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Terms of Reference

Responsibilities
This committee deals with all strategy and policy decision-making that is not the responsibility of another committee or the Governing Body. Key responsibilities include:

- Development and monitoring of strategy, policy and action plans associated with environmental, social, economic and cultural activities
- Natural heritage
- Parks and reserves
- Economic development
- Protection and restoration of Auckland’s ecological health
- Climate change
- The Southern Initiative
- Waste minimisation
- Libraries
- Acquisition of property relating to the committee’s responsibilities and within approved annual budgets
  - Performing the delegations made by the Governing Body to the former Parks, Recreation and Heritage Forum and Regional Development and Operations Committee, under resolution GB/2012/157 in relation to dogs
- Activities of the following CCOs:
  - ATEED
  - RFA

Powers

(i) All powers necessary to perform the committee’s responsibilities, including:
   (a) approval of a submission to an external body
   (b) establishment of working parties or steering groups.

(ii) The committee has the powers to perform the responsibilities of another committee, where it is necessary to make a decision prior to the next meeting of that other committee.

(iii) The committee does not have:
   (a) the power to establish subcommittees
   (b) powers that the Governing Body cannot delegate or has retained to itself (section 2)
Exclusion of the public – who needs to leave the meeting

Members of the public
All members of the public must leave the meeting when the public are excluded unless a resolution is passed permitting a person to remain because their knowledge will assist the meeting.

Those who are not members of the public

General principles
- Access to confidential information is managed on a “need to know” basis where access to the information is required in order for a person to perform their role.
- Those who are not members of the meeting (see list below) must leave unless it is necessary for them to remain and hear the debate in order to perform their role.
- Those who need to be present for one confidential item can remain only for that item and must leave the room for any other confidential items.
- In any case of doubt, the ruling of the chairperson is final.

Members of the meeting
- The members of the meeting remain (all Governing Body members if the meeting is a Governing Body meeting; all members of the committee if the meeting is a committee meeting).
- However, standing orders require that a councillor who has a pecuniary conflict of interest leave the room.
- All councillors have the right to attend any meeting of a committee and councillors who are not members of a committee may remain, subject to any limitations in standing orders.

Independent Māori Statutory Board
- Members of the Independent Māori Statutory Board who are appointed members of the committee remain.
- Independent Māori Statutory Board members and staff remain if this is necessary in order for them to perform their role.

Staff
- All staff supporting the meeting (administrative, senior management) remain.
- Other staff who need to because of their role may remain.

Local Board members
- Local Board members who need to hear the matter being discussed in order to perform their role may remain. This will usually be if the matter affects, or is relevant to, a particular Local Board area.

Council Controlled Organisations
- Representatives of a Council Controlled Organisation can remain only if required to for discussion of a matter relevant to the Council Controlled Organisation
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1 Apologies

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

2 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.

3 Confirmation of Minutes

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) confirm the ordinary minutes of its meeting, held on Tuesday, 8 May 2018, including the confidential section, as a true and correct record.

4 Petitions

4.1 Against the poisoning of the Hunua Ranges with 1080 insecticide

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To present a petition to the Environment and Community Committee.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Lynn Usmani, will present a petition to the Environment and Community Committee. The prayer of the petition is as follows:

“The World Health Organization (WHO) classifies 1080 as ‘Extremely Hazardous’ and most countries ban it outright, yet NZ continues to use 1080 insecticide (Sodium mono-fluoroacetate, a class A toxin).

1080 is a lethal metabolic poison which is extremely toxic to all air-breathing organisms. The massacre of insects, birds, pests, deer, pigs, livestock, native fauna and pets is a national tragedy. We believe that anyone who endorses the aerial spreading of this deadly insecticide are GUILTY OF CRUELTY. To allow animals to have a slow and torturous death, often up to 2 days, UNDER THE GUISE OF A NECESSARY EVIL IS DISGRACEFUL!

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) thank Lynn Usmani for her attendance
b) receive the petition in relation to the use of 1080 in the Hunua Ranges
c) request that the petition be forwarded to the Chief Operating Officer of Auckland Council for consideration.

5 Public Input

Standing Order 7.7 provides for Public Input. Applications to speak must be made to the Governance Advisor, in writing, no later than one (1) clear working day prior to the meeting and must include the subject matter. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders. A maximum of thirty (30) minutes is allocated to the period for public input with five (5) minutes speaking time for each speaker.
5.1 Zero Carbon Act endorsement - Generation Zero

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) receive and note the public input presentation from Ellie Craft, Generation Zero regarding the Zero Carbon Act.

6 Local Board Input

Standing Order 6.2 provides for Local Board Input. The Chairperson (or nominee of that Chairperson) is entitled to speak for up to five (5) minutes during this time. The Chairperson of the Local Board (or nominee of that Chairperson) shall wherever practical, give one (1) day’s notice of their wish to speak. The meeting Chairperson has the discretion to decline any application that does not meet the requirements of Standing Orders.

This right is in addition to the right under Standing Order 6.1 to speak to matters on the agenda.

At the close of the agenda no requests for local board input had been received.

7 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."

8 **Notices of Motion**

There were no notices of motion.
Hearing Panel Recommendations on the Draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018

File No.: CP2018/08842

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report


Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. Auckland Council must adopt a new waste management and minimisation plan by 30 June 2018. The draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 was publicly notified on 28 February 2018. The council received 6,759 submissions, and a Hearing Panel was convened to consider written and oral submissions. The Hearing Panel heard from 57 submitters and 12 Local Boards over 5 days of hearings.

3. The Hearing Panel members were Cr Penny Hulse (chair), Cr Linda Cooper, Cr Daniel Newman, Cr Wayne Walker and Independent Maori Statutory Board member Glenn Wilcox.

4. The Hearing Panel’s report provides the findings arising from the written and oral submissions and includes recommendations for revisions to the draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018.

5. The Hearing Panel’s report underwent a minor update following the adoption of the ten-year budget. This update deleted the ‘opt out’ rating option for food scraps collections so that the proposed revised waste plan is aligned to the budget decisions made by the Governing Body on 31 May 2018 (Resolution number GB/2018/91). This change was supported by all members of the Hearing Panel.


Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve the revisions recommended by the Hearing Panel to the draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018: Working Together for Zero Waste, as outlined in their deliberations report (Attachment A of the agenda report)

b) adopt the revised Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan: Working together for Zero Waste (Attachment B of the agenda report), as recommended by the Hearing Panel

c) authorise the Chairperson of the Hearing Panel, in consultation with the General Manager Waste Solutions, to make any minor edits or amendments to the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan: Working Together for Zero Waste to correct any identified errors or typographical edits.
Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Deliberations meeting of the hearing panel on the draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018: Working Together for Zero Waste</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTE: Due to the size of the document (193 pages) 2 copies will be made available for viewing on Level 26, 135 Albert Street, Auckland. This document will also be available on the Auckland Council website at the following link: <a href="http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/">http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Local board resolutions on the Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 from business meetings 1 to 10 May 2018</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Julie McKee – Team Leader Hearings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoriser</td>
<td>Koro Dickinson – Lead Officer</td>
</tr>
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</table>
Hearing Panel Recommendations on the Draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To adopt the draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan: Working Together for Zero Waste, as recommended by the Hearing Panel.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Auckland Council must adopt a new waste management and minimisation plan by 30 June 2018. The draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 was publicly notified on 28 February 2018. The council received 6,759 submissions, and a Hearing Panel was convened to consider written and oral submissions.
3. This report provides the findings of the Hearing Panel, including recommendations for revisions arising from submissions (see Attachment B). The revisions do not significantly change the strategic direction of the draft plan but provide clarification.
4. The Hearing Panel has identified:
   i. revisions to help to clarify the respective roles of the council and the private sector in the provision of waste services
   ii. a need for the council to offer further flexibility and to support communities as they make the transition to the new food scraps collection, as well as subsequent changes to the frequency of kerbside refuse collections. Specifically, this means:
      a. a clearer commitment to maintaining the weekly kerbside refuse collection until the food scraps collection is well embedded
      b. acknowledging that if the food scraps collection takes longer than planned to embed, it may impact budgets, resulting in an increase in the tag price for the pay-as-you-throw refuse collection.
   iii. that litter, illegal dumping and marine waste should be elevated to a ninth priority action within the plan, in recognition of significant public and local board concern
   iv. that demand for community recycling centres in addition to the 12 sites proposed will be addressed through a review of priorities, budget (including alternate funding sources) and the role of the council and other parties in the delivery of the centres.
5. Some submitters raised questions around the alignment of the draft plan with the cost-effectiveness review being undertaken under section 17A of the Local Government Act. The findings of the S17A review align with the draft plan’s strategic direction and a number of the key actions recommended in the S17A review have been included in the draft waste plan. The review will continue to inform implementation of the plan.
6. Finally, the Hearing Panel recommends that the revised plan be adopted by the Environment and Community Committee.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendations
That the Environment and Community Committee

a) approve the revisions recommended by the Hearing Panel to the draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018: Working Together for Zero Waste, as outlined in their deliberations report (Attachment B)

b) adopt the revised Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan: Working together for Zero Waste (Attachment C), as recommended by the Hearing Panel
c) authorise the Chairperson of the Hearing Panel, in consultation with the General Manager Waste Solutions, to make relevant amendments to the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan: Working Together for Zero Waste.

**Horopaki / Context**


8. The draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan: Working Together for Zero Waste 2018, sets out a range of proposed actions and initiatives that will be implemented over the next six years (the life of the plan) along with a proposed vision and targets.

9. The draft plan was developed in collaboration with mana whenua and mataawaka to ensure it reflects Te Ao Māori and priorities for Māori. Input was also sought from local boards and key stakeholders including the waste and recycling industry, the community sector, the business sector and youth.

10. The draft plan proposes to continue implementation of changes to household waste and recycling services as outlined in the Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2012. It also proposes to expand the focus beyond the 20 per cent of waste that council currently manages to include the 80 per cent of waste that is commercially generated and managed.


12. This regional plan included a specific waste management and minimisation plan for the Hauraki Gulf Islands – Getting to Zero Waste: Tikapa Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands Waste Plan 2018 (see Attachment C).

13. Consultation opened on 28 February 2018 and closed on 28 March 2018 and was undertaken in parallel with the Long-term Plan 2018-2028 process.

14. At the close of the submission period, 6,759 submissions had been received, both online and in hard copy form. Of these 4,605 were pro forma online submissions from the Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance, 239 were pro forma online submissions from other organisations, and the remaining 1,914 submissions were from individuals, businesses and community organisations.

15. The consultation feedback form provided by the council was used for 1,834 submissions. Ninety-six informal submissions from school children were provided as drawings and four videos were received from rangatahi from a kura kaupapa Māori.

16. The Hearing Panel heard around 50 oral submissions and informal feedback from 12 local boards over five days from 30 April 2018 to 7 May 2018.

**Feedback on key directions of the plan**

17. Analysis of the responses to the consultation feedback form revealed a number of key themes, as detailed below.

i. When council makes decisions about waste the most important outcomes for submitters are:
   - reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions (26 per cent)
   - reducing environmental and marine pollution (26 per cent)
   - delivering value for money for ratepayers and Aucklanders (14 per cent)
   - tidy public places (13 per cent).
ii. Strong support for council to expand its efforts to address business and commercial waste (84 per cent of submitters agreed or strongly agreed)

iii. Strong support for council to address commercial construction and demolition waste, plastic and organic waste (87 per cent of submitters agreed or strongly agreed)

iv. Strong support for council to continue establishing community recycling centres (86 per cent of submitters agreed or strongly agreed)

v. Strong support for council to advocate to central government to introduce product stewardship schemes, including a container deposit scheme (84 per cent of submitters agreed or strongly agreed)

vi. Support for the approach of the Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands Draft Waste Plan (51 per cent of submitters agreed or strongly agreed, 28 per cent of submitters didn’t know).

18. Because the Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance pro forma submissions did not specifically comment on the questions relating to key directions included in the draft plan, they were not included in the analysis of percentages of those who did or did not support each key direction shown above.

Other issues raised

19. Other issues commonly raised by submitters under the ‘Any other comments’ section of the feedback form were:
   - general support for increasing the waste levy
   - qualified support for a domestic food scraps collection with some comments over the inability to opt out, the proposed funding mechanism and the centralised processing model
   - the need for more education and communication around waste minimisation.

20. The Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance pro forma submissions addressed only two issues; opposing an increase in the waste levy and ‘a reduction in collection services at an increased cost’, presumably relating to the proposed move to fortnightly refuse collections.

21. The pro forma submissions also gave their support to the Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance detailed submission. This opposed much of the draft plan, including the introduction of a food scraps collection, and argued that the draft plan does not pay sufficient regard to the recommendations of the Domestic Waste: Value for Money S17A report.

22. Public deliberations on the draft plan submissions were held on 11 May 2018. The Hearing Panel worked through the issues raised by submitters and agreed a response to these, as shown in the deliberations report in Attachment B.

23. As part of the Long-term Plan consultation, 2,044 formal submissions commented on waste. Key topics discussed were waste collection services (refuse, recycling and inorganics), the food scraps collection, littering, illegal dumping and enforcement.

