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1 Welcome

2 Apologies

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

3 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.

4 Confirmation of Minutes

The Rodney Local Board will confirm the minutes of the 17 May 2018 business meeting at the meeting on 21 June 2018.

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 Petitions

At the close of the agenda no requests to present petitions had been received.

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 Rodney 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. To decide on the proposal for a Rodney Local Board Transport Targeted Rate (RLBTTR) to support additional transport investment in the Rodney Local Board area.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. To accelerate improvement in the transport services in the Rodney Local Board area a targeted rate of $150 per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit (SUIP) was proposed to raise $41 million over ten years. This was consulted on as part of the draft 10 Year Budget 2018-2028.

3. Forty three per cent of respondents were opposed to the proposal with 36 per cent in support. Twenty one per cent of respondents indicated partial support for the proposal.

4. The original proposal was based on accelerating investment in transport improvements in the Rodney Local board area. The base transport program for the area in the draft Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP), including projects funded by the proposed Regional Fuel Tax (RFT), has expanded considerably and now includes additional investment over ten years in road sealing, public transport service enhancements and footpaths.

5. Given the changes to the base case, officers have developed an alternative proposal for consideration. This would invest $46 million in bus services, Park-N-Rides and footpaths funded by a targeted rate of $150 per SUIP raising $4.0 million in 2018/2019 ($46 million over 10 years).

6. The proposal also includes a conservative estimate of possible NZTA funding. If this funding eventuates the proposal makes provision for an additional bus service starting in the 2019/2020 year.

7. The proposal includes capital expenditure so will require Governing Body's approval for taking on additional debt. To ensure any possibility of future NZTA funding for the projects they will need to be included in the RLTP by Auckland Transport.

8. The projects in this option have changed from the original proposal. The benefits are still distributed widely across the local board area although the form of the benefits has changed with seal extensions now funded from within the RLTP. The Rodney Local Board will need to consider this option and the original proposal the context of the statutory criteria discussed in the report and in particular the:

- nature of the additional benefits to the Rodney area of the original proposal and alternative option in excess of the transport investment proposed in the RLTP (including projects funded by the RFT)

- distribution of the benefits between ratepayers in the area

- overall impact of the proposed rate on the community.

---

1 A SUIP separately identifies for rating purposes both a granny flat and the main house and each shop in a shopping mall.

2 Uninflated. Equivalent to $46 million inflated.
Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Rodney Local Board:

a) recommend that the Governing Body either:
   i) does not adopt the proposed Rodney Local Board Transport targeted rate.
   ii) adopt the Rodney Local Board Transport targeted rate as proposed in the draft 10-Year Budget 2018-2028 if the Regional Land Transport Plan and Regional Fuel Tax are adopted but does not include the investments in the Rodney Local Board area noted in this report.
   iii) adopt an alternative Rodney Local Board Transport targeted rate of $150 per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit within the Rodney Local Board area, to fund $46 million of transport improvements in the Rodney Local Board area as set out in this report over the next ten years noting the additional debt impact subject to the adoption of a Regional Land Transport Plan and Regional Fuel Tax that includes the investments in the Rodney Local Board area noted in this report.

b) request that if recommendation a) ii) or iii) above are adopted that Auckland Transport includes the projects to be funded by the targeted rate in the Regional Land Transport Plan.

Horopaki / Context

Rodney Local Board area transport investment program in draft RLTP

9. The draft capital programme set out in the RLTP (including projects funded by the RFT) includes the following projects in the Rodney local board area:
   - seal extension programme, $121 million (being current plans $12 million, RFT $24 million and RLTP $85 million) – nearly all of which is for Rodney based on current prioritisation
   - Supporting Growth projects in Warkworth, including the Matakana Link Road
   - Warkworth temporary park and ride facility (utilising existing parking area)
   - additional footpath investment from regional allocation in RLTP of $45 million.

10. The RLTP and RFT are presently being consulted on. The Governing Body will make budget decisions at its meeting on 31 May 2018.

Rodney Local Board Plan and Proposed targeted rate

11. The Rodney Local Board consulted on investigating a targeted rate to fund transport improvements, as part of its local board plan. The Consultation Document for the 10 Year Budget 2018-2028 proposed a targeted rate of $150 per SUIP to raise $41 million over ten years to fund the transport service improvements.

12. The proposed service improvements are set out in the table below, for full details see Option Three in Attachment B: Transport investment options for Rodney Local Board that was in the December report to the Rodney Local Board entitled Rodney Local Board transport targeted rate. For full details refer to Attachment D, the original report and proposal from the Rodney Local Board business meeting of 5 December 2017.

---

3 Uninflated. Equivalent to $46 million inflated.
Table 1: Proposed projects, costs and delivery timeframes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>10 year OPEX</th>
<th>10 year CAPEX</th>
<th>10 year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Huapai to Westgate</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery from 2019 calendar year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Riverhead to Westgate</td>
<td>5,270,416</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>5,470,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery from 2019 calendar year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warkworth Park and Ride - 2018/19 – 2020/21</td>
<td>285,208</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>395,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huapai Park and Ride – dependant on investigation</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed seal extension programme – delivery over 10 year period</td>
<td>1,100,658</td>
<td>12,448,272</td>
<td>13,548,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed footpath programme - delivery over 10 year period</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>14,925,826</td>
<td>14,955,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,986,282</td>
<td>31,684,098</td>
<td>40,670,380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statutory decision making criteria

13. The council (Governing Body and local boards) are required to consider and consult on any changes to funding for services. The sources of funding for the proposed transport improvements in the Rodney Local Board area must be considered against the statutory criteria in section 101(3) of the Local Government Act 2002. The key elements of this assessment are set out in the options below. A full analysis against the statutory criteria is set out in Attachment A: Assessment against statutory criteria.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Feedback

14. A total of 1,452 responses were received (including 1,376 in writing, email or online) on the proposed targeted rate from the Rodney Local Board area. The graph below gives an overview of the responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted Rate</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media (AC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>522</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Of the 1,452 total submissions, 1,254 came from residents living in Rodney (including 1,178 in writing, email or online). The table below shows the breakdown of just these responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted Rate</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media (AC)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>440</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The costs are net of fare revenue which is not expected to be material. All costs are indicative and are subjected to further review. Delivery will be phased over time to align with revenue generated from targeted rate.
16. Forty-three per cent of respondents did not support the proposal with 36 per cent in support. However, 21 per cent of submitters partially support the proposal (which would bring the combination of support/partially support to 57 per cent).

17. The comments provided by those that gave partial support shows varying degrees of support for the proposal, ranging from those that support the proposal in principle, but not the individual projects or the specific amount ($150); those that want assurances that the rate would be spent in Rodney; and, those that are sceptical that the rate will be collected and spent correctly at all. A notable number qualified their support stating that they could not support the proposal if the regional fuel tax was also implemented.

18. Submissions that did not support the targeted rate commonly cited that rates are already too high; that they object to paying for services other parts of Auckland get from general taxation; or, that they did not know what the projects proposed were/the proposed projects had no value for them.

Response to feedback

19. The targeted rate is legally required to be spent on transport projects in the Rodney Local Board area. The council will maintain a reserve account for the funding and record expenses against that account as they are incurred on the projects by Auckland Transport.

20. The average impact of the rate in conjunction with the proposed regional fuel tax is estimated to be between $270 and $290 per year or $5 to $6 per week. This is the sum of the rate of $150 and the fuel tax on a vehicle of average fuel consumption travelling 15,000km per year ($120 to $140 per year). The cost will vary depending on the number of vehicles a household operates, fuel consumption and mileage and whether the residents are owner occupiers or renters.

Alternative option

21. The base transport investment in the Rodney Local Board area in the RLTP (including RFT funded projects) is substantially increased from that on which the original proposal is made. The detailed program is set out in Attachment B: Transport investment options for Rodney Local Board. Given these changes the board may wish to consider an alternative funding package that reflects these changes.

22. Officers have developed the following package based on an indication of preferences from the board. This replaces seal investment with a range of bus services and adding the RLTP funded temporary Park-N-Ride proposal for Warkworth. The projects are:

- additional buses on 122 service from Huapai/Kumeu to Westgate ($230K per annum)
- new bus service from Riverhead to Westgate ($547K per annum)
- new bus service from Wellsford to Warkworth $525K per annum)
- new bus service from Helensville to Silverdale ($695K per annum)
  (from 2019/2020 depending on overall NZTA subsidy success)
- new bus service from Huapai to Albany ($670K per annum)
- 120 space Park-N-Ride in Warkworth ($1.485m)
- Huapai/Kumeu Park-N-Ride ($4.0m including land purchase)
- approximately 30 new footpaths ($15m).

23. The bus services proposed will be reviewed annually to determine whether or not their use justifies them being:

- taken over and fully funded by AT
- continued under RLBTTR funding
- discontinued.

24. The Rodney Local Board will monitor the performance of the projects and determine whether to reprioritise its expenditure. A material change to spending priorities may require further

---

5 The costs are net of fare revenue which is not expected to be material. All costs are indicative and are subjected to further review.
appropriate consultation. Officers note that rates must be reset each year as part of the annual or long-term plan process.

25. To fund the proposed expenditure would require a rate set per SUIP of $150 year to raise $4.0 million in 2018/2019. The proposed rate is set conservatively given the uncertainty around the project costs. Financial modelling envisages the rate increasing at 2 per cent per annum. However, the key determinant of future rates levels will be the actual project costs, the success of any applications for NZTA funding and subsequent community consultation and local board decisions.

**Distribution of benefits**

26. The projects are spread broadly over the Rodney area but the cost of investment varies by subdivision, see table below. The table doesn’t include the costs of the Helensville to Silverdale service proposed for 2019/2020 which would add to the benefits for Kumeu and Dairy Flat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Rodney</th>
<th>Kumeu</th>
<th>Wellsford</th>
<th>Warkworth</th>
<th>Dairy Flat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of SUIPs</td>
<td>30,798</td>
<td>12,280</td>
<td>3,185</td>
<td>12,673</td>
<td>2,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annualised expenditure</td>
<td>$3,932,108</td>
<td>$2,184,827</td>
<td>$516,560</td>
<td>$938,858</td>
<td>$291,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment per SUIP</td>
<td>$147</td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>$187</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: It is proposed to set the rate at $150 given the uncertainty around the project costs as noted above:*

27. The nature of projects proposed has been structured to deliver a reasonable distribution of investment and benefit across the Rodney Local Board area. The costs vary across the region resulting in a variation in investment value in different sub-regions but provide similar levels of benefit relative to population. The subdivisions are established for electoral purposes but don’t align with the likely distribution of transport benefits.

28. The costs of providing some projects, park and rides, (Warkworth $1.2 million and Huapai $4 million), varies widely whereas the benefits are similar. Accordingly sharing the costs across the Rodney area is justified on a benefits basis for these projects.

**NZTA funding**

29. The Government Policy Statement released on 4 April indicates a change in priority for NZTA funding which would make the proposed projects more likely to qualify for a subsidy. A comprehensive business case is required to support applications for NZTA funding. Fifty one per cent of a qualifying project may be funded by NZTA. It is not clear whether these projects would meet the criteria at this time given their relative priority in the RLTP.

30. Given the above a conservative approach has been taken to budgeting for NZTA potential subsidies. Officers propose adding an additional bus service to the project list rather than reducing the targeted rate requirement by 51 per cent. The service would be planned to begin in the 2019/2020 year if applications for NZTA funding are successful for some or all of the other projects. This is roughly equivalent to achieving an overall NZTA funding of 20 per cent. If a higher level of funding is achieved the local board can decide whether to fund additional projects, bring some of projects forward or reduce the rates requirement.

31. To ensure these projects are eligible for subsidies in future they need to be included in the RLTP. Officers recommend that the Rodney Local Board ask AT to include them in the RLTP.

**Funding options**

32. A fixed rate per SUIP is proposed as the basis for the rate. The projects in both the original proposal and alternative option are spread over the entire Rodney Local Board area.
Item 12

(distribution of benefits is less on a project cost basis in Warkworth) providing benefits to all residents and properties in the form of:

a) improved personal transport choices and outcomes (bus services, new footpaths and Park and Ride facilities)

b) improved residential amenity (additional new footpaths).

33. Given the nature of the benefits:

- business owners and farms will benefit at a similar level to residential properties rather than in proportion to their scale of activity or capital value

- residential properties of differing capital value will benefit similarly.

34. As the direct transport benefit to all properties is relatively similar a rate set as a fixed charge per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit (SUIP) is appropriate on the basis of distribution of benefits.

