4
Leverage Auckland’s position to support growth in exports.

Focus area 5
Increase educational achievement, lifelong learning and training, with a focus on those most in need.

- The board supports this Outcome
- Want to see more focus at local level
- FA2: add word “investment”
- FA5: seek inclusion of the important contribution of “volunteering”

Outcome area 7: Development strategy

- Support: 37%
- Do not support: 52%
- Partially: 11%

Do you think the proposed approach for enabling growth will effectively provide for Auckland’s future?
The Auckland Plan proposes to manage long-term population growth by prioritising development in existing urban areas and establishing new communities and new business land in future urban areas.

- The board supports this Outcome but would like to see more priority given to local development, such as Spatial Priority Areas (the Inner-West Triangle)
Feedback on:
Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018

➢ To be presented to the Environment and Community Committee at its hearing on 3 May by David Holm (Puketāpapa Local Board member).

For clarifications and questions, please contact:
Mary Hay, Senior Local Board Advisor (Puketāpapa Local Board)

On 26 April 2018 the Puketapapa Local Board considered the feedback from the people of Puketapapa about the Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018.

The board would like to:

1. support the household food waste proposals coupled with the promotion of domestic composting. A ‘pay as you throw’ system is supported as long as there are protections against people using other people’s bins.

2. support the new household inorganic collection, which is an improvement in providing better sorting, ongoing jobs and fewer messy berms. However the uptake appears lower than the old system with many residents unaware that it is available. People need to be advised a couple of weeks before it comes to their street.

3. emphasise the need to reduce the waste from commercial and building sources and need for enforcement. Recent projects for Howick Local Board and the Manukau Harbour Forum on small building sites in Flatbush have revealed widespread disregard for the need to reduce waste to landfill and consequent risks of polluting local waterways and harbours.

The board would also like the Committee to consider what role kitchen sink waste disposal units play in dealing with food waste and advise whether these should be encouraged.

In addition to the comments above, the board provides feedback on each of the consultation questions in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation questions</th>
<th>Summary of Puketapapa community feedback</th>
<th>Summary of Puketapapa Local Board feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall views on Waste outcomes</td>
<td>The local feedback is consistent with the regional feedback</td>
<td>Supports:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Encouraging recycling at privately delivered events (e.g. the Easter Show) as a way of lowering waste to landfill across the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• improved education and support to households to reduce waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• the recently introduced inorganic collection system (but advocates for increased promotion of the service in order to curb illegal dumping)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notes a need for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• more accessible locations for the disposal of tyres; e-waste; batteries; mattresses; fluorescent lightbulbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• regular reminders to households of opportunities for recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• greater publicity of inorganic collection programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• a significant increase in the availability of public recycling bins alongside landfill ones, similar to those in Whitianga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Auckland Council is responsible for managing and minimising waste across the region. When we make decisions about waste, which outcomes are most important to you?</td>
<td>The three most important outcomes were:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions</td>
<td>• No additional comments from the board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reducing environmental and marine pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tidy public places</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q2. | In the last plan, we focused mostly on our services to households, which handle around 20 per cent of the waste that goes to landfill. Now we want to expand our waste minimisation efforts to include the 80 per cent of waste that comes from businesses and commercial activities. What do you think of this approach and why? | Strong support | • Stronger agreement at local level than regional – the local board strongly supports this.  
• There is a need for more than one drop-in centre on the isthmus.  
• Supports a focus on addressing the three priority commercial waste streams identified in the Waste Assessment (construction and demolition waste; organic waste; plastic waste).  
• Supports an increased levy on commercial waste.  
• Supports advocating to central government for a higher levy on commercial waste. |
| Q3. | The three largest categories of commercial waste going to landfill are construction and demolition waste, plastics, and organic waste (food, green and other types of organic waste). We want to work with businesses to try new approaches to reduce this waste. What do you think of this approach and why? | Strong support | • Stronger agreement at local level than regional – the local board strongly supports this.  
• Increased enforcement will be needed.  
• Support addressing waste generated from council and council controlled organisation’s operational activities, particularly construction and demolition waste.  
• Support a particular emphasis should be on education and enforcement in the construction industry. |
| Q4. | We want to make it easy for people to make better choices locally about how they dispose of unwanted items, so those items can be reused or recycled. Five Community Recycling Centres are up and running and we have plans to provide seven more by 2024. What do you think of this approach and why? | Strong support | • Ensure that community benefits are not going back into a big corporate.  
• Need more than one recycling centre on isthmus (Wai o rea coming on board). Local drop off depots are needed. |
Q5. We want to encourage central government to introduce product **stewardship** schemes. This includes a container deposit scheme where drink containers such as plastic, glass bottles and cans include a refundable deposit when returned for recycling. What do you think of this approach and why?