24. This feedback was analysed and has been provided to elected members for their consideration through the Long-term Plan decision making process. Feedback gathered through the Long-term Plan process on initiatives included in the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan, such as the food scraps collection, has also informed the deliberations of the Hearing Panel.

Tātaritanga me nga tohutohu / Analysis and advice

25. The recommendations of the Hearing Panel follow in Table 1. They address the eight priority actions outlined in the draft plan and other key issues brought up during consultation as per the deliberations meeting report (see Attachment B).
Table 1. Recommendations of the Hearing Panel for changes to the draft plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Panel direction</th>
<th>Reference to plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>• No change</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>• No change</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>• Clarify the role of the council and the private sector in ‘developing</td>
<td>Sections 8.2.2, 8.5, 8.6 and 9.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>infrastructure and processes to enable resource recovery’ (objective 4).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Action 1: Advocate for an increased waste levy</td>
<td>• Amend action to ensure that the views of submitters (in particular OJI Fibre</td>
<td>Section 9.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solutions and the Scrap Metal Recycling Association of NZ) are taken into account</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>when advocating to central government for an increased waste levy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Action 2: Advocate for product stewardship</td>
<td>• Include wording that Auckland Council seeks to be included in designing a</td>
<td>Section 9.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>container deposit scheme to ensure it reflects community needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Action 3: Address three priority commercial waste streams</td>
<td>• Emphasise council’s role as a facilitator and partner in addressing</td>
<td>Section 9.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(construction and demolition, organic and plastic waste)</td>
<td>commercial waste.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Correct the reference to plasterboard processing to show Green Gorilla’s</td>
<td>Section 9.3.3 (box)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Make reference to food rescue initiatives.</td>
<td>Section 9.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Where appropriate, change ‘food waste’ to reflect wasted food as a resource,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taking into account food safety standards.</td>
<td>Section 9.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Action 4: Continue establishing the resource recovery</td>
<td>• Note that demand for community recycling centres in addition to the 12 sites</td>
<td>Section 9.3.4 and Action 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>network</td>
<td>proposed will be addressed through a review of priorities, budget (including</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alternate funding sources) and the role of the council and other parties in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>delivery of community recycling centres. Note that the budget and role of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>council will be considered through the ten-year budget and section 17A review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Action 5: Continue transitioning to consistent kerbside</td>
<td>• Modify to say that the council will continue to provide weekly kerbside</td>
<td>Sections 8.6 and 9.3.6 and Action 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waste and recycling services</td>
<td>refuse collections until the kerbside food scraps collection is well embedded,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerbside refuse</td>
<td>after which refuse collections will be reviewed before moving to fortnightly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Panel direction</td>
<td>Reference to plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Kerbside recycling                         | • The panel note that this will require an adjustment to the current budget and this could be reflected in increased pay as you throw refuse charges and operational budgets in the Long-term Budget.  
• Amend the action on procurement processes to include a reference to council purchases alongside the physical works projects.  
• Add a new action for the council to work with central government and other local authorities across Australasia to explore how the remanufacturing infrastructure should be supported to develop new markets for recyclable materials (particularly from kerbside recycling collections). | Action 50  
Action 89  
n/a  
n/a |
| Inorganic collection                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                              | n/a                        |
| Multi-unit dwellings                       | • No change  
• No change                                                                                                                                                                                               | n/a                        |
| Priority Action 6: Deliver the domestic collection of food scraps | • Include ‘support redistribution of food through food rescue initiatives’ as a fourth approach to food waste, while recognising the council’s continuing commitment to food safety standards.  
• Include comment on the importance of valuing the nutrients of food scraps and minimising transportation emissions in the procurement process used for the processing plant. | Section 9.3.7 and Action 79  
Section 9.3.7 (box)                                                                                                                                                |
| Priority Action 7: Address waste diversion from council operations | • Note the important role elected members can play in reducing council waste and the power of council procurement practices to influence this.                                                                 | Section 9.3.8 and Action 50 |
| Priority Action 8: Partner with others to achieve a Zero Waste Auckland | • Include an additional action for the council to work collaboratively with Business Improvement Districts and local boards to reduce business waste.                                                                 | Action 86                  |
| Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands Draft Waste Plan | • Change reference to ‘Community Recycling Centre’ to ‘Community Resource Recovery Park.’  
• Update timeframes for contract renewal for the transfer station from 2019 to 2020.                                                                                                          | In Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands Waste Plan |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Panel direction</th>
<th>Reference to plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Great Barrier</strong></td>
<td>• Include comment on the need to trial a system for source-separated recycling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other issues raised during consultation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter, illegal dumping and marine waste</td>
<td>• Add a ninth priority action to address litter, illegal dumping and marine waste.</td>
<td>Section 9.3.5 and 9.4 and Actions 26-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add a new action to work across council to coordinate issues related to waste in the marine environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Add a new action to work with local boards to develop local solutions for litter and illegal dumping and seek local board funding to support this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase Waste Solutions’ budget by $200,000 per annum for litter and illegal dumping initiatives to support localised solutions in ‘hot spot’ areas.</td>
<td>Included in draft Long-term Plan 2018-2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazardous, medical and sanitary waste</strong></td>
<td>All amendments in this section apply. In particular, the amendments in this section are intended to align with the proposed amendments to the Auckland Unitary Plan.</td>
<td>Actions 84 and 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Amend actions on medical and dental wastes, and nappies and sanitary products to emphasise that the council will work with industry.</td>
<td>Action 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Amend actions to address the classification and disposal of medical waste and sanitary waste in the Solid Waste Bylaw review.</td>
<td>Action 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Include reference to batteries, in particular lithium batteries, and amend actions to include the need to develop an action plan within six months of adoption of the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan that addresses batteries and other specific household hazardous items.</td>
<td>Action 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Include an action to advocate for a waste tracking system for all commercial hazardous waste.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleanfills and managed fills</strong></td>
<td>• No change</td>
<td>Section 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 17A review</strong></td>
<td>• Include wording to clarify the council’s responsibilities under the Waste Minimisation Act 2008 and the Local Government Act 2002, in particular section 17A, and how they relate to each other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe /

Local impacts and local board views

26. Local boards were asked to provide feedback on the proposed direction of the draft plan through workshops and reports to business meetings from September 2017 to November 2017. All 21 local boards provided formal feedback on the plan through resolutions at business meetings in May 2018 (see full resolutions in Attachment D).

27. During consultation Upper Harbour Local Board gave informal written feedback on the draft plan, providing their notice of motion to support development of a community recycling centre in Albany.

28. A total of 12 local boards also provided informal, oral feedback to the Hearings Panel. These were: Albert-Eden, Aotea Great Barrier, Franklin, Hibiscus and Bays, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Manurewa, Ōrākei, Papakura, Puketāpapa, Rodney, Waiheke, and Waitakaruru Local Boards.

Key themes arising from feedback

29. In general, local boards supported the key directions included in the draft plan, particularly the priority actions to raise the waste levy, address commercial waste, and establish community recycling centres.

30. A number of boards supported the establishment of community recycling centres in their area, with Māngere-Ōtāhuhu, Manurewa, Ōtara-Papatoetoe and Papakura stating the establishment of a southern community recycling centre should be a priority.

31. Some concerns were raised around the kerbside food scraps collection. Some local boards raised specific details, such as wanting residents to have the ability to opt-out or for it to be a user pays system. Some boards also supported investigating expansion to rural townships, potentially as an opt-in/user-pays service, and advocated for decentralised processing.

32. Some boards noted concerns regarding the plan to reduce refuse collections to a fortnightly frequency, and asked to have weekly refuse collections continued.

33. Several local boards noted their interest in working with Business Improvement Districts to address business waste in their areas. Franklin would like to see support for farmers to develop their own waste reduction initiatives.

34. Litter and illegal dumping were concerns for some local boards, particularly those in the south and for rural boards such as Franklin and Rodney. There were requests for council to provide more enforcement and education to address these issues.

35. A number of the southern boards also raised concerns that their communities were finding it challenging to adjust to new waste services. They requested that supporting communities to adjust to future service changes, particularly to pay-as-you throw refuse, be made a priority.

36. Some boards noted concerns regarding the current inorganics service and asked that this either be changed or that the council revert to the old service.

37. Rodney supports introduction of a pay-as-you throw refuse collection service, as this would offer residents choice.

38. Waiheke would like to develop and implement a visitor waste strategy.

39. Finally, some southern boards noted their concerns regarding the consultation process, that it was rushed and that combining consultation on several plans had been confusing to the community.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

40. An overview of Te Ao Māori is included in the draft plan along with Māori priorities which were identified by mana whenua and mataawaka through the initial engagement process. Specific actions outlining how council will work with Māori are also included in the draft plan.
41. Targeted engagement with Māori was undertaken over the consultation period to encourage feedback on the draft plan. The Para Kore ki Tāmaki team promoted the consultation process with Para Kore marae and Māori organisations. Two hui were held as part of the Have Your Say events for the Long-term Plan.

42. As a result of this targeted approach 214 submissions were received from Māori, representing 10 per cent of total submissions (when Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance pro forma submissions are excluded). The majority of these submissions were from Māori residents. Four video submissions were received from rangatahi at Te Kura Kaupapa Māori o Hoani Waititi Marae in te reo; these rangatahi also made an oral submission in te reo.

43. In general, submissions received from Māori were strongly in support of the draft plan and raised similar issues to those described above from all submitters.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

44. The changes to the council’s waste service delivery described through the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan will have significant financial implications. These have been captured in the draft Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

45. Specific consultation has been carried out on the targeted rate for food scraps collection and the introduction of pay-as-you throw refuse in the legacy Manukau and Auckland City areas. Some of the changes to these services proposed by the Hearing Panel will have financial implications which are being considered through the Long-term Plan decision making process.

46. As noted above, the Hearing Panel also made a specific decision to increase Waste Solutions’ budget by $200,000 per annum for litter and illegal dumping initiatives to support localised solutions in ‘hot spot’ areas. This has been included in draft Long-term Plan 2018-2028 budgets.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

47. The key risks involved in the revisions recommended to the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan have been considered by the Hearing Panel.

48. A risk arising from the key directions in the plan, is that the advocacy to raise the waste levy is dependent on central government support. This will also be essential to ensure the success of the council’s plan to work with the commercial sector to reduce waste.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

49. Once the final version is adopted, the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan: Working Together for Zero Waste 2018 will form the basis for the council’s work planning for the next six years.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliberations meeting of the hearing panel on the draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018: Working Together for Zero Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local board resolutions on the Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 from business meetings 1 to 10 May 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

| Author      | Cr Penny Hulse, Chair of the Hearing Panel |
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Deliberations meeting of the hearing panel on the draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018: Working Together for Zero Waste

Purpose

1. To provide a summary of the public consultation and recommendations from the hearing panel to inform deliberations on the draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018

- This report is intended to help guide the Hearing Panel through the decision-making process on the draft plan that was sent out for consultation by Auckland Council from 28 February – 28 March 2018.
- It addresses the vision, targets and goals of the draft plan, and the eight priority actions. It also introduces several issues arising from the submissions that could be given greater prominence in the draft plan.
- The consultation feedback form for the draft plan contained questions about the key directions on which the draft plan was based.
- The statistics drawn from the submissions are included when appropriate, alongside a limited high level description of the tenor of submitters’ and Local Boards’ oral and written comments.
- The consultation feedback form included an open question (Question 7) which asked for any other comments. The response to this question forms the basis for comment on topic areas for which there was no specific question.
- Alongside the Panel’s recommendations on each subject area, specific comments for inclusion in the draft plan may be added.

Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018

1. Vision, Goals, Targets

The proposed vision, goals and targets for this plan are largely the same as for the 2012 WMMP, with clarifications and additions to reflect progress since the first plan was written. Few submissions commented specifically on these preacing sections of the plan.

1.1. Vision

The draft plan proposes to: confirm and continue the vision set out in the first plan in 2012: Zero Waste by 2040:

* Auckland aspires to be Zero Waste by 2040, taking care of people and the environment and turning waste into resources.*
a. Submission statistics

No specific question in the submission form

b. Submission themes

Many submissions (mostly pro formas) mention ‘zero waste’ specifically (‘I want Auckland to be Zero Waste by 2040’), and the concept/vision was implicit in many comments recorded. There were a handful of comments that New Zealand’s clean green image is either a fallacy, or is under threat from our bad waste habits, and therefore we need to move towards zero waste.

The Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance submission does not explicitly disagree with the Zero Waste vision, but argues that the WMMP ‘appears to prescribe an ideological vision of increasing the Council’s influence and control over the waste stream.’ It emphasises a narrower range of priorities centred on cost effectiveness and ratepayer preferences, and identifies the low cost of landfilling as a positive opportunity for households to dispose of their waste. This does not align with a Zero Waste vision’.

c. Local Board comment

Although no specific question was asked about the zero waste vision, Local Boards generally expressed support for this. No objections were expressed.

d. Proposed changes/ actions from staff in response to issues raised

Te Reo title for the draft plan

Panel direction

No change

1.2. Targets

The draft plan proposes

Total regional waste

Reduce total (council- and private-sector-influenced) waste to landfill by 30 per cent by 2027 (from the baseline of 832kg to 582 kg per capita per year)

This target is unchanged from the first WMMP.