35. As there is a strong relationship between capital value and income, a rate applied on capital value would place more charge on those potentially better able to afford it. A rate applied on capital value would also increase the share paid by business and farm/lifestyle properties as they tend to have higher property values. Business and farm properties can claim back GST and expense rate for tax purposes.

36. A full analysis of alternatives to the form of the rate, including general rates funding, were discussed in officers’ advice in December and is set out in Attachment A: Assessment against statutory criteria.

Overall impact

37. The cost of the proposed and alternative rates are $150 per annum ($2.90 per week). Those ratepayers with affordability issues can access the council’s rates postponement scheme or apply for the rates rebate which the council administers on behalf of the Department of Internal Affairs. Whilst business properties and more remote farms will benefit less than residential properties they can expense rates and claim back GST which means the net cost to them will be $93.90 per year $1.75 per week).

38. For residential ratepayers the cost of a targeted rate adopted in conjunction with the RFT is discussed in paragraph 20 above.

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

39. The Governing Body has decision making authority for setting rates. The Rodney Local Board will communicate their views on this proposal to the Governing Body if they wish to proceed. No other local board provided comment in their feedback on the draft 10-Year Budget.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

40. The council does not hold information on the ethnicity of ratepayers so is not able to identify the exact impact of policy changes on Māori. The impact of the policy options on Māori will be similar to that on other residents in Rodney.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

41. The capital expenditure proposed as part of either the original proposal or alternative option will require additional borrowing of $5.65 million. As the council is operating at close to its borrowing limits the Governing Body’s approval will be required.
Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
42. There is a risk that individual projects proposed may cost more than the estimates in the report. This will be managed by Auckland Transport providing updated advice to the local board before commitments are entered into.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
43. If the rate is adopted by the Governing Body the next steps will be:
   - Auckland Transport to set in place plans to deliver the projects
   - Auckland Transport to establish reporting regime for Rodney Local Board
   - establishment of a targeted rate reserve account.
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Attachment A: Assessment against statutory criteria

1. When deciding from what sources to meet its funding needs, council must consider the matters set out in section 101(3) of the Local Government Act 2002, see below. This involves elected members exercising their political judgement and considering the proposal in the context of council’s funding decisions as a whole.

101(3) The funding needs of the local authority must be met from those sources that the local authority determines to be appropriate, following consideration of,—

(a) in relation to each activity to be funded,—

(i) the community outcomes to which the activity primarily contributes; and

(ii) the distribution of benefits between the community as a whole, any identifiable part of the community, and individuals; and

(iii) the period in or over which those benefits are expected to occur; and

(iv) the extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity; and

(v) the costs and benefits, including consequences for transparency and accountability, of funding the activity distinctly from other activities; and

(b) the overall impact of any allocation of liability for revenue needs on the community.

The following section considers the funding the alternative proposal for additional transport investment in the Rodney Local Board area against the criteria in section 101(3) of the Local Government Act 2002. Given the uncertainty around NZTA funding this isn’t incorporated in the analysis below.

As this proposal is similar in many respects to the original the analysis is also similar. An assessment of the original proposal was set out in Attachment A: Assessment against the statutory criteria to the report entitled Rodney Local Board transport targeted rate considered at the Rodney Local Board meeting on 5 December 2017.

The community outcomes to which the activity primarily contributes

The community outcomes to which the activity (transport) primarily contributes are set out in the LTP 2015-2015 as:

1. A fair, safe and healthy Auckland – By promoting walking to increase levels of physical fitness

2. An Auckland of prosperity and opportunity – Through moving people and resources efficiently which has a positive impact on productivity

3. A green Auckland – By reducing our reliance on petrol, air pollution and green-house gas emissions

4. A well connected and accessible Auckland – Providing Auckland with an efficient land transport system that encourages increased patronage of bus, rail and ferry services

5. A beautiful Auckland loved by its people – Fundamentally changing parts of our urban built environment
The transport investments proposed to be funded support these outcomes as noted in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/service</th>
<th>Community outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Huapai to Westgate</td>
<td>2,3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Riverhead to Westgate</td>
<td>2,3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Wellsford to Warkworth</td>
<td>2,3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Hielessville to Silverdale</td>
<td>2,3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Huapai to Albany</td>
<td>2,3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warkworth Park and Ride</td>
<td>2,3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huapai Park and Ride (investigation)</td>
<td>2,3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New footpaths</td>
<td>1 and 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While all the projects connect to wider outcomes for the region their impact is small in a broader sense. The projects are either not included in the RLTP or bring forward work not presently scheduled for many years. Given these factors a targeted rate in the Rodney Local Board area is the most appropriate source of funding to supplement user charge revenue from the services.

The distribution of benefits between the community as a whole; any identifiable part of the community; and individuals

Where the services benefit direct users they should be funded from fares. Fares will be set at a level that does not discourage use thereby eliminating the other benefits of provision of the service. Revenue from fares that balance these factors will not be material. As a result targeted rates revenue will be required to make-up the shortfall.

The investments proposed are spread over the entire Rodney Local Board area. However, the nature of the benefits differs for each project in terms of service improvement and location. The nature of benefits is a key element in determining the appropriate funding source. The benefits of each project are described in the table below in terms of their distribution across potential beneficiaries differentiated geographically, by land use and direct use of the service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/service</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Huapai to Westgate</td>
<td>Users, Residential properties within 500m of the bus stops/route and in particular properties in Huapai and Westgate would benefit from alternative transport options to the city and other destinations to the south. Drivers along the route may also benefit from possible localised decongestion benefits No direct benefits to business properties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Bus service from Riverhead to Westgate                | Users, Residential properties within 500m of the bus stops/route and in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/service</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Wellsford to</td>
<td>Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warkworth</td>
<td>This service will benefit residents living in close proximity to the proposed route, providing an alternative mode of transport and possible localised decongestion benefits. This would primarily be of benefit to Wellsford residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Helensville to</td>
<td>User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverdale</td>
<td>This service will benefit residents living in close proximity to the proposed route, providing an alternative mode of transport and possible localised decongestion benefits. This includes Helensville, Kaukapakapa and Waitoki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Huapai to Albany</td>
<td>User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This service will benefit residents living in close proximity to the proposed route, providing an alternative mode of transport and possible localised decongestion benefits. This includes Huapai, Riverhead, and Coatesville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workworth Park and Ride</td>
<td>Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential properties in a wide catchment area around Warkworth would benefit from alternative transport options to the city and other destinations to the south. Drivers along the route may also benefit from possible localised decongestion benefits. Some benefits to business in freeing up parking spaces for retail visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huapai Park and Ride</td>
<td>Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential properties in a wide catchment area around Huapai would benefit from alternative transport options to the city and other destinations to the south. Drivers along the route may also benefit from possible localised decongestion benefits. No direct benefits to business properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New footpaths</td>
<td>Individual projects mainly benefit residents in the local area. The wider community benefits from enhanced localised amenity and promoting walking and cycling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targeted rates can be set in to cover the entire Rodney area or geographical subsets which benefit the most from the proposed service improvements.

The cost of investment differs by electoral subdivision, see table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Rodney</th>
<th>Kumeu</th>
<th>Wellsford</th>
<th>Warkworth</th>
<th>Dairy Flat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of SUlPs</td>
<td>30,798</td>
<td>12,280</td>
<td>3,165</td>
<td>12,673</td>
<td>2,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annualised expenditure</td>
<td>$3,932,108</td>
<td>$2,184,827</td>
<td>$516,560</td>
<td>$938,858</td>
<td>$291,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment per SUlP</td>
<td>$147</td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>$187</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: It is proposed to set the rate at $150 given the uncertainty around the project costs as noted in the report.

Electoral subdivisions are not set to define geographic areas of benefit for transport planning purposes. The projects proposed are spread broadly over the Rodney area although the project list has less apparent direct benefit to Warkworth. The board could address this by
adjusting the timing or content of the footpath programme during implementation when further information on costs is available.

The cost of providing the benefits differs in different parts of the region, in particular for the Warkworth, $1.2 million and Huapai, $4 million, park and rides. While the cost estimates differ between the areas the benefits will be similar in nature and therefore it is reasonable to set the rate based on benefit rather than cost distribution.

For the above reasons it is appropriate to set a uniform targeted rate across the entire local board area.

A targeted rate can also be set differentially to recover more of the cost from land uses that will benefit more from the services. The primary beneficiaries of the investments proposed are residential properties. The benefits arise from improved choice and utility for personal transport and improved residential amenity. There is therefore no case based on benefit distribution for differentiation to allocate more of the rates burden to business or farm properties.

The rates burden can be allocated on a fixed charge per SUIP or based on capital value. As there is a correlation between income and property value a capital value rate. As there is a strong relationship between capital value and income a rate applied on capital value would place more the charge on those potentially better able to afford it. Capital value rating would allocate more of the rates burden to business and farm properties. This isn’t justified on the basis of the distribution of benefits noted above. The use of capital value would allocate more of the burden to higher value properties and less to lower value. Property owners will benefit in terms of the improved amenity and options for personal transport. They will also benefit from improvements in property value arising from these benefits. Higher capital value properties may benefit more from the latter affect.

The period in or over which the benefits are expected to occur

The benefits associated with additional operating expenditure should be met by users and targeted or general rates recovering costs from the beneficiaries as they are realised.

The assets to be built with additional funding will deliver benefits over their lifetime. It would therefore be more desirable to meet the capital costs from borrowing thus spreading them over the beneficiaries over the life of the assets. However, given constraints on council borrowing it is appropriate to fund some of the upfront investment from general or targeted rates in order to realise the benefits.

The extent to which the actions or inactions of particular individuals or as a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity

None of the additional services or investments are driven by a response to the actions or inactions of particular individuals or groups.

The costs and benefits, including consequences for transparency and accountability, of funding the activity distinctly from other activities

Funding these projects from a targeted rate will improve the transparency of decision making on additional funding. Ratepayers will be able to clearly see exactly how any additional funding they provide will be used. This will make it easier for them to express a preference
on increased funding. A fixed rate per SUIP will make it easier to communicate to the community the cost of the service improvements relative to their benefits.

The use of a targeted rate will also improve accountability for expenditure. If a decision is made to raise additional funding by use of a targeted rate then ratepayers can be confident it will be used for that purpose. Targeted rates can only be spent on the activity for which they are raised.

Overall accountability will not be impacted as the form of funding will not influence ratepayers’ ability to hold the council to account for the effectiveness of this expenditure given the technical expertise required to make such an assessment.

It is administratively straightforward to implement a targeted rate in the manner proposed.

**Consideration of overall impact**

Having considered the above criteria, the council needs to consider the proposal in terms of the overall impact on the community. This involves elected members exercising their judgement and considering the proposal in the context of council’s funding decisions as a whole, not just in relation to this activity.

The total cost of a targeted rate applied over the Rodney Local Board area on a per SUIP basis is $1.50 for the alternative proposal or $2.90 per week. This is unlikely to materially impact on overall affordability for ratepayers.

For those residential ratepayers for whom it may be an issue the council offers rates postponement and administers the rates rebate scheme on behalf of the Department of Internal Affairs.

Higher capital value properties and business properties will in general be better able to manage increases in rates and accordingly consideration may be given to applying the rate on capital value or differentiating the rate between business and non-business properties. There is a correlation between capital value and income for residential properties with the average household income being higher in areas with higher capital value. Business properties can expense rates and claim back GST.
Attachment B: Alternative transport investment option for Rodney Local Board

This attachment outlines the projects that would be funded under the alternative investment option for transport improvements for Rodney Local Board. Note that all costs are indicative only and are subjected to change without notice. The programme will continue to be updated as new information becomes available. The base level of investment in the Rodney Local Board area can be established from the draft Regional Land Transport Plan. The investments included in the original proposal are set in Attachment B: Transport investment options for Rodney Local Board included in the report entitled Rodney Local Board transport targeted rate considered at the board’s 5 December 2017 meeting. The costs are net of fare revenue which is not expected to be material. All costs are indicative and are subjected to further review.

Bus service from Huapai to Westgate

Scope: Additional buses to run 122 service in the peak could enhance overall attractiveness to public transport in the Tapu Road/Matua Road catchment area. Under the new network, there is already a 122 service between Tapu Road/Matua Road to Westgate. This proposal is to introduce additional buses in the peak to increase frequency. Terminating at Westgate opens up the option of connecting to 110 service from Westgate to the City Centre and connecting to 120 services to Constellation Station. When inter-timed with 125x service, there would be a service approximately every 15 minutes on the main road in the peak. This service seeks to support forecast growth in North West Auckland. Approximately 30,000 house and 13,000 new jobs are anticipated in the area over 30 years.