| Strong support | • Need to ensure that community deposit schemes continue to return deposits to the community  
|                | • Need to ensure that the recycling technology used results in overall benefit to the environment (avoiding unintended consequences, such as increased energy use for cleaning bottles)  
|                | • Supports advocating to central government for product stewardship, particularly to achieve major reductions in the use of plastic shopping bags |

Q6. The Hauraki Gulf Islands have unique waste management and minimisation requirements. What do you think about the approach outlined in this plan and why?

| Local submissions reflect regional picture | • No additional comments from the board |


Feedback on:
Draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan, draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal and draft Contributions Policy

10 May 2018

For clarifications and questions, please contact:
Mary Hay, Senior Local Board Advisor (Puketapapa Local Board)

a) Draft 2018-2028 Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP)

The Puketapapa Local Board provides feedback on the RLTP in the table below. However, it would like to highlight the importance of the four issues below:

1. Light rail
   - Compared with other local board areas, Puketapapa has received limited capital investment in public transport. Improvements are limited to double decker buses and bus priority routes. This highlights the importance of a light rail transport option
   - Construction of light rail will need to include an effective communication strategy for business to ensure that disruption is kept to a minimum. The board cites the successful retail strategy adopted with the City Rail Link project

2. Coordination with HNZ/HLC
   - Housing NZ/HLC are undertaking significant redevelopment of its housing stock in Puketapapa, particularly in the Mt Roskill area. There will need to be appropriate transport infrastructure to support this.
   - Collaborating with HNZ/HLC will assist with leveraging resources from a variety of sources and therefore contribute to positive outcomes.

3. Increased funding for footpaths
   - There has been limited investment in footpaths in Puketapapa. Auckland Transport has advised that they do not prioritise these because they do not attract a subsidy.
   - There will be increasing competition for space on footpaths with the growing number of seniors, increasing cyclists/walkers and increasing number of waste collection bins. This is raising safety concerns regarding potential conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists.

4. Park and Ride
   - The board is seeking an assessment of the land on the corner of Denbeigh Avenue and Dominion Road for a Park and Ride facility. If this is not suitable then other park and ride options need to be found. The local board is willing to contemplate park and ride users being charged for this service, as long as it’s affordable and encourages people to use the service.
### Support

The board supports the following proposals in the draft 2018-2028 RLTP:

- Focusing on increasing safety and lowering deaths and serious injuries on the transport network
- Improving cycle and walking networks to encourage active transport
- Bus priority improvements in order to improve public transport, increase productivity and lower the environmental impact of transport
- NZTA Investment Programme: Light Rail from the city to the airport and the Manukau Harbour Crossing (Walking and Cycling)
- KiwiRail Capital Programme: The upgrade of Onehunga Rail Line to accommodate higher frequency service.

Note: the board is strongly in support of a Regional Fuel Tax and an increase in the Local Board Transport Capital Fund and provision of a fund for transport feasibility studies.

### Seeks plan amendments

The board also advocates for the following improvements to the draft RLTP:

- Funding the Housing NZ Projects – Transport infrastructure improvements to support Housing New Zealand / HLC development at Mount Roskill
- Increased promotion of the benefits of light rail to both the community along the corridor, including present users of buses, as well as to the wider region. Answers to the Frequently Asked Questions about the project should be highlighted.
- The local board seeks access to relevant (area specific) data from outcomes measured. (See draft RLTP, 07 - Measuring outcomes)
- Subsidies from the New Zealand Transport Agency to include footpath work
- Park and ride facilities within Puketapapa and the consideration of user payment for this offering
- Funding village upgrades if not included in NZTA Rapid Transit/Light Rail projects
- Investigating bikes on buses (and light rail) in order to encourage active transport and the integration of networks
- Investigating the relocation of piers along the Walkowhal coast as well as the consideration of tolling in any East West Link developments
- A emphasis on the Manukau Harbour within the Environmental sustainability infrastructure project
- A thorough investigation of ferries in the Manukau Harbour as part of the Future Ferry Strategy for Auckland
- Funding for the SH20 / Queenstown Road / Hendry Avenue project within the NZTA Investment Programme.
b) Draft Regional Fuel Tax proposal

- The Regional Fuel tax proposal

c) Draft Contributions Policy 2018

- The board supports the draft Contributions Policy 2018