Domestic waste

- Reduce domestic kerbside refuse by 30 per cent by 2021 (from 160 kg to 110 kg per capita per year)
• After 2021, reduce domestic kerbside refuse by a further 20 per cent by 2028 (from 110kg to 88 kg per capita per year)

The timeframe for target (a) has been extended since the first WMMP, from 2018 to 2021. The collection service for food scraps, which is integral to achieving this target, has taken longer to establish than originally envisaged. This revised target allows time for the service to establish. A second target is introduced, to continue to reduce domestic waste after 2021.

**Council waste**

• Reduce council’s own in-house office waste by 60 per cent per capita by 2024 (from a 2012 baseline)
• Work across council to set a baseline for operational wastes and, by 2019, put in place targets for reduction.

With the original target of 30 per cent reduction for office waste achieved, audits have shown that further reduction, in the order of 60 per cent, is possible.

An additional target will be introduced in 2019, following consultation with other council departments and CCOs to gain a better understanding of what waste is being generated and the scale of possible savings.

a. **Submission statistics**
   
   No specific question was included in the submission form

b. **Submission themes**
   
   No specific comments were made on the targets

c. **Local Board comment**
   
   No comments were received from local boards on the targets

**Panel direction**

| No change |

**1.3. Goals**

**The draft plan proposes:**

Three goals, supported by nine objectives as shown below
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#### A. Minimise waste generation

1. Advocate for stronger regulatory incentives to reduce waste
2. Advocate for product stewardship to avoid or reduce waste at source
3. Increase individuals’ sense of personal responsibility for waste reduction

#### B. Maximise opportunities for resource recovery

4. Develop infrastructure and processes to enable resource recovery
5. Identify local economic development opportunities through resource recovery
6. Achieve operational efficiencies in Council’s domestic waste and recycling services

#### C. Reduce harm from residual waste

7. Restrict organic and other harmful waste going to landfill
8. Reduce the incidence of litter and illegal dumping
9. Continue to manage residual waste effectively and efficiently while progressively reducing Auckland’s reliance on landfills

---

#### a. Submission statistics:

No specific questions were asked about the goals and objectives however a related question was:

**Q1. Auckland Council is responsible for managing and minimising waste across the region. When we make a decision about waste, which outcomes are most important to you? (Please select up to 3 options)**

The options identified by submitters were:

- Reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions (26%)
- Reducing environmental and marine pollution (26%)
- Delivering value for money for ratepayers and Aucklanders (14%)
- Tidy public places (13%)
- Reliability of collection services (9%)

Of the six outcomes provided in the formal feedback form the most popular outcomes were ‘Reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions’ (26%) and ‘Reducing environmental and marine pollution’ (26%).

‘Delivering value for money for ratepayers and Aucklanders’ (14%) was the next most important outcome, followed closely by ‘Tidy public places’ (13%).

The 4,605 Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance pro forma submissions emphasised value for money. "As a ratepayer, I submit that instead of coming up with ways to charge me more, that you focus on providing value for money, delivering core services and doing more with less – precisely what the Mayor campaigned on."
b. Submission themes:

There were relatively few comments regarding the proposed outcomes.

Waste Management Ltd in their oral submission said that “Climate change needs to be the overriding factor”.

c. Local Board comment

Hibiscus and Bays Local Board endorses reducing environmental and marine waste and reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions as the top priorities of the WMMP.

Hibiscus and Bays and Upper Harbour Local Boards support delivering value for money for the ratepayers of Auckland in the delivery of waste management and waste minimisation solutions.

Waitematā notes the public feedback on the Draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 (the draft Plan) and the strong support for the overall direction of the draft plan and the proposals consulted on; they confirmed their commitment to the vision of Zero Waste Auckland by 2040, taking care of people and the environment and turning waste into resources and support the overall direction of the draft plan.

d. Proposed changes/actions from staff in response to issues raised

- Strengthen emphasis in the draft plan on the link between greenhouse gas emissions and waste reduction
- Add emphasis on reducing environmental and marine waste
- Modify Objective 4 (page 13 of the draft plan) to make it more explicit that maximising opportunities for resource recovery will require private sector, mana whenua and māori and community sector involvement.

Panel Direction

1. Clarify the role of the council and the private sector in ‘developing infrastructure and processes to enable resource recovery’ (objective 4).
Priority Actions

The draft plan proposes eight priority actions to achieve the vision, goals and targets of the draft plan. These are as follows:

Priority Action 1: Advocate for an increased waste levy

Work with other councils and industry to advocate strongly to central government for an increase in the waste Levy and a review of the waste levy structure.

Reasons for Proposal
Stronger financial incentives to ensure resource recovery is preferred ahead of landfiling and to encourage investment in the resource recovery infrastructure.

a. Submission statistics
There was no specific question asked about the waste levy but Question 7 on the feedback form asked:

Do you have any other comments about the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan?

The Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance (ARA) submitted 4,605 pro forma submissions that opposed council advocating for an increase in the national waste levy.

249 other submitters (including 195 pro forma submissions from Eco Matters Trust) included a comment about the waste levy. The majority of these expressed strong support for an increase in the waste levy.

b. Submission themes
Those in support expressed ‘Strong government lobbying is required to ensure the waste levy is increased to something approaching average international levels. Only with a financial disincentive will companies start looking at options’.

The 195 EcoMatters pro forma submissions stated that ‘I want to see a gradual increase in the landfill waste levy from $10/tonne to $140/tonne’.

The ARA pro forma submissions stated ‘I submit that you do not use ratepayers’ money to lobby government for an increase to the National Waste Levy. An increase will just increase costs for ratepayers on top of your proposed regional fuel tax, and increased rates’. The formal submission from the Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance recommended that ‘Auckland Council should refrain from lobbying to increase the waste levy, … This will impose additional costs for waste disposal and may incentivise illegal dumping.’

They recommend that there should be a full economic analysis prior to commencing.
While most businesses and waste industry players who commented on the waste levy were in support of an increase, it was also suggested that any increase needs to be well-signalled, with staged increase or at a lower level.

**Waste Industry Points Raised:**

- Both Envirowaste Services Ltd and Waste Management NZ Ltd support expanding the waste levy to include all types of disposal sites and increasing it.

- Northland Waste questions the research used by council to support increasing the waste levy. “We invite councillors to question the motive behind this initiative very clearly, and examine without prejudice, the cost implications on this initiative to the average Aucklander.” In their oral submission they also opposed the use of rate payer funding to advocate to government for an increase of the waste levy.

- Green Gorilla support an increase in the waste levy but ‘disagree with the extent of the suggested landfill levy proposals and support a shift to say $50 tonne over 5 years. Higher rates will produce some perverse avoidance outcomes and risk being a financial burden without actually increasing diversion’.

- Both Oji Fibre Solutions and The Scrap Metal Association of NZ submitted that they do not support a blanket increase in the waste levy, unless bona fide recycling operations be exempt or there are rebated levies on waste generated from the reprocessing of materials on a commercial basis.

c. **Local Board comment**

Local Boards generally supported advocating to central government for an increase in the Waste Levy

d. **Proposed actions /changes from staff in response to issues raised**

When advocating to the Ministry for the Environment, suggest that a system be worked out with the industry that reflects the issues raised by Oji Fibre Solutions and The Scrap Metal Recycling Association of NZ.

**Panel Direction**

2. Amend action to ensure that the views of submitters (in particular OJI Fibre Solutions and The Scrap Metal Recycling Association of NZ) are taken into account when advocating to central government for an increased waste levy
Priority Action 2: Advocate for product stewardship

The draft plan proposes:

- Advocate for mandatory, nationwide container deposit scheme for beverage containers and other products such as e-waste tyres and batteries.
- Support voluntary initiatives.

Reason for Proposal

Responsibility for end-of-life disposal moves from ratepayers to producers and consumers. Incentives for products to be designed for reuse and recycling.

a. Submission statistics

Submitters were specifically asked to comment on the question:

Q 5. We want to encourage central government to introduce product stewardship schemes. This includes a container deposit scheme where drink containers such as plastic, glass bottles and cans include a refundable deposit when returned for recycling. This would encourage more recycling and help to shift the costs of recovery from council and ratepayers to the producers and consumers of beverages. What do you think of this approach and why?

84 percent of submitters ‘Agree’ or ‘Strongly Agree’ with the proposal and state that the council should encourage central government to introduce product stewardship schemes.

b. Submission themes

Of the submitters who made comments on product stewardship, the comments were overwhelmingly in support of a container deposit scheme being introduced. ‘Really great way to get more people to recycle. I think this is one of the best ideas the council has had in a long time!!’

Most people commented on the specifics of a container deposit scheme (CDS) rather than product stewardship. Reasons for supporting CDS included the increase in recycling and reduction in littering this would be expected to cause.

Waste and recycling industry submissions generally supported product stewardship

Of the 10 percent of submitters who disagreed or strongly disagreed, the majority of comments stated that a scheme would cost too much or wouldn’t make a difference.

The Packaging Forum operates two voluntary product stewardship schemes and does not agree with the draft WMMP supporting a mandatory container deposit scheme based on the perception that drink containers are being recycled at a low rate and causing a major litter problem. The Forum ‘suggested to Auckland Council officials that we identify the true beverage container recycling rate in Auckland’. The Packaging Council of New Zealand disagrees with the draft WMMP using the terms ‘product stewardship’ and
‘extended producer responsibility’ interchangeably. “Of particular concern is the freedom using the term ‘stewardship’ interchangeably with ‘extended producer responsibility’ gives to Council and consumers to ‘opt out’ of their share of responsibility for waste prevention and management”.

c. Local Board comment
- Hibiscus and Bays supports product stewardship schemes being encouraged and developed across Auckland and the rest of New Zealand
- Upper Harbour supports this approach
- Waitemata supports advocating to central government to introduce Container Deposit legislation to reduce litter, increase recycling streams and create jobs and a source of community funds. They endorse utilising the waste minimisation levy (and potential increase in funding if the waste levy increases) for an increased emphasis on waste education focusing on waste minimisation. And also working with central government to introduce product stewardship schemes.

d. Proposed actions /changes from staff in response to issues raised

Ensure issues raised by submitters are reflected in advocacy on product stewardship.

Panel Direction

3. Include wording that Auckland Council seeks to be included in designing a Container Deposit Scheme to ensure it reflects community needs.

Priority Action 3: Address three priority commercial waste streams (construction and demolition, organic and plastic waste)

The draft plan proposes that the council lead by example with council construction and demolition waste. Partner with industry to identify alternatives for these waste streams.

Reason for proposal

These are the biggest waste streams going to landfill and proposed actions will help reduce total waste to landfill by 30 percent by 2027.

a. Submission statistics

Submitters were specifically asked to comment two questions:

Q2. In the last plan, we focused mostly on our services to households, which handle around 20 percent of the waste that goes to landfill. Now we want to expand our waste minimisation efforts to include the 80 per cent of waste that
comes from businesses and commercial activities. What do you think of this approach as why?

84% of submitters ‘Strongly agree’ or ‘Agree’ with this approach.

However, if pro forma submissions from members of the Auckland Ratepayers Alliance are included, 73% of submitters disagree or strongly disagree with the proposal. It is to be noted that submissions from ARA members did not directly address this issue. In their submissions they reference a formal submission from the ARA disagreeing with this approach.

Q3. The three largest categories of commercial waste going to landfill are construction and demolition waste, plastics, and organic waste (food, green and other types of organic waste). We want to work with businesses to try new approaches to reduce this waste. What do you think of this approach and why?

A strong majority of submitters (87%) ‘Agree’ or ‘Strongly agree’ with council’s proposal to try new approaches to reduce commercial construction and demolition waste, plastics, and organic waste from landfill.

b. Submission themes

Expand waste minimisation to include the 80 percent of waste that comes from commercial activities

Submitters who agreed felt that it was logical for council to include the 80% of waste that comes from business and commercial activities due to the large proportion of the waste it compromises.

Waste Management NZ Ltd and Kalista/Green Gorilla strongly disagreed and had serious concerns about council taking a more active role in the commercial waste sector in Auckland and underplaying the important role that private operators play. The submission repeatedly raises the issue of competition law “…the Council as a waste operator itself, will potentially be in breach of competition law”

Packaging Council of New Zealand Inc questions “what is the justification for directing ratepayer resources into the private commercial sector”.

The formal submission from the Auckland Ratepayers Alliance also strongly opposed any involvement of Auckland Council in the private commercial waste market.

Reduce three commercial waste streams: C&D, plastic and organic waste

Many submitters stated that businesses need to do their fair share to reduce waste and agree that the three priority waste streams should be reduced or recycled. There was strong support for businesses taking more responsibility for the waste they produce.

Many submitters considered that businesses would not make the necessary changes without incentives, either in the form of mandatory waste management plans, product stewardship schemes, or through other financial incentives. There was strong
agreement that council should reinforce such initiatives with education and support for businesses.

A high proportion of submissions in favour of reducing food waste suggested a food redistribution system as the first step in reducing waste, with excess food from businesses being given to those in need.

A consortium of small business raised some concerns in their joint submission that there was not a clear plan for including compostable packaging in the food scraps service. They were keen for Council to work with producers and consumers of compostable packaging to find an option that prevents this type of packaging going to landfill.