Estimated costs: Estimated project cost for 4 trips in the peak direction at peak times would cost around $230,000 p.a.

As per RLTP: AT does not have plans to increase/introduce additional buses to the 122 service.

Beneficiaries: This service will benefit residents living in close proximity to the proposed route, providing an alternative mode of transport and possible localised congestion benefits. This includes Riverhead and Westgate. This is depicted in appendix A, figure 3.

Rationale for Beneficiaries: Beneficiary (bus service catchment area) assumptions for this route were made on allowing 500m catchment of proposed bus stops, but up to 1000m can be considered within the catchment of a stop depending on the situation. In the case of projects proposed by Rodney Local Board, none of the settlements are that big, so they could all realistically be said to benefit. Location of proposed bus stops were based on their placement at key intersections and existing locations.

Bus service from Riverhead to Westgate

Scope: Riverhead to Westgate would connect to the wider AT Metro network. This would enable connections to more destinations, including 110 services direct to the City Centre, as well as 120 to Constellation Station. The service would operate 30 minutes at peak, and hourly at other times 7 days a week. This service seeks to support forecast growth in North West Auckland. Approximately 30,000 house and 13,000 new jobs are anticipated in the area over 30 years.

Estimated costs: Estimated project cost for 4 trips in the peak direction at peak times, and hourly services at all other times would cost around $520,000 p.a. Whilst a comprehensive review of any current bus stop facilities and requirements for new bus stops and shelters has not been undertaken, AT envisage that a further 5 pairs of bus stops, with shelters on the inbound bus stops, might be required to support this service. This would be a one-off capital cost of $200,000 – based on $40,000 per stop pairing. This is depicted in appendix A, figure 4.

As per RLTP: AT has plans to introduce this service but this wouldn't be before the 2020/21 financial year.
**Beneficiaries:** This service will benefit residents living in close proximity to the proposed route, providing an alternative mode of transport and possible localised decongestion benefits. This includes Riverhead and Westgate. This is depicted in appendix A, figure 4.

**Bus service from Wellsford to Warkworth**

**Scope:** Wellsford to Warkworth would connect to the wider AT Metro network. This would enable connections to more destinations. The service would operate hourly 7am to 7pm, 7 days a week. With additional 7.30 and 8.30am services to Warkworth on weekdays and additional 5.30 and 5.30pm services to Wellsford on weekdays.

**Estimated costs:** Estimated project cost for hourly services 7am to 7pm, 7 days per week, plus additional half hourly services, would cost around $520,000 pa. Whilst a comprehensive review of any current bus stop facilities and requirements for new bus stops and shelters has not been undertaken, AT envisage that additional bus stops, with shelters on some of these, would be required to support this service. This would be a one-off capital cost of $50,000.

**As per RLTP:** AT has no current plans to introduce a service such as this.

**Beneficiaries:** This service will benefit residents living in close proximity to the proposed route, providing an alternative mode of transport and possible localised decongestion benefits. This would primarily be of benefit to Wellsford residents.

**Bus service from Helensville to Silverdale (Hibiscus Coast Bus Station)**

**Scope:** Helensville to Hibiscus Coast Bus Station would connect to the wider AT Metro network. This would enable connections to more destinations, including 110 services direct to the City Centre, as well as 120 to Constellation Station. The service would operate hourly 7am to 7pm, 7 days a week. This service seeks to provide connections from the Northwest to the high frequency Northern Express.

**Estimated costs:** Estimated project cost for hourly services 7am to 7pm, 7 days per week would cost around $750,000 pa. Whilst a comprehensive review of any current bus stop facilities and requirements for new bus stops and shelters has not been undertaken, AT envisage that additional bus stops, with shelters on some of these, would be required to support this service. This would be a one-off capital cost of $200,000 – based on $40,000 per stop pairing.

**As per RLTP:** AT has no current plans to introduce a service such as this.

**Beneficiaries:** This service will benefit residents living in close proximity to the proposed route, providing an alternative mode of transport and possible localised decongestion benefits. This includes Helensville, Kaukapakapa and Waitoki.

**Bus service from Huapai to Albany (Albany Bus Station)**

**Scope:** Huapai to Albany Bus Station would connect to the wider AT Metro network. This would enable connections to more destinations, including services direct to the City Centre. The service would operate hourly 7am to 7pm, 7 days a week. This service seeks to provide connections from the Northwest to the high frequency Northern Express.

**Estimated costs:** Estimated project cost for hourly services 7am to 7pm, 7 days per week would cost around $715,000 pa. Whilst a comprehensive review of any current bus stop facilities and requirements for new bus stops and shelters has not been undertaken, AT envisage that additional bus stops, with shelters on some of these, would be required to support this service. This would be a one-off capital cost of $200,000 – based on $40,000 per stop pairing.

**As per RLTP:** AT has no current plans to introduce a service such as this.
**Beneficiaries:** This service will benefit residents living in close proximity to the proposed route, providing an alternative mode of transport and possible localised decongestion benefits. This includes Huapai, Riverhead, and Coatesville.

**Warkworth Park and Ride**

**Scope:** The local board considers that a park and ride facility at the old Atlas site would be relatively easy to implement, provided a lease/licence arrangement could be established, subject to further investigation.

**Estimated costs:** Capital cost for 120 spaces at an estimate of $10,000 per space equals $1.2 million.

**As per RLTP:** This project has been considered in the draft RLTP and is not planned to be delivered within the 2018-2028 period. Opex cost of $285,000 over 10 years.

**Beneficiaries:** Warkworth Park and Ride would provide a wide catchment. The Park and Ride would provide an alternative mode of transport the Warkworth area and possible localised decongestion benefits.

**Rationale for Beneficiaries:** Based on the survey data from FLOW. Passenger origin data from Albany saw people travelling from Snells beach, Waiuku, Helensville, Arkles Bay, and Warkworth. This confirms the fact that stations/terminals which are most distant from the city centre attracts wide catchments. It is plausible to assume Warkworth Park and ride could attract a wide catchment north and north east of Warkworth.

**Huapai Park and Ride investigation**

**Scope:** AT investigated the possibility of accelerating a Huapai Park and Ride facility. This project seeks to support forecast growth in North West Auckland. Approximately 30,000 house and 13,000 new jobs are anticipated in the area over 30 years.

AT have undertaken rapid investigation of a number of options:

- A Park and Ride facility on 391 and 393 Main Road has been considered. However, AT understands as part of safety improvements along State Highway 16, the Transport Agency (NZTA) are planning on placing a median “barrier” along SH16 opposite and to either side of this land which will prevent right hand turns out on to SH16 from that land. Access to that land from the realignment of Station Road is being investigated however AT traffic engineers advise that right hand turns into that area of land by vehicles travelling south from the Tapu Rd \ Station Rd intersection should be kept to a minimum as this may create localised congestion in a residential zone.

- Kumeu showgrounds could be established as a Park and Ride. The land is privately owned and current estimates for a lease land arrangement would be in the order of $40,000 p.a.

The advice from AT Strategy is that a Huapai park and ride facility was not planned for another decade. However, a programme business case on the park and ride programme is underway, which will look at appropriate locations regionally, including the Huapai/Kumeu area. AC has strongly recommended AT to include Huapai Park and Ride into the draft revised proposal.

**Estimated costs:** An indicative amount of $4 million dollars, intended to represent the cost of a small park and ride (50 spaces, including land purchase) has been included. The completion of the programme business case will inform the decision on whether a park and ride is sensible in the Huapai/Kumeu area.

**As per RLTP:** This project has not been considered in the draft RLTP, as it is planned in the 2nd decade.

**Beneficiaries:** Huapai Park and Ride would provide a wide catchment, as depicted in appendix A, figure 1. The Park and Ride would provide an alternative mode of transport the Huapai area and possible localised decongestion benefits.

**Rationale for Beneficiaries:** Flow transportation specialist (FLOW) was commissioned by Auckland Transport to undertake a survey of public transport users at key stations and Park and Rides. The survey was designed to provide information on those who currently use the Park and Ride facilities, particularly the trip characteristics of the users, including origin and designation information. These surveys show stations/terminals which are most
distant from the city centre, such as Albany, Half Moon Bay, West Harbour, Pukekohe, and Hobsonville attract wide catchments. Passenger origin data from Swanson saw people traveling from Bethells Beach, Waimauku, Riverhead, and Taupaki. Therefore, it is plausible to assume Huapai rail station could attract a wide catchment.

Proposed footpath programme

Scope: The proposed footpaths programme supports integration with public transport by providing improved links to bus stops and other public transport interchanges, provides improved transport links to metropolitan centres, district centres, town centres and village centres and integrate with other planned community infrastructure investment, increase mode choice and encourage active modes, particularly for short distance trips, to improve safety for pedestrians, support overall network resilience and efficiency by providing alternative mode options for shorter trips and to provide wider air quality, economic, health and recreational benefits for local residents living in the areas targeted for increased investment.

Estimated costs: Rodney Local Board has an unprioritised footpath list. A targeted rate that raised $15m could deliver a programme of footpaths spread around Rodney's township, such as:

- Kapera Coast Highway - Kaukapakapa (740m, $1.4m)
- Alice Street - Riverhead (254m, $365k)
- Newton Road - Riverhead (245m, $347k)
- Tapu Road, Huapai - Periview Lane (86m, $123k)
- Springs Road - Riverhead (402m, $604k)
- Fire Station to Peak Rd along SH16 – Kumeu (1.2km, $1.4m)
- Puhinui Road – Warkworth (240m, $405k)
- Wilson Road – Warkworth (490m, $690k)
- Rodney street – Wellsford (230m, $539k)
- Domain Crescent - Muriwai (536m, $770k)
- Falls Road – Warkworth (417m, $599k)
- Goodall Road - Snells Beach (216m, $310k)
- Blue Gum Drive - Warkworth (449m, $614k)
- Dairy Flat Highway - Dairy Flat (815m, $1.1m)
- Matakana Road - Matakana (2.1km, $717k)
- Leigh Road – Whangateau (259m, $372k)
- Puhoi Library to the Krippers Road Bridge (tbc, $255k)
- Puhoi to State Highway 1 (tbc, $455k)
- Karaka Point Road – Waitoki (345m, $495k)
- Omana Drive - Omana (600m, $1.1m)
- Rodney Street - Wellsford (330m, $108k)
- Rodney Street - Wellsford (Centennial Park Road), (375m, $123k)
- Sandspit Road - Sandspit (924m, $303k)
- Worker Road - Wellsford (259m, $65k)
- School Road – Wellsford (544m, $178k)
- State Highway 1 – Wellsford (tbc, $160k)
- Mckinney Road – Warkworth (tbc, $987k)

Estimated maintenance costs for footpaths are roughly $275 dollars per km, per annum. Because the footpaths programme has not been prioritised, AT has included a nominal amount of $30,000 for maintenance of footpaths over 10 years. The programme may need to be revised from time to time in light of operational factors. Indicative location is depicted in appendix A, figure 1.

As per RLTP: This programme has been considered in the draft RLTP, which has provisioned $30m in the draft RLTP. However, when compared to other project proposals for funding, this programme has not been identified as high priority and therefore unlikely to get funding.

Beneficiaries: Although individual projects mainly benefit residents in the local area, the overall programme provides benefits across Rodney’s township by enhancing localised amenity and promoting walking and cycling in the community.
Rationale for Beneficiaries: New footpath proposals are primarily in the urban areas and would benefit town centres, bus stops, education intuition, employment areas, significant community areas. Priority are given to those footpaths which lie within 300m from those areas, along with safety and connection to existing footpath and growth area and other considerations. As per the attached map, these priority footpaths are reasonably disperse in Rodney and seeks to address infrastructure deficit and provide a basic network of footpaths where key gaps are identified.

Summary of costs for option 3: Distributed benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>10 year OPEX</th>
<th>10 year CAPEX</th>
<th>10 year total (inflated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Huaiapai to Westgate</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Riverhead to Westgate</td>
<td>5,270,416</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>5,470,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Wellsford to Warkworth</td>
<td>5,200,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>5,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Huaiapai to Abany</td>
<td>6,500,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>6,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warkworth Park and Ride</td>
<td>285,208</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,485,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huaiapai Park and Ride investigation</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New footpaths</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>14,925,826</td>
<td>14,955,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,585,624</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,575,826</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,161,450</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interest cost: 1,693,448

Total targeted rate: 46,051,581

Bus service from Helensville to Silverdale from 2019/2020 (depends on broader NZTA funding)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>10 year OPEX</th>
<th>10 year CAPEX</th>
<th>10 year total (inflated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,750,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>6,950,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: All costs are indicative only and are subjected to further review. Delivery will be phased to be aligned with revenue generated from targeted rate. The programme will continue to be updated as new information becomes available. If business cases for the additional public transport services delivered an NZTA subsidy the Helensville to Silverdale service could be delivered within the current funding envelope.)

Summary of costs for option 3: Differential benefits based on Rodney subdivision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>10 year OPEX</th>
<th>10 year CAPEX</th>
<th>10 year Total (inflated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kumeu Subdivision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Huaiapai to Westgate</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Riverhead to Westgate</td>
<td>5,270,416</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>5,470,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Huaiapai to Abany (80%)</td>
<td>5,200,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>5,360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huaiapai Park and Ride investigation</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Footpaths</td>
<td>11,906</td>
<td>5,149,608</td>
<td>5,158,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,782,384</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,506,608</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,288,992</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Dairy Flat Subdivision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>10 year OPEX</th>
<th>10 year CAPEX</th>
<th>10 year Total</th>
<th>10 year total (inflated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Footpaths</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>1,667,815</td>
<td>1,870,927</td>
<td>1,932,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Huapai to Albany (20%)</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>1,340,000</td>
<td>1,463,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,301,111</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,707,816</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,010,927</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,395,547</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Warkworth Subdivision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>10 year OPEX</th>
<th>10 year CAPEX</th>
<th>10 year Total</th>
<th>10 year total (inflated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warkworth Park n Ride</td>
<td>285,208</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,485,208</td>
<td>1,512,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Wellsford to Warkworth (20%)</td>
<td>1,040,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,050,000</td>
<td>1,148,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Footpaths</td>
<td>12,310</td>
<td>6,891,587</td>
<td>6,903,897</td>
<td>7,983,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,337,518</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,191,587</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,439,105</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,644,869</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wellsford Subdivision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>10 year OPEX</th>
<th>10 year CAPEX</th>
<th>10 year Total</th>
<th>10 year total (inflated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Wellsford to Warkworth (80%)</td>
<td>4,180,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>4,220,000</td>
<td>4,595,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Footpaths</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>1,220,015</td>
<td>1,222,027</td>
<td>1,413,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,192,012</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,260,015</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,422,047</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,008,369</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,693,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total targeted rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>46,051,581</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: All costs are indicative only and are subjected to further review. Delivery will be phased, to be aligned with revenue generated from targeted rate. The programme will continue to be updated as new information becomes available.*
## Attachment C: Legislative information alternative information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Targeted rate of $150 per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit to fund accelerated improvements in transport projects in Rodney.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s intent reference</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Financial strategy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Infrastructure strategy</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on rates</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on debt</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on levels of service</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with other council plans</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in ownership or control of a strategic asset</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rodney Local Board Transport Targeted Rate

File No.: CP2017/25526

Purpose
1. To provide advice on funding options for a local targeted rate to support additional transport investment in the Rodney Local Board area.

Executive summary
2. To accelerate improvement in the transport services in the Rodney Local Board area it is proposed to introduce a targeted rate to raise $41 million over ten years to fund:
   - Increased frequency of the Huapai to Westgate bus service (effectively providing a 15-minute service out of Huapai, in the peak)
   - Bus service from Riverhead to Westgate
   - Huapai Park and Ride (investigation)
   - Warkworth Park and Ride
   - Proposed seal extension programme
   - Proposed footpath programme.
3. Officers propose a fixed rate of $150 per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit\(^1\) (SIUP) as the primary benefits manifest in terms of improvement to personal transport options and outcomes and residential amenity. Accordingly the benefits will not differ materially between types of property. The projects are relatively evenly spread over the region and therefore all properties should share the costs.
4. Consideration was given to three alternatives:
   - General rates – not appropriate to fund projects not presently in the Regional land transport plan and benefiting only part of the region
   - Differentiated geographically within Rodney Local Board area
     - investment distribution varies across local board subdivisions
     - projects are reasonably spread across region providing benefits to all areas (subdivisions are electoral boundaries and don’t reflect transport benefit distribution)
   - Differentiated targeted rate on business properties
     - businesses can expense income tax and claim back GST – equivalent to a differential of 1.6 times the residential rate
     - businesses do not benefit more than non-business properties and may benefit less

Recommendation/s
That the Rodney Local Board:
a) decide if it wishes to recommend to the Governing Body consultation as part of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 on a targeted rate of $150 per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit to fund $41 million of transport improvements in the Rodney Local Board area over the next ten years.

---
\(^1\) A SIUP separately identifies for rating purposes both a granny flat and the main house and each shop in a shopping mall.
Comments

Background

Rodney Local Board Plan

5. The Rodney Local Board consulted on investigating a targeted rate to fund transport improvements, as part of its local board plan. The draft text of the plan stated that “to make an impact and start addressing more of Rodney’s issues, we need extra funding, and for that we propose investigating a new targeted rate and progressing this pending the result of the investigation.” Potential uses for the rate were identified in the plan as including public transport trials (such as buses between Warkworth and Silverdale or rail to Huapai), park and ride facilities in Warkworth and Kumeu-Huapai, and sealing Rodney’s roads. The local board received 1,414 responses to the targeted rate question in the local board plan, and 53% of respondents supported the investigation into the targeted rate.

6. Auckland Transport has analysed the investments suggested in the local board plan consultation. The proposed investments have been adjusted to incorporate projects most likely to make a material difference to transport outcomes relative to their costs. These are set out in the proposal that follows and are discussed in more detail in Attachment B: Transport investment options for Rodney Local Board.

Current Rodney Local Board area transport investment program

7. The draft capital programme includes a number of potential projects in the Rodney local board area for consideration as part of development of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028:
   - seal extension programme, $30 million
   - Supporting Growth projects in Warkworth, including
     - Matakena Link Road
     - future extension of Matakena Link Road to Sandspit Road
   - Warkworth Western Collector
   - Warkworth grade separated park and ride facility.

8. The Supporting Growth projects are a relatively low priority and the potential for funding is highly uncertain. For full details see Attachment B: Transport investment options for Rodney Local Board.

Statutory decision making criteria

9. The council (Governing Body and local boards) are required to consider and consult on any changes to funding for services. This proposal considers the sources of funding for the proposed transport improvements in the Rodney Local Board area against the statutory criteria in section 101(3) of the Local Government Act 2002. The key elements of this assessment are set out in the options below. A full analysis against the statutory criteria is set out in Attachment A: Assessment against statutory criteria.

Rodney Local Board Transport Improvements Proposal

10. To fund a range of additional transport service improvements in the Rodney Local Board area of $41 million over ten years. The proposed service improvements are set out in the table below, for full details see Option Three in Attachment B: Transport investment options for Rodney Local Board. The costs are net of fare revenue which is not expected to be material. All costs are indicative and are subjected to further review. Delivery will be phased over time to align with revenue generated from targeted rate.

---

Rodney Local Board Transport Targeted Rate
Table 1: Proposed delivery timeframes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>10 year OPEX</th>
<th>10 year CAPEX</th>
<th>10 year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Huapai to Westgate Delivery from 2019 calendar year</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Riverhead to Westgate Delivery from 2019 calendar year</td>
<td>5,270,416</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>5,470,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warkworth Park and Ride - 2018/19 – 2020/21*</td>
<td>285,208</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>395,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huapai Park and Ride – dependant on investigation</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed seal extension programme – delivery over 10 year period</td>
<td>1,100,658</td>
<td>12,448,272</td>
<td>13,548,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed footpath programme – delivery over 10 year period</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>14,925,826</td>
<td>14,955,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,886,282</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,684,099</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,570,381</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See paragraph 13

11. The proposal does not include rail to Huapai that was referred to in the Rodney Local Board Plan consultation due to the high estimated cost of $18.7m capital plus $5.5m per annum for operating costs relative to potential benefit within the LTP planning timeframes. Two bus service proposals were also removed due to expected low patronage. The investment proposal has been adjusted to replace these projects with a range of other investments to serve the community in that area, including additional bus services to Westgate and investigation of Huapai Park and Ride.

12. Auckland Transport does not currently have plans for a park and ride in the Huapai area until after 2028, and no formal work has been done on identifying potential locations. Auckland Transport is currently undertaking a Programme Business Case for its park and ride programme. This work, which is planned for completion in February 2018, will include examining options for Huapai and will provide a decision on the merits of a facility. In the meantime, Auckland Transport will also investigate potential sites, including temporary options using existing parking sites. We propose a Huapai park and ride facility is tentatively included in the proposal, noting that this is subject to further investigation on the costs, feasibility and operational merits of constructing a facility in the short to medium term. In the meantime a placeholder allowance of $4 million has been made to cover the possibility that land purchase may be required.

**Proposed funding**

13. The Warkworth Park and Ride assumes the availability of Warkworth Showgrounds carpark, based on a lease land/licence arrangement between Auckland Transport and Auckland Council’s Community Facilities Department. Further work is required to confirm the suitability of the site for Park and Ride.

14. It is proposed to fund the transport improvements with a targeted rate of $150 per SUIP.

15. The projects are spread over the entire Rodney Local Board area providing benefits to all residents and properties in the form of:
   a) improved personal transport choices and outcomes (bus services, new footpaths and Park and Ride facilities)
   b) improved residential amenity (additional road sealing and new footpaths).

16. Given the nature of the benefits:
17. As the benefit to all properties is relatively similar a rate set as a fixed charge per separately used or inhabited part of a rating unit (SUIP) is appropriate.

18. The cost of the rate is estimated to be $150 per annum or $2.90 per week. This is unlikely to present material affordability issues for most ratepayers. Those ratepayers with affordability issues can access the council’s rates postponement scheme or apply for the rates rebate which the council administers on behalf of the Department of Internal Affairs. Whilst business properties and more remote farms will benefit less than residential properties they can expense rates and claim back GST which means the net cost to them will be $93.90 per annum or $1.80 per week.

**Alternative funding options**

19. The following alternative funding options were considered
   - General rates
   - Differentiate by sub-region
   - Differentiated targeted rate on business properties
   - Maintain current investment.

Each of these options is assessed below.

**General rates**

20. General rates are not an appropriate funding source as the projects proposed are low priority for the region as a whole. While the cost of the service improvements would only increase general rates by 0.3 per cent for all other ratepayers the relative cost benefit of the projects isn’t justified on a regional basis.

**Differentiate by sub-region with local board**

21. Targeted rates can be set to cover the entire Rodney area or geographical subsets if some benefit more from the proposed service improvements. The projects are spread broadly over the Rodney area but the cost of investment varies by subdivision, see table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Rodney</th>
<th>Kumeu</th>
<th>Wellsford</th>
<th>Warkworth</th>
<th>Dairy Flat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of SUIPs</td>
<td>31,207</td>
<td>12,450</td>
<td>3,236</td>
<td>12,805</td>
<td>2,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annualised expenditure (revenue requirement)</td>
<td>$4,067,036</td>
<td>$2,170,054</td>
<td>$363,006</td>
<td>$1,366,906</td>
<td>$167,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment per SUIP</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$129</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. The nature of projects proposed has been structured to deliver a reasonable distribution of investment and benefit across the Rodney Local Board area. The costs vary across the region resulting in a variation in investment value in different sub-regions but provide similar levels of benefit relative to population. The subdivisions are established for electoral purposes but don’t align with the likely distribution of transport benefits.

23. The costs of providing some projects, park and rides (Warkworth $400,000 and Huapai $4 million), varies widely whereas the benefits are similar. Accordingly sharing the costs regionally is justified on a benefits basis for these projects.

**Targeted rate with business differential**

24. Business properties are able to expense rates and claim back GST. This makes the rate more affordable for these properties. In addition business properties are better placed to
adjust their income in response to a change in costs than residential ratepayers. However, business ratepayers receive similar benefits to residential properties and accordingly should pay the same rate.

25. If a business differential was set it could be based on their tax advantage. Business properties would pay a fixed charge 1.6 times the non-business rate or $232 per SUIP. The non-business rate would be $145 per SUIP. After adjusting for expensing the additional rate against tax and claiming back GST business ratepayers would pay the same as residential ratepayers.