Some submitters recommended that council change our language when referred to organics/food waste and identify it as resource.

Fewer submissions commented on construction and demolition waste than on organics. These submitters agreed it should be a focus for council.

Plastic packaging was mentioned frequently in the context of plastic waste.

The majority of submissions from the waste and resource recovery industries expressed support for council working with businesses to reduce the three priority waste streams.

EnviroWaste, Green Gorilla, EcoStock Supplies Ltd and the Bioenergy Association support council addressing priority commercial waste streams.

The Sustainable Business Network (SBN) strongly support partnering with industry to identify alternatives to landfill, and support promoting best practice and celebrating business success.

Most of the 8 per cent of submitters who disagree with council working with businesses on the three specified waste stream state that, as rates are paid for household services and not for businesses, council should stay focussed on household waste.

Northland Waste considers that a cost-benefit analysis should be undertaken before council embarks on commercial waste minimisation. They made several mentions of Section 17A of the Local Government Act 2002 in their submission, questioning many of the proposed activities in the draft WMP on the basis of their alignment (or lack thereof) with Section 17A which requires local authorities to ‘review the cost-effectiveness of current arrangements for meeting the needs of communities within its district’.

Waste Management NZ Ltd ‘agrees that new approaches to reducing commercial waste should continue to be explored, but strongly disagrees that the Council should drive this’.

**Green Gorilla requested that a sentence referring to plasterboard processing (page 36) be corrected to show their involvement.**

c. Local Board submissions
Hibiscus Bays supports increased encouragement of Central Government to ban plastic bags.

Upper Harbour aligns closely with the regional view (to expand the focus to the entire waste stream) and support new approaches given the recent success of a pilot programme run in Upper Harbour.

Waitemata supports the focus of the key actions set out in the draft plan being waste from businesses and commercial activities, working with businesses to try new approaches to reduce waste. They also support advocating to central government to amend the Building Act to regulate diverting construction material from landfill; to end the use of single use plastic, styrofoam and eliminate single use plastic bags.

Waitemata also recommend partnering with BIDS on initiatives to assist businesses minimise waste to landfill and avoid cluttering town centres with rubbish bags.

Waitemata also recommends that Auckland Council champions high profile developments e.g. Headland Park and events e.g. the America’s Cup, to be zero waste to showcase best practice and the potential for successful waste minimisation.

There was a general desire from a number of Local Boards to work with them as a conduit to work with local businesses and BIDs.

d. Proposed actions /changes from staff in response to issues raised

Review language used to focus on food as a resource.

Correct the sentence referring to plasterboard processing in the draft plan (page 36) to show Green Gorilla’s involvement.

Include an action in the draft plan on working with Business Improvements Districts in partnership with Local Boards.

Clarify council’s role in the area of commercial waste as a facilitator and partner.

Panel direction

4. Emphasise the council’s role as a facilitator and partner in addressing commercial waste.

5. Correct reference to plasterboard processing to show Green Gorilla’s involvement

6. Make reference to food rescue initiatives

7. Where appropriate change ‘food waste’ to reflect wasted food as a resource, taking into account food safety standards
Priority Action 4: Continue establishing the resource recovery network

The draft plan proposes to:

- Establish 12 Community Recycling Centres and the Waitakere Resource Recovery Park.
- Develop a long-term resource recovery infrastructure plan.

Reason for Proposal

Much of the material sent to landfill could be diverted for other uses, creating opportunity instead of waste. Continuing established the resource recovery network will result in a network of thriving community hubs is in place across Auckland, supporting waste minimisation.

a. Submission statistics

Submitters were specifically asked to comment on the question:

**Q4. We want to make it easy for people to make better choices locally about how they dispose of unwanted items, so these items can be reused or recycled. Five Community Recycling Centres are up and running and we have plans to provide seven more by 2024.**

There was a high level of support from submitters for council’s approach to Community Recycling Centres (CRCs) with 86 per cent ‘Strongly agree’ (59%) or ‘Agree’ with this approach. However, if pro – forma submissions from members of the Auckland Ratepayers Alliance\(^1\) are included, 73 per cent of submitters disagree or strongly disagree with the proposal.

b. Submission themes

Many submitters suggested there should be more CRCs, to ensure it is convenient for the community and to ensure that maximum recycling and waste diversion occurs. Some submitters felt that CRCs would remove some barriers that lead to illegal dumping.

Many submissions mentioned the need for education. This included:

- the need for council to do a better job to raise awareness about the existence of the centres themselves
- the need for better waste minimisation education overall.
- providing opportunities for repurposing of items

About half the submissions from the waste and resource recovery industry were in support of establishing CRCs. Of those that weren’t:

---

\(^1\) Submissions from ARA members did not directly address this issue. However, in their submissions they reference a formal submission from the ARA disagreeing with this approach.
• Northland Waste opposes establishing CRCs, asserting that “...community groups incur greater expense and achieve lower levels of waste diversion than efficient private operators”.

• Waste Management NZ Ltd acknowledges Community Recycling Centres have been useful in repurposing waste items from the inorganic collections. However “in our view Auckland is already appropriately serviced by private resource recovery and recycling centres”.

In response to a question by a member of the Hearings Panel to the representative from Waste Management NZ Ltd relating to adequate levels of service from private operators in all areas the response indicated that it was not always commercially viable to provide services in all areas.

The Auckland Ratepayers Alliance did not support CRCs, submitting that whilst well-meaning, Community Recycling Centres are heavily ratepayer funded. The ARA further commented that in some areas, the service is currently provided for free to ratepayers as it is operated by a private provider.

c. Local Board submissions

The following local boards support the development of the resource recovery network and community recycling centres across Auckland. A number are requesting CRCs in their local board area.

Hibiscus Bays endorses partnerships between local boards to develop new centres across Auckland.

Upper Harbour supports this approach and re-iterates its previous resolutions that their area be considered as a location for one of the proposed new recycling centres.

Waitemata – continue developing the resource recovery network, and utilise resource recovery facilities as localised community composting facilities and depots for drink containers (thereby covering their costs by accessing a small percentage of the container deposits). Also ensure that there is more public awareness of the five Community Recycling Centres and development of the centre at Western Springs.

d. Proposed actions /changes from staff in response to issues raised

The demand for CRCs is in excess of allocated budget which allows for 12 CRCs to be established over the period 2014-2024. This will require re-evaluating the work programme and re-prioritisation. We will also investigate alternative funding sources.

Panel Direction

8. Note that demand for Community Recycling Centres in addition to the 12 sites proposed, will be addressed through a review of priorities, budget (including alternate funding sources) and the role of the council and other parties in the delivery of CRCs. Note that the budget and role of the council will be considered through the 10-year
Priority Action 5: Continue transitioning to consistent kerbside waste and recycling services

The draft plan proposes:

We will deliver these services to households across Auckland (with some variations to account for local conditions):

- Pay-as-you-throw refuse collections (weekly, potentially fortnightly)
- Recycling collection (fortnightly)
- Collection of food scraps for urban areas (weekly)
- Inorganic collection (annually)

**Reason for proposal**

Developing a regionalised service for all households, reducing contract costs and providing households with a full range of services to minimise their waste and reduce their disposal costs

- **Submission statistics**

  No specific question in the submission form but a number of submitters and local boards made reference to kerbside collections.

1. **Pay-as-you-throw refuse collections (weekly, potentially fortnightly)**

   **Submission themes**

   The Auckland Ratepayer’s Alliance submitted 4,065 pro forma submissions opposed to a ‘reduction in collection services at an increased cost’, presumably relating to the proposed move to fortnightly waste collections.

   There were a small number of other submissions that opposed a move to fortnightly waste collections “I oppose the move to fortnightly rubbish collection. We moved to small rubbish bins and now we have rubbish bags being dumped everywhere. This will only get worse with fortnightly collections … in south Auckland households are much larger and so have more rubbish and they can least afford paying for more rubbish bins. So people will just dump stuff in parks”.

   Housing NZ Corporation, in their submission, opposed a change from weekly to fortnightly refuse collection, due to the potential for health and safety issues for their tenants with special needs and requirements which rely heavily on the service.

   A few submissions supported the move to fortnightly waste collections.
Northland Waste in their submission strongly opposed the proposed action in the draft plan for introduction of a refuse collection in the former Rodney District Council area.

The Chamber of Commerce in their oral submission also opposed this.

c. **Local Board submissions**

Some Local Boards made reference to pay as you throw collection services.

Waitemata recommend that the draft plan identifies long-term commercial waste collection solutions for the city centre that does not involve retailers putting out plastic rubbish bags each day.

d. **Proposed actions /changes from staff in response to issues raised**

- The draft plan states that the change to a refuse collection from weekly to fortnightly, alternating with fortnightly recycling collection would occur after a weekly collection service for food scraps is introduced (subject to performance evaluation)
- Early indications are residents are transitioning to fortnightly set-out of refuse in areas with pay as you throw bins (Waitakere and North Shore). This will be closely monitored in Papakura with the newly introduced kerbside food scraps service now in place.
- Revisit work on social equity issues around pay as you throw in collaboration with HNZC and other key stakeholders
- Investigate option for weekly collections to continue and reassess once the kerbside food scraps collections is well embedded.

**Panel Direction**

9. Modify action to say that the council will continue to provide weekly kerbside refuse collections until the kerbside food scraps collection is well embedded, after which refuse collections will be reviewed before moving to fortnightly collections.

The Panel note that this will require an adjustment to the current budget and this could be reflected in increased Pay-as-You-Throw refuse charges and operational budgets in the Long-term Budget.

---

2. **Recycling collection**

a. **Submission themes**

A small number of submitters made reference to:

- Confusion over what can be recycled and need for better information and education
- China no longer accepting recycling and what our strategy is
- Concern over commingled collections

b. **Local Board submissions**
No submissions were received from Local Boards on this.

c. Proposed actions /changes from staff in response to issues raised

- Greater focus on reduction and communication
- Work with central government and other local authorities in NZ and Australia to explore what infrastructure could be supported to develop new markets
- Amend action 47 in the Action Plan to encourage the use of recovered materials in council purchases as well as physical works
- Advocacy for schemes such as a Container Deposit Scheme will enable recycled material to be collected separately reducing contamination of kerbside recycling collections.

Panel Direction

10. Amend the action on Procurement Processes to include a reference to council purchases alongside the physical works projects.

11. Add a new action for the council to work with central government and other local authorities across Australasia to explore what remanufacturing infrastructure should be supported to develop new markets for recyclable materials (particularly from kerbside recycling collections).

3. Food scraps collection (see Priority Action 6)

4. Inorganic collections

a. Submission themes

Fewer than 20 submissions stated that they would prefer to have the old inorganic collection reinstated: “…Bring back inorganic collections so individuals can scavenge to provide income, recycle, minimise waste – all things you are trying to encourage, you have stopped by stopping inorganic collections.”

b. Local Board submissions

Manurewa and most southern Local Boards advocated for the return to the previous kerbside inorganic collection and saw this as helping to reduce illegal dumping.

c. Proposed actions /changes from staff in response to issues raised

- Continuously review inorganic collection to address issues regarding communications, access to bookings, and promotion of service.
- Action 18 in the draft plan is to “Review the inorganic collection service before the current contract ends in 2019 to assess the potential for partial or full delivery of services through the Community Recycling Centres. Initial trials
have indicated potential for rural facilities in particular to provide this service under contract to council.

Panel direction

No change

5. Multi-unit developments (MUDs)

a. Submission themes

No submissions on this theme

b. Local Board submissions

Upper Harbour requests that further consideration be given to the needs of apartment dwellers and their reduce ability to store multiple rubbish bins.

Waitemata supports providing innovative waste solutions to multi-unit developments and apartments e.g. worm farms for small balconies.

Orakei raised issues about intensification and bin placement in their oral submissions.

c. Proposed changes/ actions from staff in response to issues raised

Actions in the draft plan related to MUDs are:

- Continue working with property owners, body corporates and the waste industry to develop tailored collection services for refuse, recycling, inorganic and food scraps that meet their needs and the requirements of the Solid Waste Bylaw (Action 13)
- Working with property developers and waste service providers to develop guidelines that ensure adequate handling and storage systems are provided in accordance with the requirements of the Solid Waste Bylaw. (Action 14)

Panel direction

No change

Priority Action 6: Deliver the domestic kerbside collection of food scraps

The draft plan proposes:
Progressively introduce the kerbside food scraps collection to urban areas, starting in Papakura. Rollout complete by 2021.

a. Submission statistics

No specific question in the feedback form on the draft plan but there was a question asked in the Long-term Plan relating to the targeted rate.

Food Waste Targeted Rate

Approximately 600 submission points commented on the food waste targeted rate. Of these:

- 40% or 240 submitters supported the food waste targeted rate
- 60% or 360 submitters did not support the food waste targeted rate

The formal submission from the Auckland Ratepayers Alliance also opposed the food scraps service “to manage the food waste of a minority of residents” and want an opt-out option for households who compost at home.

b. Submission themes

There were approximately 1,100 comments made on organic waste, principally around the food scraps collection and composting.

Many comments were made about food scrap collections with the majority of submissions giving qualified support for the service. Most people strongly support the concept of diverting food away from landfill. The key issues raised by submitters were

- Displeasure with the universal charge as they already compost
- Wanting to opt out of the service and not be charged for it
- A short-term targeted rate to set up the service but for it to be a user-pays service within five years (EcoMatters Trust pro form submission)
- Advocating for a decentralised processing and community compost approach as the primary way to manage food waste

A small number of submissions supported providing households with vermicomposting bins or in-sink waste disposal units rather than introducing a council food waste collection.

Of the 15 mana whenua who submitted on the long-term plan, one iwi, Ngāti Tamao, commented specifically on the food waste targeted rate and the pay as you throw refuse collections. They expressed support for both proposed rates.

Para Kore Ki Tamaki, Hoani Waititi Marae and rangatahi from Kura Kaupapa Maori o Hoani Waititi Marae all strongly advocated for a food scraps collection. In the 214 submissions received from maori residents there was strong support for a food scraps collections (particularly from south Auckland residents). No iwi opposed the food waste targeted rate or the pay as you throw refuse collections.

The Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance formal submission opposed the introduction of a food waste collection.
The Bioenergy Association notes that “The use of food waste to produce energy is used internationally as a means of reducing waste disposal to landfill; and that ‘Extending the household food waste collections to small businesses (cafes etc.) should also be considered to achieve economies of scale and collection efficiencies’.

Northland Waste is opposed to a food waste collection that does not have an opt-out option for residents.

Waste Management NZ Ltd strongly opposes the proposal for a kerbside food scraps collection. In their view “…the Council’s methodology of measuring food waste tonnes to landfill is flawed and misleading and is likely to result in the unnecessary development of highly inefficient alternative technologies” and also “disagrees that organic waste contributes to the level of carbon dioxide emissions described in the Draft WMMP”.

Envirowaste supported the food waste collection but challenged the data on greenhouse gas emissions from organics in landfill.

c. Local Board submissions

Hibiscus Bays requests that the food waste collection strategy be reviewed to provide for a user-pays approach (tag or ticket system) rather than being subsidised by all ratepayers as currently proposed. They also request that the food waste collection strategy proposed to be rolled out in 2018/2019 financial year in the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board area be extended to include the Hibiscus Coast subdivision as well as the East Coast Bays subdivision.

Waitemata does not support a centralised collection of food waste; they support a decentralised food waste system that encourages more people to compost at home as a priority. They support decentralised systems which grows the capacity of composting locally by leveraging the existing resource recovery infrastructure in a way that supports local and small scale initiatives for composting and local re-use in our parks and community gardens.

Franklin and Rodney advocated food waste collections for rural townships. Rodney sought clarification of the distinction between urban and rural, for purposes of collections and asked for a pay as you throw system.

d. Proposed actions /changes from staff in response to issues raised

Add a new (fourth) level in the strategy for food waste reduction, on distribution of wasted food:
- Prevent food waste in the first place
- Support redistribution through food rescue initiatives
- Encourage home composting where possible
- Collect the remainder with the kerbside collection of food scraps service.

Outline approach to rural townships – e.g. pilot a decentralised approach to composting of food scraps with the rural CRCs.

Explore an ‘Opt Out’ system in accordance with the LTP targeted rate submissions.
Panel direction

12. Include ‘support redistribution of food through food rescue initiatives’ as a fourth approach to food waste, while recognising the council’s continuing commitment to food safety standards.

13. Include comment on the importance of valuing the nutrients of food scraps and minimising transportation emissions in the procurement process used for the processing plant.

14. Include an action to trial an ‘Opt Out’ scheme for home composters in Papakura for the food scraps service prior to the regional roll out.

Priority Action 7: Address waste diversion from Council operations

The draft plan proposes:

- Increase the target for office waste from council administrative offices from 30 per cent to 60 percent.
- Work with other council departments and CCOs to categorise and quantify operational waste, and establish appropriate targets by 2019.

Reason for proposal

Council is a large organisation and can lead by example, with better knowledge of waste generated across our operations, and plans in place to significantly reduce waste to landfill.

a. Submission statistics

No specific question in the feedback form.

b. Submission themes

There was a moderate amount of support for council to “get its house in order” and “Walk the talk”.

There were also some comments regarding the need for Council’s procurement and purchasing decisions to align with the draft plan objectives.

c. Local Board submissions

Hibiscus and Bays supports the Governing Body promoting more innovation from council controlled organisations to trial new products from recyclable materials, such as alternative roading materials.

Waitemata supports all events supported or promoted by the Council and Council Controlled Organisations to be Zero Waste; facilities to be Zero Waste and ‘walking the talk’ to work towards Zero Waste by 2040. They recommend a requirement that all events on council facilities and/or land be Zero Waste events.
Panel direction

14. Note the important role elected members can play in reducing council waste and the power of council procurement practices to influence this.

Priority Action 8: Partner with others to achieve a Zero Waste Auckland

The draft plan proposes:

- Continue the range of community-led, council-supported programmes
- Work with business and commercial sector to reduce and divert commercial waste streams

Reason for proposal

Council can’t achieve this on its own. We need to continue to partner with communities, businesses, mana whenua and mataawaka in finding solutions to reduce Auckland’s waste

a. Submission statistics

No specific question in the feedback form.

b. Submission themes

Over 350 submitters commented specifically about waste education or communication. A common theme was support for more waste education and communication, or investment in education on waste reduction, often suggested via schools. A few submitters took this point further to suggest council should provide more information to residents on product life cycles.

Some submitters thought education should be undertaken through community groups that can connect with schools with what is happening locally.

Respondents also commented that council should provide more information on what/where/how to recycle, and what happens to the recycling collected.

One submitter recommended more use of te reo to better support rangatahi from kohanga reo and kura kaupapa for example at the Waitakere Zero Waste Learning Zone.

The AKBID (Business Improvement Districts of Auckland) stated the business improvement district model is an excellent way for council to partner with the commercial sector to find ways to reduce and divert waste from landfills, and asked that council use a portion of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund to work with BIDs and business sectors to maintain and enhance these waste minimisation initiatives. In the Long-term Plan submissions a number of BIDS also raised this point.
A number of submitters said they would like to work with council to achieve waste reduction outcomes including Progressive Enterprises, BIDs and Housing New Zealand.

c. Local Board submissions

Hibiscus and Bays express its concerns of the high costs of delivering waste minimisation and waste management practices at local events and seek support to reduce the costs and make waste management and waste minimisation a requirement at all Auckland Council local events.

Waitakere supports funding projects that accelerate New Zealand towards becoming a Circular Economy. They support more public place recycling in high traffic areas in urban areas and in parks (leveraging off Love NZ initiatives).

d. Proposed actions/ changes from staff in response to issues raised

Include reference to Local Boards in working together with businesses and communities

The actions in the draft plan relating to Communications and engagement campaigns (Actions 19-24) and Working with Others (Actions 54) provide a comprehensive range of initiatives) and issues raised can be taken into account under existing actions.

Recommend an additional action on working collaboratively with Business Improvement Districts and Local Boards to reduce business waste

Panel direction

15. Include an additional action for the council to work collaboratively with Business Improvement Districts and local boards to reduce business waste.

2. Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands Draft Waste Plan

The draft plan proposes: the implementation of The Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Draft Waste Plan.

a. Submission statistics

Submitters were specifically asked to comment on:

_The Hauraki Gulf Islands have unique waste management and minimisation requirements. The Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Draft Waste Plan sets a vision and outlines a practical approach to waste management and minimisation for communities of Waiheke, Aotea Great Barrier, Rakino and Kawau Islands. What do you think about the approach outlined in this plan and why?_
A large number of submitters didn’t express an opinion about this proposed plan, with 28% of submitters stating that they ‘Don’t know’ what they think of the plan and a further 16% remaining ‘Neutral’. Just over half of respondents (51%) either ‘Agree’ (24%) or ‘Strongly agree’ (27%) with the plan.

A number of submitters stated that they did not have enough information to comment on the draft plan.

However, of the submitters from Waiheke, 83% supported the approach to waste management and minimisation as outlined in The Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Draft Waste Plan.

Of the submitters from Aotea Great Barrier 86% supported this approach.

b. Submission Themes

Many submitters agreed that the Hauraki Gulf Islands are unique and require a unique plan. There were numerous comments about the ecological significance of the gulf and the islands, and the need to keep them pristine for generations to come.

There were a number of comments about the different needs of the Hauraki Gulf Islands and the challenges due to the cost of transporting waste and recyclables to the mainland. The need for local solutions was referred to in a number of submissions, especially in reference to Waiheke.

A small number of submitters disagreed with the Hauraki Gulf Islands requiring a separate plan or should be treated differently.

Waste Management NZ Ltd stated “Waiheke Island has a significant seasonal population fluctuation and should remain as part of the Auckland waste system. They also submitted that it “has developed a transfer stations and resource recovery facility on Waiheke Island for the Council – this is a model that could be used on other Hauraki Gulf Islands.

Submissions specific to individual islands:

Waiheke

- Focus on how their community cares about waste, the island’s strong waste minimisation culture, the effectiveness of how the community used to be responsible for the entire waste streams and finding innovative uses for ‘waste’ material, and the need for local control of the waste stream
- Expanding the role of a Community Recycling Centre to a Community Resource Recovery Park that manages the entire waste stream on Waiheke
- Advocacy from Waiheke Resources Trust for a separate waste levy for the island

Great Barrier

- Source separated recycling
- Expansion of the Tip Shop into a Community Recycling Centre
- Education

Kawau Island

- Overflowing bins at Sandspit and the need for more recycling facilities to be available at the boat club
- Difficult of getting inorganic waste off the island
- One submitter said Kawau residents should pay for their own rubbish and not just dump it at Sandspit Wharf.

c. Local Board submissions

Hibiscus and Bays seeks additional engagement on the Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands Draft Waste Plan as the vision and plan is not well understood and received less support as a result.

Waiheke Local Board noted the overwhelming support for the following from the Waiheke community, provide the following feedback:

- As part of the Waiheke Local Board Pilot Project, delegations be approved by the Governing Body to the Waiheke Local Board to give effect to the Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Draft Waste Plan within the Waiheke local board area
- That Council promote locally based service providers across all the waste streams and ensures on-island control of the full waste stream with community participation within the Waiheke local board area
- That Council promote, develop and implement a Zero Waste Waiheke strategy in accordance with the waste hierarchy
- That Auckland Council promote, develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to deal with visitor generated waste in the Waiheke local board area

Great Barrier Local Board supported the draft plan.

d. Proposed changes/actions from staff in response to issues raised

Minor amendments:

For Waiheke

- change reference to Community Recycling Centre to a Community Resource Recovery Park
- Update timeframes for contract renewal for the Transfer Station from 2019 to 2020

For Great Barrier

- Include trialling a system for source separated recycling

For Kawau and Rakino
- No changes

Panel direction

Waiheke:
16. Change reference to ‘Community Recycling Centre’ to ‘Community Resource Recovery Park’

17. Update timeframes for contract renewal for the transfer station from 2019 to 2020

Great Barrier
16. Include comment on the need to trial a system for source separated recycling.

3. Other Issues raised during consultation

4.1 Litter, Illegal Dumping and Marine waste

a. Submission themes

There were a small number of submissions on illegal dumping. Points raised related to service changes such as the new inorganic collections, replacing bags with refuse bins, the introduction of Pay-as-You-Throw and the proposed move to fortnightly collections all contributing to illegal dumping.

There were also a small number of submissions on litter (including beach litter) and marine waste, better co-ordination of volunteers, removing barriers for volunteer clean-ups, encourage local communities to deal with litter, working in ways that strengthen local pride, and banning of plastic straws, cups and plastic bags.

Two submitters drew attention to the connection with stormwater and marine litter.

A small number of submitters drew the connection between a Container Deposit Scheme and the reduction of litter.

b. Local Board submissions

Waiheatea – supports the inclusion of specific targets aimed at reducing litter and dumping; litter prevention and education targeted on the city centre particularly focussed on cigarette litter.

Franklin Local Board advocated for a Be a Tidy Kiwi campaign

Manurewa, Franklin, Mangere Otahuhu, Otara Papatoe toe and Maungakiekie

Tamaki Local Boards raised issues relating to illegal dumping in their submissions.

c. Proposed changes/ actions from staff in response to issues raised
Integrate work related to marine litter and waste and work in collaboration with other sectors such as Stormwater

Panel direction

19. Add a ninth priority action to address Litter, Illegal Dumping and Marine Waste.

20. Add a new action to work across council to co-ordinate issues related to waste in the marine environment.

21. Add a new action to work with local boards to develop local solutions for litter and illegal dumping and seek local board funding to support this.

22. Increase Waste Solutions budget by $200,000 p.a. for litter and illegal dumping initiatives to support localised solutions in ‘hot spot’ areas.

4.2 Hazardous, Medical & Sanitary Waste

a. Submission Themes

Submissions from the waste industry highlighted the risks around hazardous waste (especially lithium batteries) and that council needs to do more. This was articulated strongly in the oral submissions.