**Maintaining current investment and service levels**

26. Auckland Transport’s draft capital programme includes a number of potential projects in the Rodney local board area for consideration as part of development of the Long-term Plan 2018-2028:

- seal extension programme, $30 million
- Supporting Growth projects in Warkworth, including
  - Matakana Link Road
  - future extension of Matakana Link Road to Sandspit Road
  - Warkworth Western Collector
  - Warkworth grade separated park and ride facility.

27. The Supporting Growth projects are a relatively low priority and the potential for funding is highly uncertain. For full details see Attachment B: Transport investment options for Rodney Local Board.

28. The additional investments in the proposal, which complement the list above, would not occur within the Long-term Plan timeframe.

**Consideration**

**Local board views and implications**

29. The Governing Body has decision making authority for setting rates.

30. The Rodney Local Board will communicate their views on this proposal to the Governing Body if they wish to proceed.

31. Other local boards will give formal feedback on the draft Long-term Plan in May 2018 and have the opportunity to comment on this proposal at that time if it proceeds.

**Māori impact statement**

32. The council does not hold information on the ethnicity of ratepayers so is not able to identify the exact impact of policy changes on Māori. The impact of the policy options on Māori will be similar to that on other residents in Rodney.

**Implementation**

33. There are no implementation issues.
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Attachment A: Assessment against statutory criteria

1. When deciding from what sources to meet its funding needs, council must consider the matters set out in section 101(3) of the Local Government Act 2002, see below. This involves elected members exercising their political judgement and considering the proposal in the context of council’s funding decisions as a whole.

101(3) The funding needs of the local authority must be met from those sources that the local authority determines to be appropriate, following consideration of,—

(a) in relation to each activity to be funded,—

(i) the community outcomes to which the activity primarily contributes; and

(ii) the distribution of benefits between the community as a whole, any identifiable part of the community, and individuals; and

(iii) the period in or over which those benefits are expected to occur; and

(iv) the extent to which the actions or inaction of particular individuals or a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity; and

(v) the costs and benefits, including consequences for transparency and accountability, of funding the activity distinctly from other activities; and

(b) the overall impact of any allocation of liability for revenue needs on the community.

The following section considers the funding the proposed additional transport investment in the Rodney Local Board area against the criteria in section 101(3) of the Local Government Act 2002.

The community outcomes to which the activity primarily contributes

The community outcomes to which the activity (transport) primarily contributes are set out in the LTP 2015-2015 as:

1. A fair, safe and healthy Auckland – By promoting walking to increase levels of physical fitness

2. An Auckland of prosperity and opportunity – Through moving people and resources efficiently which has a positive impact on productivity

3. A green Auckland – By reducing our reliance on petrol, air pollution and green-house gas emissions

4. A well connected and accessible Auckland – Providing Auckland with an efficient land transport system that encourages increased patronage of bus, rail and ferry services

5. A beautiful Auckland loved by its people – Fundamentally changing parts of our urban built environment

The transport investments proposed to be funded support those outcomes as noted in the table below.
attachment D

item 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/service</th>
<th>Community outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Huapai to Westgate</td>
<td>2,3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Riverhead to Westgate</td>
<td>2,3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitworth Park and Ride</td>
<td>2,3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huapai Park and Ride (investigation)</td>
<td>2,3 and 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal extension</td>
<td>2 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New footpaths</td>
<td>1 and 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While all the projects connect to wider outcomes for the region their impact is small in a broader sense. The projects are either not included in the RLTP or bring forward work not presently scheduled for many years. Given these factors a targeted rate in the Rodney Local Board area is the most appropriate source of funding to supplement user charge revenue from the services.

The distribution of benefits between the community as a whole; any identifiable part of the community; and individuals

Where the services benefit direct users they should be funded from fares. Fares will be set at a level that does not discourage use thereby eliminating the other benefits of provision of the service. Revenue from fares that balance these factors will not be material. As a result targeted rates revenue will be required to make-up the shortfall.

The investments proposed are spread over the entire Rodney Local Board area. However, the nature of the benefits differs for each project in terms of service improvement and location. The nature of benefits is a key element in determining the appropriate funding source. The benefits of each project are described in the table below in terms of their distribution across potential beneficiaries differentiated geographically, by land use and direct use of the service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/service</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Huapai to Westgate</td>
<td>Users Residential properties within 500m of the bus stops/route and in particular properties in Huapai and Westgate would benefit from alternative transport options to the city and other destinations to the south. Drivers along the route may also benefit from possible localised decongestion benefits No direct benefits to business properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Riverhead to Westgate</td>
<td>Users Residential properties within 500m of the bus stops/route and in particular properties in Riverhead and Westgate would benefit from alternative transport options to the city and other destinations to the south. Drivers along the route may also benefit from possible localised decongestion benefits No direct benefits to business properties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Targeted rates can be set in to cover the entire Rodney area or geographical subsets which benefit the most from the proposed service improvements.

The cost of investment differs by electoral subdivision, see table at paragraph 19 in report. However, electoral subdivisions are not set to define geographic areas of benefit for transport planning purposes. The projects proposed are spread broadly over the Rodney area, see maps for Option 3 in Attachment B: Transport investment options for Rodney Local Board.

The cost of providing the benefits differs in different parts of the region, in particular for the Warkworth, $400,000, and Huapai, $4 million, park and rides. The difference arises from historical reasons i.e. the Warkworth park and ride can take advantage of land already owned by the council whereas land acquisition will probably be required for Huapai. While the costs differ between the areas the benefits will be similar in nature and therefore it is reasonable to set the rate based on benefit rather than cost distribution.

For the above reasons it is appropriate to set a uniform targeted rate across the entire local board area.

A targeted rate can also be set differentially to recover more of the cost from land uses that will benefit more from the services. The primary beneficiaries of the investments proposed are residential properties. The benefits arise from improved choice and utility for personal transport and improved residential amenity. There is therefore no case based on benefit distribution for differentiation to allocate more of the rates burden to business or farm properties.

The rates burden can be allocated on a fixed charge per SUIP or based on capital value. Capital value rating would allocate more of the rates burden to business and farm properties. This isn’t justified on the basis of the distribution of benefits noted above. The use of capital value would allocate more of the burden to higher value properties and less to lower value.
Property owners will benefit in terms of the improved amenity and options for personal transport. They will also benefit from improvements in property value arising from these benefits. Higher capital value properties may benefit more from the latter affect.

Given the foregoing staff recommend that a targeted rate proposal be presented for consultation based on a fixed charge per SUIP.

The period in or over which the benefits are expected to occur

The benefits associated with additional operating expenditure should be met by users and targeted or general rates recovering costs from the beneficiaries as they are realised.

The assets to be built with additional funding will deliver benefits over their lifetime. It would therefore be more desirable to meet the capital costs from borrowing thus spreading them over the beneficiaries over the life of the assets. However, given constraints on council borrowing it is appropriate to fund the upfront investment from general or targeted rates in order to realise the benefits.

The extent to which the actions or inactions of particular individuals or as a group contribute to the need to undertake the activity

None of the additional services or investments are driven by a response to the actions or inactions of particular individuals or groups. While the costs of maintaining new sealed roads are higher where there are more heavy vehicle movements most of this will be associated with the properties nearby. This factor has already been considered in the assessment of benefits above.

The costs and benefits, including consequences for transparency and accountability, of funding the activity distinctly from other activities

Funding these projects from a targeted rate will improve the transparency of decision making on additional funding. Ratepayers will be able to clearly see exactly how any additional funding they provide will be used. This will make it easier for them to express a preference on increased funding. A fixed rate per SUIP will make it easier to communicate to the community the cost of the service improvements relative to their benefits.

The use of a targeted rate will also improve accountability for expenditure. If a decision is made to raise additional funding by use of a targeted rate then ratepayers can be confident it will be used for that purpose. Targeted rates can only be spent on the activity for which they are raised.

Overall accountability will not be impacted as the form of funding will not influence ratepayers’ ability to hold the council to account for the effectiveness of this expenditure given the technical expertise required to make such an assessment.

It is administratively straight forward to implement a targeted rate in the manner proposed.

Consideration of overall impact

Having considered the above criteria, the council needs to consider the proposal in terms of the overall impact on the community. This involves elected members exercising their
judgement and considering the proposal in the context of council’s funding decisions as a whole, not just in relation to this activity.

The total cost of a targeted rate applied over the Rodney Local Board area on a per SUJP basis is $132 per property per annum or $2.50 per week. This is unlikely to materially impact on overall affordability for ratepayers.

For those residential ratepayers for whom it may be an issue the council offers rates postponement and administers the rates rebate scheme on behalf of the Department of Internal Affairs.

Higher capital value properties and business properties will in general be better able to manage increases in rates and accordingly consideration may be given to applying the rate on capital value or differentiating the rate between business and non-business properties. There is a correlation between capital value and income for residential properties with the average household income being higher in areas with higher capital value. Business properties can expense rates and claim back GST.
Attachment B: Transport investment options for Rodney Local Board

This attachment outlines three investment options to provide transport improvements for Rodney Local Board. Note that all costs are indicatively only and are subject to change without notice. The programme will continue to be updated as new information becomes available.

Option 1: Draft Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) projects only

If a targeted rate is not introduced, funding for projects in the Rodney area will be based on what is currently proposed for funding in the draft RLTP. Funding for the RLTP is primarily based on revenue from general rates, user charges, and debt. Some transport projects are also funded through the National Land Transport Fund (NLTF) which is administered by the Transport Agency (NZTA).

Auckland Transport is in the process of revising the draft RLTP, which involves reprioritising our capital projects for the 2019 – 28 period. Inclusion of projects in the draft RLTP depends on the outcomes of a comprehensive scoring process with a multi-agency panel comprised of AT and NZTA. A fair assessment of projects is conducted by considering the merits of each project according to their alignment with strategic intent, effectiveness in delivering objectives and value for money associated with the investment. Whether the proposed projects are included in the ten-year plan depends on how the project compares to other proposals and overall funding decisions between Council and Government. The draft RLTP will be out for public consultation early January 2018.

Current Capital investment proposed in the draft RLTP:

Auckland Transport Proposal

The draft RLTP includes a $30m seal extensions programme for 2019 – 28 period. This would address the unsealed portion of Wellsford Valley Road, Ahuroa Road, Ngarewa Road, Underwood Road, Muruwi Valley Road, Te Arari Point Road, Covon Wilson Road and Hanuru Road. When compared to other proposals, it is likely to be funded.

The following projects on the Rodney Local Board area are currently included in the draft RLTP.

- Matakania Link Road (connection between State Highway 1 and Matakania Road)
- Supporting growth projects such as future extension of Matakania link Road to Sands Pit Road, Western Collector (connection of Western parts of Warkworth with State Highway 1) and a grade separated Park and Ride facility
- More widely, supporting growth projects in the Northwest such as the Redills network (connection from Coastville Riverhead Highway to Don Buck Road), Fred Taylor Drive upgrade and local crossing over State Highway 18 (from Brigham Creek Road to Hobsonville Road).

State Highway Proposal

Warkworth to Wellsford motorway remains the long term option for the second stage of Road of National Significance and is continuing to be investigated. The Puhoro to Warkworth Road of National Significance is the main State Highway project for Warkworth. In the Northwest, there has been proposals for a direct State Highway 10 to 18 connection, enhancing the connection between Rodney and Upper Harbour.

AT Renewals and Maintenance:

AT plans to continue with its maintenance programme. AT invests more in maintenance and renewals, on a per km basis than its peers. This is depicted in the figure 1 below.
Public transport operations
The New Bus Network was launched for West Auckland in June 2017. The new West Auckland bus network is part of a simpler, more integrated public transport network for Auckland. This includes improved services for Helensville, Huapai and Kumeu as follows:

122, 125 - Improved weekend services on these routes. The combination of 122 and 125 creates an hourly service between Huapai, Kumeu and Westgate, 7 days a week.

125x - Peak express services from Helensville, through Huapai, Kumeu and Westgate to the city centre. This service operates every 33 minutes, 7 days a week.

Option 2: Full Local Board Proposal
This option reflects the full list of project proposals suggested by the Rodney Local Board. AT has reviewed the request and provided initial cost estimates and likely beneficiaries for each project. Note that all costs are indicatively only and are subjected to change without notice. The programme will continue to be updated as new information becomes available. The likely period in which benefits will be fully realised has not been considered for this exercise. These additional projects would be delivered on top of other potential projects in the RLTP (i.e. Option 1).