- EnviroWaste believes that lithium ion batteries should be included in any product stewardship schemes given their health and safety risk and indicated they are keen to work with council to better deal with hazardous waste
- Upcycle Ltd - Auckland Council doesn’t recognise end-user behaviour and varied battery materials when it tells households to simply put them in the bin.
- Interwaste – the draft Plan doesn’t meet the Waste Minimisation Act and WMMP aspirations to reduce harmful effects of waste, or reduce harm from waste. Hazardous waste volumes are small and doesn’t get the attention it deserves. It needs correct regulations, handling and enforcement. Also noted that the Hospital sanitary waste and pharmaceutical waste needs to fall under the definition of hazardous waste under the current bylaw.

b. Local Board submissions

Papakura – needs to be mechanisms to dispose of hazardous waste. The Haz Mobile needs to be re-introduced

c. Proposed changes/actions from staff in response to issues raised

Strengthen Actions 81 (Medical and dental wastes) and 82 (Nappies and sanitary products) in the draft plan and emphasise need to work with industry.

Strengthen actions in the draft plan relating to Hazardous Waste.
Work with the DHBs to investigate the viability of alternative collection services in place for medical waste (including home health care treatment).

Panel direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical and Sanitary Waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Amend actions on medical &amp; dental wastes and nappies and sanitary products to emphasise that the council will work with industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Amend actions to address the classification and disposal of medical and sanitary waste in the Solid Waste Bylaw review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Hazardous Waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. Include reference to batteries, in particular lithium batteries, and amend actions to include the need to develop an action plan within 6 months of adoption of the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan that addresses batteries and other specific household hazardous waste items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Include an action to advocate for a waste tracking system for all commercial hazardous waste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Cleanfills and managed fills

a. Submission Themes

A small number of submitters from Rodney noted that:

There should also be a proper plan on the table as to where clean, managed and landfill are to be sited in the future, taking into account access to these sites, the amenity value compromised by immediate and close proximity neighbours and the long term residual effect of such dumps. I am also a keen supporter of cut and fill where new housing/business developments are taking place, rather than the wholesale removal of entire mountains of earth.

Stop dumping soil from sites, use it to contour the land and reduce carbon footprints and destruction of usable land in rural areas and contamination and sedimentation issues in streams which end up in our harbours!

GBC Winstone (GBCW) raised concerns around the economic implications of applying the waste levy to cleanfill or managed fills. They also requested that any regulation dealing with cleanfills and managed fills should be aligned to enabling and supporting the development of fill sites in appropriate areas throughout the Auckland region.

b. Local Board submissions

The number and location of cleanfill and managed fills is an area of concern for rural local boards, Rodney Local Board and Franklin Local Board in particular raised concerns regarding:

- The number of unconsented fill sites in rural areas
c. Proposed actions/changes from staff in response to issues raised

Many of the aspects raised are controlled through the Auckland Unitary Plan, any changes to the planning rules will need to be made through a plan change process. Waste Solutions can work with the relevant consenting and compliance teams to assess the effectiveness of these rules and the need for a plan change.

At the recommendation of the Rodney Local Board, Waste Solutions will engage with Auckland Transport on the fill work that they are currently undertaking.

Following the sign off of the draft plan, the Solid Waste Bylaw 2012 will be reviewed to ensure alignment with the draft plan. The possibility of licensing cleanfill sites (currently not a requirement) will be reviewed through that process.

Panel direction

No change

4.4 Section 17A Review

A number of submitters challenged the draft plan in relation to the Section 17a review requirements of the Local Government Act; in particular Northland Waste, Waste Management NZ Ltd and the Auckland Ratepayers’ Alliance.

Proposed actions/changes from staff in response to issues raised

- Draft a clause for inclusion in the draft plan that notes that due to statutory timelines the draft plan needs to be adopted by 12 June 2018, however actions in the draft plan will be subject to the findings of the Section 17A review requirements. Legal opinion will be sought on this statement.

Panel direction

27. Include wording to clarify the council’s responsibilities under the Waste Minimisation Action (2008) and the Local Government Act (2002), in particular section 17A, and how they relate to each other.
Local Board Resolutions on the Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan from Business Meetings 1 to 10 May 2018
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Albert-Eden

Resolution number AE/2018/1

That the Albert-Eden Local Board:

h) Provides the following feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 noting that the board had to provide its feedback to the hearings panel on Thursday, 3 May 2018, before considering submissions or formally resolving its position:
   i) Strongly supports the targets, initiatives, and advocacy points in the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 which will lead to real progress in addressing the region’s growing waste problems, noting the strong support shown by the Albert-Eden community.
   ii. Notes that the top two key themes received from the Albert-Eden community were reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions, and reducing environmental and marine pollution.
   iii. Supports expanding the waste minimisation efforts to include the 80 per cent of waste that comes from businesses and commercial activities, noting the feedback received from the Albert-Eden community that 55 per cent strongly agree with this proposal.
   iv. Supports working with businesses to try new approaches to reduce construction and demolition waste, plastics, and organic waste going to landfill, noting the feedback received from the Albert-Eden community that 66 per cent strongly agree with this proposal.
   v. Supports expanding the network of community recycling centres, noting the feedback received from the Albert-Eden community that 64 per cent strongly agree with this proposal.
   vi. Supports encouraging central government to introduce product stewardship schemes, noting the feedback received from the Albert-Eden community that 61 per cent strongly agree with this proposal.
   vii. Notes the Albert-Eden Local Board consulted on a project to work with local businesses to implement sustainable practices as part of the 10-year Budget 2018-2028/Lock Board Agreement 2018/2019 consultation period and received 1,409 responses, 79 per cent of which were in support.
   viii. Supports the framework provided for in the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 for a recycling centre network across the Auckland region, noting that investment and resourcing is needed from Auckland Council to establish and run these facilities.
   ix. Notes that the Albert-Eden Local Board is working with Puketāpapa and Waitāmatā Local Boards to establish the central recycling centre at Western Springs to address the lack of any recycling facilities on the Auckland isthmus.
   x. Supports the commitment to minimising waste to landfill and maximising recycling opportunities.
   xi. Supports advocacy to central government for New Zealand-based recycling centres to process materials currently recycled offshore.
   xii. Supports the food scraps collection scheme and request further investigation into whether local procurement is more effective.
   xiii. Supports separated bins being available in public spaces which allow for rubbish and recycling to be disposed of separately.
Devonport-Takapuna

Resolution number DT/2018/2

That the Devonport-Takapuna Local Board:

g) provides the following feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018:

i. supports the overarching and strategic objectives outlined in the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan;

ii. recommends that there be increased focus on expediting issues between central and local government, such as tip levies and container deposit levies.

Franklin

Resolution number FR/2018/3

That the Franklin Local Board:

g) supports the proposals in the Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan on the basis that this aligns with Franklin Local Board Plan outcomes 1.4 and 5 and is supported by Franklin residents, subject to the following feedback:

i) targets for reduction of litter, graffiti and illegal dumping in public places should be reintroduced and reported at local board level to ensure this remains a priority for Auckland Council;

ii) behavioural change initiatives such as the “Be a Tidy Kiwi” campaign should be leveraged to complement improvements in service and facility strategies to instil a long-term sense of stewardship;

iii) Where possible support should be provided to communities, including business communities, including farmers and developers to allow them to design and deliver their own waste reduction and diversion initiatives or programmes.

Great Barrier

Resolution number GBI/2018/4

That the Great Barrier Local Board:

a) endorse the attached feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 that was presented at the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan Hearings on Wednesday, 3 May 2018.
Draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 – Submission to the hearings panel by Aotea Great Barrier Local Board

That the Great Barrier Local Board:

- endorses the Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands Draft Waste Plan for Aotea Great Barrier Island
- looks forward to working collaboratively with mana whenua as the Ngāti Rehua - Ngātiwai ki Aotea Trust Board has identified in their Hapu Management Plan waste minimisation as an area of possibility for its hapu, in terms of employment generation and supporting its aspirations as kaitiaki
- strongly supports lobbying central government for product stewardship
- advocates for Auckland Council to use its purchasing power to drive change by including a Zero Waste measure in its procurement process
- advocates for Zero Waste measures to be embedded across all funding areas (not only events)
- supports working with businesses to reduce construction and demolition, plastic and organic waste
- supports innovations for the recycling of glass and container deposit schemes
- supports the expansion of the council’s network of Community Recycling Centres and looks forward to the Great Barrier Island centre being established in 2020
- supports expanding council’s focus to non-domestic waste
- supports a boatie waste ‘pack in/pack out’ education initiative. We also request to keep bins at wharves and request monitors at peak times plus locally-created educational signage
- supports local fit-for-place solutions using local contractors facilitated by community waste groups

Henderson-Massey

Resolution number HM/2018/5

That the Henderson-Massey Local Board:

g) provides the following feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018.
Hearing Panel Recommendations on the Draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018

Attachment D

Hibiscus and Bays

Resolution number HB/2018/61

That the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board:

h) provides local board views feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan (WMMP) 2018 (Attachment G) as follows:

i) Endorses reducing environmental and marine waste and reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions as the top priorities for the WMMP.

ii) Supports delivering value for money for the ratepayers and Auckland in the delivery of waste management and waste minimisation solutions.

iii) Supports the proposal to work closer with and expand waste minimisation practices from businesses and commercial activities across Auckland.

iv) Supports increased encouragement of Central Government to ban plastic bags.

v) Supports the Governing Body promoting more innovation from council controlled organisations to trial new products from recyclable materials, such as alternative roading materials.

vi) Strongly supports the establishment and development of community recycling centres across Auckland and endorses partnerships between local boards to develop new centres across Auckland.

vii) Supports product stewardship schemes being encouraged and developed across Auckland and the rest of New Zealand.

viii) Expresses its concerns of the high costs of delivering waste minimisation and waste management practices at local events and seeks support to reduce the costs and make waste management and waste minimisation a requirement at all Auckland Council events.
ix) Seeks additional engagement on the Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands Draft Waste Plan as the vision and plan is not well understood and received less support as a result.

x) Requests that the food waste collection strategy be reviewed to provide for a user-pays approach (tag or ticket system) rather than being subsidised by all ratepayers as currently proposed.

xi) Requests that the roll-out of the food waste collection strategy proposed to be rolled out in the 2018/2019 financial year in the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board area be extended to include the Hibiscus Coast subdivision as well as the East Coast Bays subdivision.

Howick

Resolution number HW/2018/6

That the Howick Local Board:

h) supports the proposals in the Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 on the basis that this aligns with the Howick Local Board Plan Outcome 4 and is supported by the majority of submitters in the Howick Ward.

Kaipātiki

Resolution number KT/2018/7

That the Kaipātiki Local Board:

g) provide feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018, as per the tabled document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall views on Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste from businesses and commercial activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with businesses on approaches to reduce waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community recycling centres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In line with efforts to encourage greater community access to recycling, the Kaipātiki Local Board would like to suggest a possible “Garage Sale Trail” festival similar to council-run efforts in Australia and the United Kingdom, and a play space using recycled goods as described under the Takoro Investing in Play strategy.

**Container deposit scheme**  
The Kaipātiki Local Board supports encouraging central government to introduce product stewardship schemes, including a container deposit scheme, in line with feedback received from the community, but would like to note that this should be a central government initiative and have a national focus.

The Kaipātiki Local Board would like to go even further to place the responsibility for all packaging on manufacturers and/or retailers, similar to the Green Dot (Der Grüne Punkt) scheme in Germany, where manufacturers are encouraged to reduce packaging as this saves them costs in licence fees.

**Hauraki Gulf Islands waste management**  
The Kaipātiki Local Board supports the Hauraki Gulf Islands having unique waste management and minimisation requirements, in line with feedback received from the community.
Māngere-Ōtāehu

Resolution number MO/2018/8

That the Māngere-Ōtāehu Local Board:

f) endorses the feedback on the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, the draft Auckland Plan 2050 and the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018, tabled at the meeting and attached to the minutes.

Attachment: Māngere-Ōtāehu Local Board Advocacy Initiatives – Long-term Plan 2018-2028

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste management and our environment</th>
<th>The city’s waste-minimisation plan implementation requires that communities are prepared, equipped and supported to reach waste reduction targets. There is a need to get communities ready for change and finding opportunities in the way waste will be managed. Proactive support at this stage of the roll-out of changes in how council manages waste is important. This needs to be for multiple actions - communication, engagement, encouraging social enterprise and community-led initiatives. Ongoing work to develop local community recycling centres and waste reduction is a priority in the southern area. The board requests continued action for the regional scoping exercise to investigate the siting of various regional resource recovery centres and support for local community recycling centres.</th>
<th>Governing Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board Feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018

- The local board generally supports the plan

Consultation:
- Not enough time to consider draft document and engage with community
- Confusing as too many plans being consulted on at the same time
- Better engagement with groups and organisations where communities gather in large numbers – Marae and places of worship.

Local issues that the plan needs to address:
- Support people with large families, and on lower incomes, to meet targets
- A staged approach that considers the diversity of needs across the city
- Resolve illegal dumping
- Increase accountability by industries, business associations, and community groups – to play their part in changing practices and behaviours
- Distribute regional resources to local boards for implementing innovative local ideas e.g. a southern community recycling centre
- Improve the new inorganic collection system, it needs a re-think.