East West bus service
Scope: An hourly service between Parakai, Helensville, Kaukapakapa, and Hibiscus Coast Station would offer connections with local Hibiscus Coast buses and Northern Express buses at Hibiscus Coast Station. This service could also be timetabled to connect with the 125 service from Helensville to Westgate. This service seeks to provide alternative mode of transport for the Parakai, Helensville and Kaukapakapa area.

Estimated costs: Estimated operational costs per annum is approximately $820,000 p.a. No assessment of the bus stop requirements through Kaukapakapa has been made to date, so an allowance for one pair, with a shelter on the Silverdale bound side of the road has been made. Cost would be around $40,000.

Beneficiaries: This service will benefit residents living in close proximity to the proposed route, providing an alternative mode of transport. This includes Parakai, Helensville, Kaukapakapa and Whitianga.

Rationale for Beneficiaries: Beneficiary (bus service catchment area) assumptions for this route were made on allowing 500m catchment of proposed bus stops, but up to 1000m can be considered within the catchment of a stop, depending on the situation. In the case of projects proposed by Rodney Local Board, none of the settlements are that big, so they could all realistically be said to benefit. Location of proposed bus stops were based on their placement at key intersections and existing locations.
Additional comments: AT believes this service would not be the best value for money, as it wouldn’t be frequent enough to be attractive for many commuters, and is expensive to operate all-day for what would be a limited number of users. The service makes sense in the longer term.

Bus service from Riverhead to Huapai

Scope: A route for buses from Riverhead (which is currently not served by AT) could connect to Huapai Station, should a train service be reintroduced. This would offer connections from Riverhead to the wider transport network, and well as local destinations and services in Kumeu and Huapai. The service would operate hourly, 7 days a week, with a peak-period frequency of every 30 minutes in each direction. The route could start at Riverhead School, and travel via Great North Road and Kaipara Portage Road (to maximise the catchment in Riverhead), before travelling to Huapai via Riverhead Road. The route would terminate near Kumeu Library.

Estimated costs: Estimated project cost for 4 trips in the peak direction at peak times would cost around $420,000 p.a. Bus stops in Riverhead will be required to enable safe boarding and alighting. Whilst a comprehensive review of any current bus stop facilities and requirements for new bus stops and shelters has not been undertaken, AT envisage that a further 5 pairs of bus stops, with shelters on the inbound bus stops, might be required to support this service. This would be a one-off capital cost of $200,000 – based on $40,000 per stop pairing.

Beneficiaries: This service will benefit residents living in close proximity to the proposed route, providing alternative modes of transport and connection between centres. This includes Riverhead and Huapai.

Additional comments: AT believes this service would make sense in the longer term, once both Riverhead and Huapai area are developed further. Without a train service from Huapai, it wouldn’t be the best value for money. AT’s view is that the main appeal of a Riverhead to Huapai service is for trips to the local amenities in Kumeu/Huapai for Riverhead residents, as opposed to commuters.

Bus service from Riverhead to Westgate

Scope: Riverhead to Wegisgate would connect to the wider AT Metro network. This would enable connections to more destinations, including 110 services direct to the City Centre, as well as 120 to Constellation Station. The service would operate 30 minutes at peak, and hourly at other times 7 days a week. This service seeks to support forecast growth in North West Auckland. Approximately 30,000 houses and 13,000 new jobs are anticipated in the area over 30 years.

Estimated costs: Estimated project cost for 4 trips in the peak direction at peak times would cost around $520,000 p.a.

Beneficiaries: This service will benefit residents living in close proximity to the proposed route, providing an alternative mode of transport and possible localised congestion benefits. This includes Riverhead and Westgate.

Train service to Huapai

Scope: A 30-minute interval service will require 2 DMUs to operate the timetable, with the trains passing each other at Watakerake station. This is the maximum frequency service that could be operated on the existing single track line between Swanson and Huapai. Operation of a 10-minute service would require double tracking between Swanson and Huapai, which would incur significant capital expenditure. This service seeks to support forecast growth in North West Auckland. Approximately 30,000 houses and 13,000 new jobs are anticipated in the area over 30 years.

Estimated costs: Estimated project cost for a 30-minute interval service is approximately $18.7m of capital expenditure with $5.5 operating expenditure per annum.
Beneficiaries: This service would provide a wide catchment and would provide an alternative mode of transport the Northwestern area and possible localised decongestion benefits.

Rationale for Beneficiaries: Flow transportation specialist (FLOW) was commissioned by Auckland Transport to undertake a survey of public transport users at key stations and Park and Rides. The survey was designed to provide information on those who currently use the Park and Ride facilities, particularly the trip characteristics of the users, including origin and destination information. These surveys show stations/terminals which are most distant from the city centre, such as Albany, Half Moon Bay, West Harbour, Pakerohe, and Hobsonville attract wide catchments. Passenger origin data from Swanson saw people travelling from Settells Beach, Waimauku, Riverhead, and Taupoki. Therefore, it is plausible to assume Huspaw rail station could attract a wide catchment.

Additional comments: This service performs poorly from an economic perspective due to high capital costs and low patronage forecasts. Therefore, as standalone investments they appear to offer poor value for money. AECOM has calculated the BCRs, based on patronage forecast from Auckland Forecast Centre to reflect both 10 and 30 minute options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Estimated costs</th>
<th>Estimated BCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 min – no tunnel upgrade</td>
<td>$18.7M Capex, $5.5M Opex/ year</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 min – with tunnel or rolling stock fire safety risk upgrade</td>
<td>$64.67M Capex, $5.5M Opex/ year</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AT’s view is that this is a high cost service that is only likely attract limited patronage. From a strategic and operational perspective, AT does not support heavy rail operation to Huspaw in the medium term.

Warkworth Park and Ride

Scope: AT Metro considers that a park and ride facility at the Warkworth Showgrounds would be relatively easy to implement, provided a lease land/license arrangement could be established, subject to further investigation. This project would seek to support forecast growth in North Auckland. Approximately 3,000 house and 4,000 new jobs are anticipated in the area over 36 years.

Estimated costs: Establishing a pair of bus shelters will cost around $70,000. This would include two shelters and associated hardstanding and kerb work. Further stops on State Highway 1 near the intersection of Woodcocks Road would also be beneficial, to enable greater access to the service. This is estimated to cost approximately $40,000. This would include a pair of bus stops, with a shelter on the southbound side of the road. Warkworth Showgrounds is on recreation reserve, but leases to the community are managed by the community leases section of Auckland Council. Advice from AT Property suggests $29,000 p.a. as a rough estimate for a lease land arrangement.

Estimated maintenance costs for one bus shelter is roughly $976 dollars per annum.

Beneficiaries: Warkworth Park and Ride would provide a wide catchment, as depicted in appendix A, figure 1. The Park and Ride would provide an alternative mode of transport the Warkworth area and possible localised decongestion benefits.

Rationale for Beneficiaries: Based on the survey data from FLOW, Passenger origin data from Albany saw people travelling from Snells beach, Waitoki, Helensville, Arkles Bay, and Warkworth. This confirms stations/terminals which are most distant from the city centre attract wide catchments. It is plausible to assume Warkworth Park and ride could attract a wide catchment north and north east of Warkworth.

Proposed seal extension programme

Scope: Auckland has a total legal road length of 7,300km of which approximately 868km (12%) is sealed. 678km (78%) of the unsealed road network is in Rodney. As mentioned previously, the draft RLTP does have
$33m planned for the next 10 years. Targeted rates would enable acceleration and ability to deliver more unsealed roads for the next 10 years.

**Estimated costs:** The cost to complete a seal extension varies significantly from road to road but it typically relates to the condition width of the existing roadway and the topography that it follows. A 7.2m wide seal extension would cost around $800,000/km over unsealed near level uncomplicated terrain, however, this would escalate to around $1,400,000/km over narrow and steep complex terrain. Based on the review of the current seal extension priority list the average cost per kilometre to extend the seal on the existing network would be around $980,000/km.

If a targeted seal extension roading rate was implemented and a further $13m was raised over a similar 10 year period, additional projects could also be added to the currently planned seal extension asumed in the draft RLTP. Currently, potential additional projects are:

- Krippner Road (2.7 km, $2,930k)
- Rustybrook Road (1.8 km, $2,011k)
- Weraani Road (3.3 km, $2,758k)
- Cames Road (130 m, $0,156k)
- Wilson Road #3 (3.6 km, $3,483k)
- Pebble Brook Road (1.2 km, $1.14k)

Estimated maintenance costs for sealed roads are roughly $18,500 dollars per km, per annum. Note all costs are estimates only and the programme may be revised from time to time in light of operational factors.

**Additional comments:** AT is currently trialling a number of cost effective treatments for unsealing roads. Otta and Nota seal are currently part of a 2-year trial. Given the trial status of these AT would not recommend including these in a targeted rate proposal as AT cannot yet confirm the full cost and OPEX implications of these yet.

**Beneficiaries:** Although individual projects mainly benefit residents in the local area, the overall programme provides benefits across Rodney’s township by improving overall network connectivity to key destinations, with added benefit of mitigating dust effects for residents in close proximity.

**Rationale for Beneficiaries:** One of the prioritisation criteria considers the number of dwellings/businesses in close proximity or along the unsealed roads. To some degree these are the direct beneficiary of the seal extension programme. AT typically only count dwellings located within 100 - 120m of the carriageway. Residences living in close proximity of the unsealed roads will have the benefit of less dust particulates. However, the seal extension programme is well disbursed in the Rodney region, which allows all users to use the facility around the region.

**Proposed footpath programme**

**Scope:** The proposed footpaths programme supports integration with public transport by providing improved links to bus stops and other public transport interchanges, provides improved transport links to metropolitan centres, district centres, town centres and village centres and integrate with other planned community infrastructure investment, increase mode choice and encourage active modes, particularly for short distance trips, to improve safety for pedestrians, support overall network resilience and efficiency by providing alternative mode options for shorter trips and to provide wider air quality, economic, health and recreational benefits for local residents living in the areas targeted for increased investment.

**Estimated costs:** AT currently has a candidate list of approximately 500 requests for new or improved footpath segments. A targeted rate that raised $7m could address the highest priority items on this list such as:

- Albert Street, (317m $455,719)
- Matakana School Road, (162m $261,643)
item 12

York Terrace / Elliot street, (336m $485,069)
Tapu Road, (86m $123,634)
Springs Road, (482m $661,171)
Hill Street, (180m $238,768)
Princess Street, (444m $638,264)
Puriri street, (235m $337,836)
Rodney street, (375m $539,100)
SH16, (556m $799,306)
Mahurangi East Road, (265m $382,402)
Goodall Road, (216m $310,522)
Blue Gum Drive, (449m $445,482)
Dairy Flat Highway, (815m $1,171,644)

Estimated maintenance costs for footpaths are roughly $275 dollars per km, per annum. Note all costs are estimates only.

Beneficiaries: Although individual projects mainly benefit residents in the local area, the overall programme provides benefits across Rodney’s township by enhancing localised amenity and promoting walking and cycling in the community.

Rationale for Beneficiaries: New footpath proposals are primarily in the urban areas and would benefit town centres, bus stops, education institutions, employment areas, significant community areas. Priority is given to those footpaths which lie within 300m from those areas, along with safety and connection to existing footpath and growth areas and other considerations.

Summary of costs for option 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>10 year OPEX</th>
<th>10 year CAPEX</th>
<th>10 Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus service: Kaukapakapakai Waitoki</td>
<td>8,200,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>8,240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Riverhead to Huapai</td>
<td>4,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Riverhead to Westgate</td>
<td>5,370,418</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>5,570,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train service to Huapai</td>
<td>55,000,000</td>
<td>18,700,000</td>
<td>73,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warkworth Park and Ride</td>
<td>285,208</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>395,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal extension</td>
<td>1,100,058</td>
<td>12,448,272</td>
<td>13,548,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New footpaths</td>
<td>12,787</td>
<td>7,074,410</td>
<td>7,087,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74,969,069</td>
<td>38,572,702</td>
<td>112,541,771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All costs are indicative only and are subject to further review. Delivery will be phased to be aligned with revenue generated from targeted rate.

Option 3: Revised Proposal

This option provides a revised version of the full list of Local Board proposals. It retains the bus service between Riverhead to Westgate, Warkworth Park and Ride and additional seal extension programme from the previous option. The more expensive rail option has been replaced with a proposed increase in frequency of the Huapai to Westgate bus service (effectively providing a 15-minute service out of Huapai, in the peak). The proposed footpath programme has been replaced (at the Local Board’s request). This option provides a valuable programme for Rodney, which is more affordable, whilst ensuring a reasonably even distribution of benefits.
across the Local Board area. Note that all costs are indicatively only and are subject to change without notice. The programme will continue to be updated as new information becomes available.