Manurewa

Resolution number MR/2018/9

That the Manurewa Local Board:

f) provide the following feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall views on Waste outcomes</th>
<th>What we have now is not currently working for the south - from the roll out of the new red bins to the implementation of a new inorganic collection programme.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The local board is requesting a return to the traditional inorganic collection as the paramount solution to what has become a daily occurrence of illegal dumping throughout the region. The vision is to educate residents to recycle and provide the resources required for recyclables and inorganics to be disposed of. This is taking time. A return of the traditional annual inorganic collection is needed to support this transition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support for a change to the Crimes Act to target commercial and entrepreneurial illegal dumpers. Recommend that Ministers be petitioned to amend Part 10 (which deals with Crimes against the rights to Property) of the Crimes Act 1961.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Applying the Lean Model to evidence the true cost of illegal dumping to better inform solution based decision making.
  - Accurate statistical data and corresponding financial reporting is absent when decision making on reported illegal dumping and inorganic collections. The organisation is not geared up to present complete costs of each transaction associated with the disposal of illegal dumping.

- A GPS app for reporting rubbish is being developed and requires sponsorship to enable it to interact with Auckland Council’s reporting tool. This app will allow anyone to take a photo of illegal dumping and log its location via GPS. This can be sent through various media to Auckland Council. It removes the barrier of calling the call centre or completing a standardised template on the Auckland Council website. Both interactions take time and cost money.

- Encourage businesses to reduce the number of plastic bags that are used.

- In our community, education is an important tool towards improving Waste Management. Improvement in this area should be applied by targeting environmental/recycling programmes in local schools, Marae community organisations and the business sector and is paramount to the ongoing implementation and success of the Waste Minimisation and Management Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste from businesses and commercial activities</th>
<th>Housing intensification has led to increasing volumes of construction and demolition industries. Infrastructure is needed to enable businesses to separate, sort and recover resources instead of sending them to landfill.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The board supports a deconstruction approach which incorporates the recycling of recovered materials that are effectively diverted from landfill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The board also supports changes to the Crimes Act 1961 (to amend part 10) to enable commercial builders to be prosecuted for irresponsible dumping and waste management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community recycling centres / Container deposit scheme</th>
<th>It is proving to be an impossible task expecting residents to transition to ZERO 2040 without providing the tools that enable success.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy restrictions coupled with no access to recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>Hauraki Gulf Islands waste management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants and financial barriers to disposal of inorganic waste are presenting the community with a lived experience of unhygienic streets littered with significant dumping of household inorganic waste that present a health and safety risk to residents, young and old.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The board supports advocating to central government to increase the waste levy and review how it is applied.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The board supports the implementation of product stewardship schemes and advocating to central government to put in place legislation for a container deposit scheme whereby a refundable deposit is built into the purchase price of drinks which could greatly increase the recycling rate and reduce litter. To be implemented at the same pace as the Fuel tax.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local board supports maximising recycling or social enterprise opportunities such as providing free drop off at recycling centers for paper, glass, tins particularly where local recycling centers are not available. Is there an option to provide recycling bins or wire crates similar to clothing recycling bins? It would also make it easier for people in our communities who do not have a vehicle to enable them to drive to recycling centers located outside their board areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manurewa residents have difficulty in disposing of waste excluded from the criteria and weight limits set by Auckland Council’s policy for inorganic collection. The local board would like to see the return of the previous inorganic collection or a variation of it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeting environmental/recycling programmes in local schools, marae, community organisations and the business sector would support achieving ZERO waste 2040.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The board would like to see additional investment into the waste minimisation and innovation fund to provide opportunities and support to local organisations such as Te Awa Ora Trust, a Manurewa-wide social enterprise which includes Talking Trash (recycling, upcycling and re-using) to work in this space educating, training and creating employment opportunities for local people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The board supports the implementation of the Tikapa Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands draft waste Plan to respond to developing on-island waste solutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Manurewa Local Board Advocacy on Long-term Plan 2018-2028

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illegal dumping</th>
<th>Governing Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Manurewa Local Board area has experienced a significant increase in illegal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dumping and this has been evidenced with data from the Waste Solutions team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The board is therefore advocating for the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) That south Auckland be a priority for a community recycling centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) A variation to the inorganic collection. Residents and businesses are calling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the return of the traditional inorganic collection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Support for a change to the Crimes Act 1961 to target commercial and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entrepreneurial illegal dumpers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Application of the Lean Model of continuous improvement to create efficiencies and identify savings within existing budgets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Support for the development of a rubbish reporting GPS app that interacts with Auckland Council's CRM reporting tool. This app will allow anyone to take a photo of illegal dumping and will log it using GPS co-ordinates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) An increase in community engagement and participation in waste management by providing high quality, accessible and relative waste management education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to improve and reduce illegal dumping the board supports retaining a weekly cycle for ‘pay as you throw’ pick-ups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Resolution number MT/2018/10

That the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board:

f) recommends that Council work with waste management companies to investigate innovative ways to repurpose waste, reduce carbon emissions and support other waste research and development initiatives.

g) advocates for the continuation of weekly waste collections as fortnightly waste collection service is unlikely to sufficiently meet the needs of larger households residing in our community. If the service does not meet the need, it will most likely lead to an increase in rubbish dumping around the neighbourhood and an increase in pests which will adversely affect health and wellbeing of communities and the ‘look and feel’ of the local area.

h) is concerned that there is a community perception that illegal dumping has increased since change in inorganic waste collection service has changed. The local board requests an investigation of local resource recovery facilities and other free or affordable services that will assist members of our communities to dispose of inorganic waste responsibly.

Ōrākei

Resolution number OR/2018/11

That the Ōrākei Local Board:

h) formally endorses the Board’s submission on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 as tabled which was presented to the Governing Body committee on 3 May 2018.

j) provides the following further feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 as follows:

i) supports the most important waste outcomes as reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions, and reducing environmental and marine pollution.

ii) supports the approach to expand the waste minimisation efforts to include the 80 per cent of waste that comes from businesses and commercial activities.

iii) supports the approach to work with businesses to try new approaches to reduce construction and demolition waste, plastics, and organic waste (food, green and other types of organic waste) going to landfill, with the inclusion of specific plastics such as straws and plastic bags being targeted.

iv) supports the Council’s approach to maintain the existing five community recycling centres and to establish seven more by 2024.

v) supports the approach to encourage central government to introduce product stewardship schemes and in particular to reduce plastic and packaging at source.

vi) supports an opt in/opt out option for a targeted rate to fund food waste collection.

vii) supports the approach taken in Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands Draft Waste Plan towards waste management and minimisation for the communities of Waiheke, Aotea Great Barrier, Rakino and Kawau Islands.
viii) supports reverting to the former inorganic collection.

Presentation by the Ōrākei Local Board on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan - 3 May 2018

Introduction
We are making an effort to respond, despite limited time to read submissions and prepare for today. We have relied on the summary provided to us by the Local Board Services Team and the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan agenda item.

- The Board (and therefore the GB) does not have a clear response from our electorate from the feedback. I believe we have had around 85 submissions from a population of 85,000+ i.e. possibly less than 0.1%.
- What is clear from the feedback to us, including what we heard at the Have Your Say events, is that there is support for the principles behind the Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.

Household Food Scraps Collection
- There is widespread concern about the practical and compulsory nature of some of the proposals, such as the introduction of the small scrap food waste bin.
- Residents commented about using the sink disposal units, which these days are in most modern and renovated homes and assist the movement of wastewater through the system. In addition many households have composting systems and worm farms. Households should be able to opt out of the food bin collection system and not be required to pay for something they will not use.
- There is again the practicality of storing the bins, particularly if the system is compulsory and the household does not use the bins and the frequency of disposal of the bin’s smelly contents. Storage is an issue and some residents were concerned about them attracting vermin.

Inorganic Waste Collection
- The present and proposed method of collecting inorganic material should be abandoned. It is noted that people still put out unwanted furniture on berms, rather than calling for its official removal or taking the item to a disposal centre. Most people I talk with favour the previous inorganic collection. Sure it may cause an issue of a week or so, but in itself this was recycling. Those wanting the Council to return to the former system, suggested it should occur annually or even every six months.

Recycling and Education about Managing Waste
- There is continuing uncertainty about what should be recycled and inadequate information. The complexity of having to sort out the different grades of plastic as to which can or cannot be recycled for example, leads to households not bothering.
- Some residents believed the Council is not doing enough to educate residents about aspects of recycling and should be doing more in terms of “think before you throw”
type campaigns. Respondents believed that a lot more could be done to encourage (incentivise?) residents to restrict and manage waste.

Local Recycling and/or Composting Centres

- Submitters supported the idea of having more local recycling centres; some suggested that it should be free to take materials there.
- Submitters also supported the encouragement of home compost systems, but a local composting depot was also suggested for people to either take food and garden waste to, or their own compost if it started to build. Increasingly, properties do not have room for traditional composting systems, and gardens are too small to take all the compost that households generate.

Bin Collection Frequency and Charging

- The proposed frequency of collecting the red bin needs to be reviewed taking into account babies’ soiled nappies, incontinence pads etc.
- Some residents have requested a return to weekly collections for recycling and consideration of options for large households.
- Bins should be supported rather than paper/plastic bags which are targets of animals and when ripped their contents are widely spread.
- Many submitters were concerned about the user-pays and pay-as-you-throw methods of charging for waste collection. They believed this would just lead to more illegal dumping and to people putting their rubbish in their neighbours’ bins (at the expense of the neighbour).

Industrial and Building Site Waste

- With the building boom in Auckland there is always a lot of waste material from demolitions and construction sites. The cost of disposing of such material should not be subsidised by the residential and the non-building/demolition sector.
- Ordinary residents are penalised due to decreasing landfill space – a positive is to highlight and reward those who recycle/minimise their building waste.
- Businesses should be encouraged to reduce and recycle demolition materials by using the best practice examples, such as how waste from sites associated with CRL has been dealt with.

Retail/Business Waste

- There is also a need to stop waste at source. A simple example is when buying a shirt with all its packaging. Mail order products often have excessive packaging. There is unnecessary plastic on food products etc.
- Much of this goes to the landfill, but it should be either restricted at source or returned to the supplier for disposal.
- Other plastic ends up in the environment and there is increasing rubbish in our harbours and waterways.
- Some submitters believed that waste collection and landfill charges for businesses, retail outlets and industries should be much higher.

Working with Central Government
• The Council could do more to lobby Central Government regarding levies or polluter pays penalties.

b)

Ōtara-Papatoetoe

Resolution number OP/2018/12

That the Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board:

h) provide feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 (Attachment E).


| Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board Waste Management and Minimisation Plan         |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Consultation Period        | This boards view is:                                                            |
|                            | • Felt rushed                                                                   |
|                            | • Too many plans to consult on at the same time                                 |
|                            | • Not enough time given to genuinely engage with communities                    |
| Local Issues               | Local Issues concerning the board are:                                          |
|                            | • Illegal dumping                                                               |
|                            | • New inorganic system                                                          |
|                            | • Sale and use of single use plastics                                           |
| Further Investigation      | This board would like more investigation into:                                 |
|                            | • Initiatives to eliminate single use plastics (plastic bags, straws)            |
|                            | • Recovery Recycling Centre in the South                                         |
|                            | • Alternative rubbish disposal methods (clean burning)                          |

Papakura

Resolution number PPK/2018/13

That the Papakura Local Board:

b) approve its advocacy initiatives (outlined below) including its key advocacy project, for inclusion (as an appendix) to its 2018/2019 Local Board Agreement, as outlined in attachment D to the report entitled “Local board decisions and input into the 10-year Budget 2018-2028, draft Auckland Plan 2050 and draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Advocating to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource recovery centre for the South</td>
<td>To protect our environment for future generations, we must reduce our waste</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f) provide the following feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Advocating to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and recycle. The Papakura Local Board is supportive of the establishment of a network of community resource recovery centres that will make it easy, affordable and convenient for people to reuse and recycle unwanted goods. The board would like to see one established and providing services in the South.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall views on waste outcomes

- The Papakura Local Board believes that the following outcomes should be prioritised in order to drive change in relation to waste management:
  - reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions;
  - reducing environmental and marine pollution;
  - creating jobs in resource recovery and processing industries.

- The board also believes that the following outcomes should be part of Councils core business:
  - delivering value for money for ratepayers and Aucklanders;
  - reliability of collection services;
  - tidy public places.

Waste from businesses and commercial activities

- The Papakura Local Board support the proposed option 2, ie:
  - keep going with the 20 percent of waste council can easily influence AND expand the focus to include the 80 per cent of waste that is commercially managed.