The likely period in which benefits will be fully realised has not been considered for this exercise and will be conducted in due course.

**Bus service from Huapai to Westgate**

**Scope:** Additional buses to run 122 service in the peak could enhance overall attractiveness to public transport in the Tapu Road/Matua Road catchment area. Under the new network, there is already a 122 service between Tapu Road/Mapua Road to Westgate. This proposal is to introduce additional buses in the peak to increase frequency. Terminating at Westgate opens up the option of connecting to 110 service from Westgate to the City Centre and connecting to 120 services to Constellation Station. When inter-timed with 125x service, there would be a service approximately every 15 minutes on the main road in the peak. This service seeks to support forecast growth in North West Auckland. Approximately 30,000 house and 13,000 new jobs are anticipated in the area over 30 years.

**Estimated costs:** Estimated project cost for 4 trips in the peak direction at peak times would cost around $230,000 p.a.

**As per RLTP:** AT does not have plans to increase/introduce additional buses to the 122 service.

**Beneficiaries:** This service will benefit residents living in close proximity to the proposed route, providing an alternative mode of transport and possible localised decoupling benefits. This includes Riverhead and Westgate. This is depicted in appendix A, figure 3.

**Rationale for Beneficiaries:** Beneficiaries (bus service catchment area) assumption for this route were made on allowing 500m catchment of proposed bus stops, but up to 1000m can be considered within the catchment of a stop, depending on the situation. In the case of projects proposed by Rodney Local Board, none of the settlements are that big, so they could all realistically be said to benefit. Location of proposed bus stops were based on their placement at key intersections and existing locations.

**Bus service from Riverhead to Westgate**

**Scope:** Riverhead to Westgate would connect to the wider AT Metro network. This would enable connections to more destinations, including 110 services direct to the City Centre, as well as 120 to Constellation Station. The service would operate 30 minutes at peak, and hourly at other times 7 days a week. This service seeks to support forecast growth in North West Auckland. Approximately 30,000 house and 13,000 new jobs are anticipated in the area over 30 years.

**Estimated costs:** Estimated project cost for 4 trips in the peak direction at peak times, and hourly services at all other times would cost around $520,000 p.a. Whilst a comprehensive review of any current bus stop facilities and requirements for new bus stops and shelters has not been undertaken, AT envisages that a further 5 pairs of bus stops, with shelters on the inbound bus stops, might be required to support this service. This would be a one-off capital cost of $200,000 – based on $40,000 per stop pairing. This is depicted in appendix A, figure 4.

**As per RLTP:** AT has plans to introduce this service but this wouldn't be before the 2020/21 financial year.

**Beneficiaries:** This service will benefit residents living in close proximity to the proposed route, providing an alternative mode of transport and possible localised decoupling benefits. This includes Riverhead and Westgate. This is depicted in appendix A, figure 4.

**Warkworth Park and Ride**

**Scope:** AT Metro considers that a park and ride facility at the Warkworth Showgrounds would be relatively easy to implement, provided a lease/land/lease arrangement could be established, subject to further investigation. Approximately 3,000 house and 4,000 new jobs are anticipated in the area over 30 years.
Estimated costs: Establishing a pair of bus shelters will cost around $70,000. This would include two shelters and associated hardstanding and kerb work. Further stops on State Highway 1 near the intersection of Woodcocks Road would also be beneficial, to enable greater access to the service. This is estimated to cost approximately $40,000. This would include a pair of bus stops, with a shelter on the southbound side of the road. AT believes Warkworth Showgrounds is on recreation reserve, but leases to the community may be managed by the community leases section of Auckland Council. Advice from AT Property suggest $25,000 p.a. as a rough estimate for a lease land arrangement.

Estimated maintenance costs for one bus shelter is roughly $978 dollars per annum.

As per RLTP: This project has been considered in the draft RLTP and is planned to be delivered by 2024/2025 period. This does depend on funding decisions between Council and Government.

Beneficiaries: Warkworth Park and Ride would provide a wide catchment, as depicted in appendix A, figure 1. The Park and Ride would provide an alternative mode of transport the Warkworth area and possible localised decongestion benefits.

Rationale for Beneficiaries: Based on the survey data from FLOW, Passenger origin data from Albany saw people travelling from Snells beach, Waiwera, Helensville, Arkles Bay, and Warkworth. This confirms the fact that stations/terminals which are most distant from the city centre attracts wide catchments, it is plausible to assume Warkworth Park and ride could attract a wide catchment north and north east of Warkworth. This is depicted in appendix A, figure 1.

Huapai Park and Ride investigation

Scope: AT investigated the possibility of accelerating a Huapai Park and Ride facility. This project seeks to support forecast growth in North West Auckland. Approximately 30,000 house and 13,000 new jobs are anticipated in the area over 30 years.

AT have undertaken rapid investigation of a number of options

- A Park and Ride facility on 391 and 393 Main Road has been considered. However, AT understands as part of safety improvements along State Highway 16, the Transport Agency (NZTA) are planning on placing a median “barrier” along SH16 opposite and to either side of this land which will prevent right hand turns out on to SH15 from that land. Access to that land from the realignment of Station Road is being investigated however AT traffic engineers advise that right hand turns into that area of land by vehicles travelling south from the Tapu Rd & Station Rd intersection should be kept to a minimum as this may create localised congestion in a residential zone.

- Kumeu showgrounds could be established as a Park and Ride. The land is privately owned and current estimates for a lease land arrangement would in the order of $40,000 p.a.

The advice from AT Strategy is that a Huapai park and ride facility was not planned for another decade. However, a programme business case on the park and ride programme is underway, which will look at appropriate locations regionally, including the Huapai/Kumeu area. AC has strongly recommended AT to include Huapai Park and Ride into the draft revised proposal.

Estimated costs: An indicative amount of $4 million dollars, intended to represent the cost of a small park and ride (50 spaces, including land purchase) has been included. The completion of the programme business case will inform the decision on whether a park and ride is sensible in the Huapai/Kumeu area.

As per RLTP: This project has not been considered in the draft RLTP, as it is planned in the 2nd decade.

Beneficiaries: Huapai Park and Ride would provide a wide catchment, as depicted in appendix A, figure 1. The Park and Ride would provide an alternative mode of transport the Huapai area and possible localised decongestion benefits.

Rationale for Beneficiaries: Flow transportation specialist (FLOW) was commissioned by Auckland Transport to undertake a survey of public transport users at key stations and Park and Rides. The survey was designed to
provide information on those who currently use the Park and Ride facilities, particularly the trip characteristics of the users, including origin and destination information. These surveys show station terminuses which are most distant from the city centre, such as Albany, Half Moon Bay, West Harbour, Pukekohe, and Hobsonville attract wide catchments. Passenger origin data from Swanson saw people travelling from Bethells Beach, Wainamu, Riverhead, and Taupaki. Therefore, it is plausible to assume Huapai rail station could attract a wide catchment. This is depicted in appendix A, figure 1.

**Proposed seal extension programme**

**Scope:** Auckland has a total road length of 7,300km of which approximately 660km (12%) is unsealed. 678km (78%) of the unsealed road network is in Rodney. As mentioned previously, the draft RLTP does have $30m planned for the next 10 years. Targeted rates would enable acceleration and ability to deliver more unsealed roads for the next 10 years.

**Estimated costs:** The cost to complete a seal extension varies significantly from road to road but if it typically relates to the condition width of the existing roadway and the topography that it follows. A 7.2m wide seal extension would cost around $800,000/km over unsealed near level uncomplicated terrain, however, this would escalate to around $1,400,000/km over narrow and steep complex terrain. Based on the review of the current seal extension priority list the average cost per kilometre to extend the seal on the existing network would be around $980,000/km.

If a targeted seal extension road rate was implemented and a further $13m was raised over a similar 10 - year period, additional projects could also be added to the currently planned seal extension assumed in the draft RLTP. Currently, potential additional projects are:

- Kippiner Road (2.7 km, $2.93m)
- Rustybrook Road (1.8 km, $2.01m)
- Wanganui Road (3.3 km, $2.75m)
- Cairns Road (130 m, $0.15m)
- Wilson Road #3 (3.6 km, $3.48m)
- Petal Brook Road (1.2km, $1.1m)

Estimated maintenance costs for sealed roads are roughly $18,500 dollars per km, per annum. Note all costs are estimates only and the programme may be revised from time to time in light of operational factors. This is depicted in appendix A, figure 1.

**As per RLTP:** Currently these projects have not been considered in the draft RLTP due limited funding available in 2018 - 2026 period. Therefore, these projects would be considered in the second decade (2025 - 2035 period).

**Additional comments:** AT is currently trialling a number of cost effective treatments for unsealing roads. Otta and Nota seal are currently part of a 2-year trial. Given the trial status of these AT would not recommend including these in a targeted rate proposal as AT cannot yet confirm the full cost and OPEX implications of these yet.

**Beneficiaries:** Although individual projects mainly benefit residents in the local area, the overall programme provides benefits across Rodney’s township by enabling overall network connectivity to key destinations, with added benefit of mitigating dust effects for residents in close proximity.

**Rationale for Beneficiaries:** One of the prioritisation criteria considers the number of dwellings/businesses in close proximity or along the unsealed roads. To some degree these are the direct beneficiary of the seal extension programme. AT typically only count dwellings located within 100 - 120m of the carriageway. Residence living in close proximity of the unsealed roads will have the benefit of less dust particulates. However, the seal extension programme is well dispersed in the Rodney region, which allows all users to use the facility around the region. This is depicted in appendix A, figure 1.
Proposed footpath programme

**Scope:** The proposed footpaths programme supports integration with public transport by providing improved links to bus stops and other public transport interchanges, provides improved transport links to metropolitan centres, district centres, town centres and village centres and integrate with other planned community infrastructure investment, increase mode choice and encourage active modes, particularly for short distance trips, to improve safety for pedestrians, support overall network resilience and efficiency by providing alternative mode options for shorter trips and to provide wider air quality, economic, health and recreational benefits for local residents living in the areas targeted for increased investment.

**Estimated costs:** Rodney Local Board has an un prioritised footpath list. A targeted rate that raised $15m could deliver a programme of footpaths spread around Rodney’s township, such as:

- Kaipara Coast Highway - Kaukapakapa (740m, $1.4m)
- Alice Street - Riverhead (254m, $365k)
- Newton Road – Riverhead (245m, $347k)
- Topu Road, Huaapi - Parkview Lane (99m, $123k)
- Springs Road – Riverhead (462m, $664k)
- Fire Station to Peak Rd along SH10 – Kumena (1.2km, $1.4m)
- Putham Road – Warkworth (249m, $400k)
- Wilson Road – Warkworth (990m, $696k)
- Rodney street - Wellsford (230m, $539k)
- Domain Crescent - Munwai (539m, $770k)
- Falls Road – Warkworth (417m, $359k)
- Goodall Road - Snells Beach (216m, $310k)
- Blue Gum Drive - Warkworth (449m, $645k)
- Dairy Flat Highway - Dairy Flat (815m, $1.1m)
- Matakana Road - Matakana (2.1km, $717k)
- Leigh Road – Whanipateau (259m, $372k)
- Puhoi Library to the Krippner Road Bridge (tbc, $255k)
- Puhoi to State Highway 1 (tbc, $455k)
- Kahikatea Flat Road – Waitoki (345m, $495k)
- Omaha Drive - Omaha (800m, $1.1m)
- Rodney Street - Wellsford (330m, $1.08k)
- Rodney Street - Wellsford (Centennial Park Road), (375m, $123k)
- Sandspit Road - Sandspit (924m, $303k)
- Worker Road - Wellsford (259m, $505k)
- School Road – Wellsford (544m, $178k)
- State Highway 1 – Wellsford (tbc, $190k)
- Mckinney Road – Warkworth (tbc, $867k)

**Estimated maintenance costs for footpaths are roughly $275 dollars per km, per annum. Because the footpaths programme has not been prioritised, AT has included a nominal amount of $30,000 for maintenance of footpaths over 10 years. The programme may need to be revised from time to time in light of operational factors. Indicative location is depicted in appendix A, figure 1.**

**As per RLTP:** This programme has been considered in the draft RLTP, which has provisioned $30m in the draft RLTP. However, when compared to other project proposals for funding, this programme has not been identified as high priority and therefore unlikely to get funding.

**Beneficiaries:** Although individual projects many benefit residents in the local area, the overall programme provides benefits across Rodney’s township by enhancing localised amenity and promoting walking and cycling in the community.

**Rationale for Beneficiaries:** New footpath proposals are primarily in the urban areas and would benefit town centres, bus stops, education intuition, employment areas, significant community areas. Priority is given to those footpaths which lie within 300m from these areas, along with safety and connection to existing footpath...
and growth area and other considerations. As per the attached map, these priority footpaths are reasonably
disperse in Rodney and seeks to address infrastructure deficit and provide a basic network of footpaths where
key gaps are identified. This is depicted in appendix A, figure 1.

**Summary of costs for option 3: Distributed benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>10 year OPEX</th>
<th>10 year CAPEX</th>
<th>10 year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Huapai to Westgate</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Riverhead to Westgate</td>
<td>5,270,416</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>5,470,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitworth Park and Ride</td>
<td>285,208</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>395,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huapai Park and Ride investigation</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal extension</td>
<td>1,100,628</td>
<td>12,448,272</td>
<td>13,548,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New footpaths</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>14,025,826</td>
<td>14,055,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,965,282</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,664,668</strong></td>
<td><strong>41,630,950</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All costs are indicative only and are subject to further review. Delivery will be phased, to be aligned with revenue generated from targeted rate. The programme will continue to be updated as new information becomes available.

**Summary of costs for option 3: Differential benefits based on Rodney subdivision**

**Kunes Subdivision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>10 year OPEX</th>
<th>10 year CAPEX</th>
<th>10 year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Huapai to Westgate</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service from Riverhead to Westgate</td>
<td>5,270,416</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>5,470,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huapai Park n Ride investigation</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal Extensions</td>
<td>156,695</td>
<td>4,814,848</td>
<td>4,971,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Footpaths</td>
<td>11,068</td>
<td>5,146,608</td>
<td>5,157,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,739,679</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,961,456</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,701,135</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dairy Flat Subdivision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>10 year OPEX</th>
<th>10 year CAPEX</th>
<th>10 year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Footpaths</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>1,667,816</td>
<td>1,670,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,111</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,667,816</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,670,927</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Waitworth Subdivision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>10 year OPEX</th>
<th>10 year CAPEX</th>
<th>10 year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waitworth Park n Ride</td>
<td>285,208</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>395,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal Extensions</td>
<td>897,228</td>
<td>5,872,728</td>
<td>6,769,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Footpaths</td>
<td>12,310</td>
<td>6,891,587</td>
<td>6,903,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>Wellsford Subdivision</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>994,745</td>
<td>12,674,315</td>
<td>13,669,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAL Ext</td>
<td>246,735</td>
<td>2,180,698</td>
<td>2,427,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Foot</td>
<td>2,612</td>
<td>1,220,015</td>
<td>1,222,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>249,346</td>
<td>3,380,711</td>
<td>3,630,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,986,282</td>
<td>31,684,098</td>
<td>40,670,380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All costs are indicative only and are subjected to further review. Delivery will be phased to be aligned with revenue generated from targeted rates. The program will continue to be updated as new information becomes available.
Appendix A: Supporting information for option 3

Figure 1: Proposed projects in Rodney, distributed benefits (Option 3 – Revised proposal)
Figure 2: Proposed projects in Rodney, differential benefits based on Rodney subdivision (Option 3 – Revised proposal)
Figure 3: Bus service from Huapai to Westgate
Based on 500m catchment from bus stops

Figure 4: Bus service from Riverhead to Westgate
Based on 500m catchment from bus stops
### Attachment C: Legislative information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor's intent reference</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Financial strategy</td>
<td>Yes Requires capital investment of $32.3 million over ten years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Infrastructure strategy</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on rates</td>
<td>Yes New targeted rate introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on debt</td>
<td>Yes The majority of the proposed capital expenditure will be spread over time to allow cash funding by the targeted rate. Some additional borrowing, up to $4 million, may be required to support the Huapai park and ride depending on its timing in relation to other capital expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on levels of service</td>
<td>No Increase in service level in Rodney Local Board area. Service level increase not material on a regional basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with other council plans</td>
<td>No Projects to be funded bring forward some investments in RLTP and add others not presently included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in ownership or control of a strategic asset</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local board feedback on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill

File No.: CP2018/07982

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide an opportunity for local boards to formally provide feedback on the government’s Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. The Government introduced the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill (the Bill) into Parliament on 5 April 2018. The Bill has been referred to Select Committee and submissions are now open.
3. On 1 May 2018, the Planning Committee approved that staff would develop a submission on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill and established a political working group to approve the final submission.
4. The political working group consists of the chair and deputy chair of the Planning Committee, chair and deputy chair of the Environment and Community Committee, chair and deputy chair of the Community Development and Safety Committee, a member of the Independent Māori Statutory Board and two local board chairs.
5. The Bill seeks to address two main areas:
   - to reinstate the purpose of local government to promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of communities
   - to restore the power to collect development contributions for a wider group of infrastructure projects.
6. Both of these areas can have significant impact on council’s way of working, as they define local government’s purpose and its ability to collect funds.
7. In both 2012 and 2014 changes were made to the Local Government Act 2002 (the Act) regarding these two main themes. Auckland Council made submissions opposing those changes. The submission to this new Bill will be founded on the evidence from those previous submissions.
8. Broadly the submission intends to support the amendments. However, staff require time to ensure a robust analysis of any potential impact, particularly of the development contribution changes.
9. To develop a submission, staff will work across the council family, including CCOs, and with the Independent Māori Statutory Board.
10. An opportunity is provided for local boards to formally provide feedback on the government’s Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill.
11. Submissions on the Bill close on 25 May 2018. Due to the tight timeframes, local boards need to provide their feedback for consideration by 16 May. Any formal feedback received after 16 May and before 21 May 2018 will be attached to the final submission.
12. In order to meet timeframes for the Governing Body meeting on this matter the local board has provided informal feedback on the Bill, this is attached as Attachment A to the agenda report for retrospective approval.
Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Rodney Local Board:

a) retrospectively approve the feedback on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill attached as Attachment A to the agenda report.

Horopaki / Context

13. The Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill (the Bill) has two main themes:
   - to reinstate the purpose of local government to promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of communities
   - to restore the power to collect development contributions for a wider group of infrastructure projects.

14. Specifically, the Bill seeks to:
   - restore the purpose of local government to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities, taking a sustainable development approach
   - restore territorial authorities' power to collect development contributions for any public amenities needed as a consequence of development
   - make a minor technical modification to the development contributions power to allow territorial authorities to collect development contributions for projects financed through financial advances from the New Zealand Transport Authority.

15. The Governance and Administration Select Committee deadline for submissions on the Bill is 25 May 2018.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

16. The Local Government Act 2002 Amendment Act 2012 made significant changes to the purpose of local government through an amendment to section 10. This removed the focus on social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of communities and reoriented the purpose towards the provision of cost-effective infrastructure and core services.

17. In 2014, there was another amendment to the Act which made an array of changes including to the development contributions regime. This limited territorial authorities' ability to collect development contributions for community amenities (e.g. sports grounds, swimming pools and libraries).


19. The development of this submission will be based on the evidence of the council’s previous submissions on the Act.

20. Broadly the submission intends to support the amendments. However, staff require the remaining time to gain input from subject matter experts across the council family and ensure a robust analysis of the impact, particularly of the development contribution changes.

21. In order to meet timeframes for the Governing Body meeting on this matter the local board has provided informal feedback on the Bill, this is attached as Attachment A to the agenda report for retrospective approval.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

22. An opportunity is provided for all local boards to provide formal feedback. Local Board Services sent out an email on 13 April to all local board members outlining the objectives of the Bill and that staff would be requesting local board involvement.

23. Submissions on the Bill close on 25 May 2018. Due to the tight timeframes, local boards need to provide their feedback for consideration by 16 May. Any formal feedback received after 16 May and before 21 May 2018 will be attached to the final submission.

24. Additionally, two local board chairs have been invited to participate on the political working group that endorses the final council submission.

25. The proposed restoration of the purpose of local government to include social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being aligns well with local boards planning for and delivering on issues of local importance, as defined in the Local Board Plans.

26. The restoration of local government’s power to collect development contributions will allow for better access to funding of key local facilities that are of significant interest to local boards such as swimming pools and sports grounds.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

27. The Bill’s proposed changes align well with the Independent Māori Statutory Board’s Māori Plan for Tāmaki Makaurau that describes the implementation of their key directions through the lens of the four pou of social, cultural, economic and environmental wellbeing areas.

28. Māori experience disproportionately high negative social, economic and health outcomes. The reinstating of a more holistic purpose of local government could have a positive impact on Māori by refocusing local government decisions to require consideration of broader outcomes.

29. Council staff will seek to engage and receive input from mana whenua by email. Staff will also seek input from the Independent Māori Statutory Board.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

30. There are no anticipated negative financial implications from supporting the Bill, however, staff will work with the finance team to identify and analyse any impact.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

31. If the local board does not contribute to the submission, then there is a risk that Auckland Council family’s position on this Bill will not include their insights.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
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Feedback on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill 2018 (Parliamentary Select Committee submission)

From: The Rodney Local Board
Date: 21 May 2018 (to be retrospectively approved on 24 May)

Executive Summary

1. The Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill seeks to restore the purpose of local government to be to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of communities, taking a sustainable development approach. It also restores territorial authorities’ power to collect development contributions for any public amenities needed as a consequence of development. Broader the definition of community infrastructure and makes a minor modification to the development contributions power.

2. Council’s Planning Committee is considering preparing a council submission on the Bill, which would be presented to the Governing Body for approval. The deadline for submissions to the Governance and Administration Select Committee is 25 May 2018.

3. Local boards may provide input on the matters that are the subject of the Bill.

Rodney Local Board Feedback:
The Rodney Local Board:

a) Provide the following feedback to the Governing Body on the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill 2018 (the Bill) for inclusion in a submission to the parliamentary select committee:

General Comments

i. note that council operates in a restrained funding environment where the demand for new infrastructure, which is the result of considerable growth, vastly exceeds the amount of funding available

ii. broadly support the intention of the Bill which recognises the reality that new development requires appropriate council services and community facilities

iii. agree that it is appropriate that a ‘developer’ generating additional demand for infrastructure contributes to meeting the capital costs that council must incur to support this increased demand

Part 1: The Four Well-beings

iv. does not support the re-introduction of the ‘four well-beings’ being the “social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being of [a] district or region” as proposed in sections 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9 of the Bill

v. note that there are no measures to assess the ‘four well-beings’ in the Bill and that the definition of “social, economic, environmental, and cultural well-being” will vary from territorial authority to territorial authority

vi. if the ‘four well-beings’ are included, then recommend a definition be included in the Bill of what these are and how they can be measured, which will provide for a consistent, national approach

vii. express concern that the reintroduction of the ‘four well-beings’ will require council’s to continually report on or give effect to the ‘four well-beings’ and this will require significant investment of resources

viii. does not support section 6 of the Bill, being the repeal of section 10(1)(b) of the Local Government Act 2002, which would remove the requirement for local government to
perform its functions “...in a way that is most cost-effective for households and businesses”

ix. note that ratepayers expect local government to act in a cost-effective manner and the repeal of section 10(1)(b) is inconsistent with ratepayer expectations for their local council

Part 2: Other Amendments

x. supports section 11 of the Bill which expands the definition of “community infrastructure” and permits territorial authorities to collect development contributions for a much broader range of public amenities

xi. supports section 12 of the Bill, which repeals section 198A of the Local Government Act and will allow territorial authorities to require development contributions for reserves if a development is non-residential in nature

xii. supports section 13 of the Bill, as it will allow territorial authorities to collect development contributions to repay financial advances from the New Zealand Transport Agency necessary to provide reserves, network infrastructure, or community infrastructure

Authorisation

The Rodney Local Board members have been consulted and asked to provide feedback regarding the Local Government (Community Well-being) Amendment Bill 2018.

This feedback is informal feedback, subject to retrospective approval at a business meeting on 24 May 2018.

Beth Houlbrooke
Chairperson
Rodney Local Board
Date: 23 May 2018

Contact Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Rodney Local Board, Auckland Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address:</td>
<td>C/- Kathryn Martin, Senior Local Board Advisor, Rodney Local Board, Auckland Council, Orewa Service Centre, Private Bag 92300 Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone number:</td>
<td>Kathryn Martin, Senior Local Board Advisor 09 427 3252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email contact:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kathryn.aileen.martin@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz">Kathryn.aileen.martin@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>