Working with businesses on approaches to reduce waste

- The Papakura Local Board supports the proposed new approaches to reduce commercial construction and demolition waste, plastics and organic waste from landfill.
  - Education and incentives will be required as contractors only care about getting the job done as quickly as possible and not necessarily about separating out the different waste streams.
  - This will need to be worked through with the contracting, business sector and those most affected because it potentially could impact on building costs.
  - The Papakura Local Board supports the supermarkets’ initiatives reducing the usage of plastics bags and wants to see the use of plastic packaging and polystyrene substantially reduced.
| **Community recycling centres** | The Papakura Local Board believes that the development of a resource recovery network should be given priority. There are potential social enterprise opportunities in establishing the resource recovery centres. Local resource recovery centres are needed now. Make it easy for people to take unwanted furniture, equipment, building materials etc to a nearby location for re-use or repurposing. The Papakura Local Board Plan identifies the establishment of a resource recovery centre in the South as a key initiative and would like to be considered as a location for one of the seven additional community recycling centres. |
| **Container deposit scheme** | The Papakura Local Board supports advocacy to central government for product stewardship schemes, including a container deposit scheme. The board is an advocate for product stewardship legislation for environmentally friendly recyclable packaging. |
| **Hauraki Gulf Islands waste management** | The Papakura Local Board supports the Tikapa Moana - Hauraki Gulf Island based waste goals. An education component will be required to ensure boaters are educated, informed and committed to those goals. The submission form could have had a little more information relating to the initiatives for each island in it that probably would have helped the number of people in the “I don’t know” category understand. |
| **Any other comments about the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan?** | The Papakura Local Board is supportive of the implementation of a pay as you throw weekly kerbside collection. However, the board is mindful of the impact on those with limited incomes and the potential unintended consequence of increased illegal dumping due to people not being able to afford to pay for disposal. At this point the board would not support the reduction of regularity of collection. The board believes moving to a fortnightly collection would:  
- exacerbate the incidences of illegal dumping;  
- attract vermin;  
- create unsanitary conditions for households, particularly those with large families. The board is supportive of progressively introducing kerbside food waste service funded through the rates take. The board is concerned about the practicalities of three bins per unit on the street front for multi-unit and intensive housing developments. |
The board asks that when delivering the bins, council ensures there is information attached advising the customer of the commencement dates for use. There have been instances in the Papakura bin roll out where this information was not attached to the new bins which created confusion.

The current inorganic system is not user friendly. People do not understand the system. An “on demand” service would be more appropriate.

Adequate affordable, access and availability to legal rubbish dump sites is essential, including user friendly opening hours.

The disposal of e-waste and hazardous waste needs to be addressed. The continuation of the haz-mobile service is essential. If this service replacement by something else, ensure the information is readily available.

The board believe the “0800 no dump” rubbish reporting line should continue.

The Papakura Local Board also supports the Manurewa Local Board’s feedback in relation to:
- South Auckland being a priority for a community recycling centre;
- The request for a variation to the inorganic collection;
- a legislative change to the Crimes Act to target commercial and entrepreneurial illegal dumpers;
- applying the Lean Model to evidence the true cost of illegal dumping to better inform solution based decision making;
- rubbish reporting via a GPS App.

**Puketāpapa**

Resolution number PKTPP/2018/14

That the Puketapapa Local Board:

p) provide feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018, as per Attachment B.
Feedback on:
Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018

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

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

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

The board would like to:

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

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

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

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

In addition to the comments above, the board provides feedback on each of the consultation questions in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation questions</th>
<th>Summary of Puketapapa community feedback</th>
<th>Summary of Puketapapa Local Board feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall views on Waste outcomes</td>
<td>The local feedback is consistent with the regional feedback</td>
<td>Supports:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Encouraging recycling at privately delivered events (e.g. the Easter Show) as a way of lowering waste to landfill across the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• improved education and support to households to reduce waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• the recently introduced inorganic collection system (but advocates for increased promotion of the service in order to curb illegal dumping)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notes a need for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• more accessible locations for the disposal of tyres; e-waste; batteries; mattresses; fluorescent lightbulbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• regular reminders to households of opportunities for recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• greater publicity of inorganic collection programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• a significant increase in the availability of public recycling bins alongside landfill ones, similar to those in Whitianga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Auckland Council is responsible for managing and minimising waste across the region. When we make decisions about waste, which outcomes are most important to you?</td>
<td>The three most important outcomes were:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reducing environmental and marine pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tidy public places</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q2. | In the last plan, we focused mostly on our services to households, which handle around 20 per cent of the waste that goes to landfill. Now we want to expand our waste minimisation efforts to include the 80 per cent of waste that comes from businesses and commercial activities. What do you think of this approach and why? | Strong support | • Stronger agreement at local level than regional – the local board strongly supports this
• There is a need for more than one drop-in centre on the isthmus
• Supports a focus on addressing the three priority commercial waste streams identified in the Waste Assessment (construction and demolition waste; organic waste; plastic waste)
• Supports an increased levy on commercial waste
• Supports advocating to central government for a higher levy on commercial waste |
| Q3. | The three largest categories of commercial waste going to landfill are construction and demolition waste, plastics, and organic waste (food, green and other types of organic waste). We want to work with businesses to try new approaches to reduce this waste. What do you think of this approach and why? | Strong support | • Stronger agreement at local level than regional – the local board strongly supports this
• Increased enforcement will be needed
• Support addressing waste generated from council and council controlled organisation’s operational activities, particularly construction and demolition waste
• Support a particular emphasis should be on education and enforcement in the construction industry |
| Q4. | We want to make it easy for people to make better choices locally about how they dispose of unwanted items, so those items can be reused or recycled. Five Community Recycling Centres are up and running and we have plans to provide seven more by 2024. What do you think of this approach and why? | Strong support | • Ensure that community benefits are not going back into a big corporate
• Need more than one recycling centre on isthmus (Wai o rea coming on board). Local drop off depots are needed |
Q5. We want to encourage central government to introduce product stewardship schemes. This includes a container deposit scheme where drink containers such as plastic, glass bottles and cans include a refundable deposit when returned for recycling. What do you think of this approach and why?

Strong support

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

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

Local submissions reflect regional picture

• No additional comments from the board

Rodney

Resolution number RD/2018/15

That the Rodney Local Board:

i) provide the following feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 (WMMP):
   
   i. endorse “reducing environmental and marine waste” and “reducing waste to landfill and carbon emissions” as the top priorities for the WMMP
   
   ii. broadly supports the aims and objectives of the WMMP

   iii. support advocating to central government for a higher waste levy, noting that an analysis of the economic impact on residents and businesses will be required

   iv. support the proposal to work closer with and expand waste minimisation practices from businesses and commercial activities across Auckland

   v. support the focus in the WMMP on the three priority commercial waste streams, including construction and demolition waste and organic and plastic waste

   vi. support the Governing Body promoting more innovation from council controlled organisations to trial new products from recyclable materials, such as alternative roading materials

   vii. strongly support the establishment and development of Community Recycling Centres across Auckland
viii. support product stewardship schemes being encouraged and developed across Auckland and the rest of New Zealand, including the council advocating for the creation of a container deposit scheme.

Clean and Managed Fill

ix. request that clean and managed fills become a focus under the WMMP, noting that waste for clean and managed fills has considerable impact on rural areas and that by not addressing that impact council will shift the cost of this activity onto the environment and infrastructure (ie roads)

x. request that managing contamination caused by waste (including contaminated fill) should be made a focus in the WMMP

xi. support the stated objective in the WMMP to "review licencing of these fill sites, and work with industry to promote diversion and appropriate disposal" and requests that this occur as soon as possible

xii. request that more resource is made available to monitor the compliance of clean and managed fill sites, including a greater monitoring of compliance conditions

xiii. support council investigating the imposition of a levy for clean and managed fill operators in order to incentivise the reduction of waste, improve compliance and recoup costs that are incurred by council as a result of these operators' activities (i.e. fixing damaged roads).

Rural Needs

xiv. request that the waste management needs of rural communities become a focus under the WMMP

xv. request a definition of "rural" be provided in the WMMP noting that there is no current definition and that many of Rodney’s major townships (including Warkworth, Wellsford, Helensville, Riverhead and Kumeu-Huapai) are more urban than rural and are excluded from "urban" waste management initiatives

xvi. request that the WMMP address the issues associated with illegal dumping in rural area and the effects of poor waste management practices in our rural environment

xvii. support the exploration of expanding kerbside food waste collection to rural townships to give rural communities a choice to opt into this scheme, which may be on a user pays basis

xviii. support the current practice to allow residents a choice between rubbish bags or bins and encourage efforts to ensure that those bags are biodegradable in the future.

xix. support the proposal to have ‘pay as you throw’ service that gives Rodney residents a choice over their waste provider.

Upper Harbour

Resolution number UHCF/2018/15
That the Upper Harbour Local Board Community Forum:
e) provide the following feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 after considering the feedback received from the Upper Harbour community:
i) Question 1 (relative importance of outcomes): value for money comes through as an important factor for our community
ii) Question 2 (expansion of focus to the entire waste stream): the Upper Harbour community view aligns closely with the wider regional view, and the board requests that further consideration be given to the needs of apartment dwellers and their reduced ability to store multiple rubbish bins
iii) Question 3 (new approaches with business waste): support new approaches given the recent success of the pilot programme run in Upper Harbour
iv) Question 4 (community recycling centres): the board supports this approach and re-iterates its previous resolution number UH/2018/16, that the Upper Harbour Local Board area be considered as a location for one of the proposed new recycling centres
v) Question 5 (product stewardship): the board supports this approach.

Waiheke

Resolution number WHK/2018/16
MOVED by Chairperson C Handley, seconded by Member S Brown:
That the Waiheke Local Board:
h) noting the overwhelming support for the following from the Waiheke community, provide the following feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018:
i. that as part of the Waiheke Local Board Pilot Project, delegations be approved by the Governing Body to the Waiheke Local Board to give effect to The Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands Draft Waste Plan within the Waiheke local board area
ii. that Auckland Council promote locally based service providers across all the waste streams that ensures on-island control of the full waste stream with community participation within the Waiheke local board area.
iii. that Auckland Council promote, develop and provide an on-island Community Resource Recovery Park on Waiheke and inclusion of that to be within the next tier of funding.
iv. that Auckland Council promote, develop and implement a Zero Waste Waiheke strategy in accordance with the waste hierarchy.
v. that Auckland Council promote, develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to deal with visitor generated waste in the Waiheke local board area.

Appendix A: Advocacy initiatives for Long-term Plan 2018-2028
### Waitākere Ranges

Resolution number WTK/2018/17

That the Waitākere Ranges Local Board:

g) provide feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 as outlined in Attachment A.

### Draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Why is it a priority?</th>
<th>Advocating to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste management</td>
<td>That as part of the Waiheke Local Board pilot project, delegations be provided to the board to give effect to The Tikapa-Moana Hauraki Gulf Islands Draft Waste Plan (WMMP) to ensure on-island control of the full waste stream with community participation, including the development of on-island Community Resource Recovery Park within the next tier of funding, a Zero Waste Waiheke strategy and a visitor impact strategy. Commercial waste management including construction and road-building waste is now recognised as a region-wide challenge and is also a focus for us on Waiheke Island.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Overall views on Waste outcomes
- Note that the local board has previously given feedback on the pre-consultation draft plan.
- Support the overall intent of waste minimisation and reducing environmental impacts, through education, pricing, and actions encouraging more sustainable processes and life styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Why is it a priority?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste from businesses and commercial activities</td>
<td>Support proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with businesses on approaches to reduce waste</td>
<td>Support proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community recycling centres</td>
<td>Support proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container deposit scheme</td>
<td>Support proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauraki Gulf Islands waste management</td>
<td>The local board area is outside of proposed targeted zone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Waitematā

Resolution number WTM/2018/2

That the Waitematā Local Board:
f) provides the following feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018.
   i) note the public feedback on the Draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 (the draft Plan) and the strong support for the overall direction of the draft plan and the proposals consulted on.
   ii) confirm our commitment to the vision of Zero Waste Auckland by 2040, taking care of people and the environment, and turning waste into resources.
   iii) support the overall direction of the draft Plan.
   iv) support the focus of the key actions set out in the draft Plan being waste from businesses and commercial activities, working with businesses to try new approaches to reduce waste, continue developing the community recycling centres network and working with central government to introduce product stewardship schemes.
   v) does not support a centralised collection of food waste.
   vi) support a decentralised food waste system that encourages more people to compost at home as a priority.
   vii) support a decentralised food waste collection service which grows the capacity of composting locally by leveraging the existing resource recovery infrastructure in a way that supports local and small scale initiatives for composting and local re-use in our parks and community gardens.
   viii) support advocating to central government to increase the waste levy to $140 per tonne.
   ix) support advocating to central government to amend the Building Act to regulate diverting construction material from landfill.
   x) support advocating to central government to introduce Container Deposit legislation to reduce litter, increase recycling streams and create jobs and a source for community funds.
   xi) support working with central government to end the use of single use plastic, styrofoam and eliminate single use plastic bags.
   xii) support all Council and Council Controlled Organisations supported or promoted events to be Zero Waste.
   xiii) support all Council and Council Controlled Organisation facilities to be Zero Waste.
   xiv) support all Council and Council Controlled Organisations “walking the talk” to work towards Zero Waste 2040.
   xv) support the inclusion of specific targets aimed at reducing litter and dumping.

   g) provide the following additional feedback:
   i) that Auckland Council champions high profile development e.g. Headland Park and event e.g. America’s Cup to be zero waste to showcase best practice and the potential for successful waste minimisation.
   ii) that the Plan identifies long-term commercial waste collection solutions for the city centre that does not involve retailers putting out plastic rubbish bags each day.
   iii) partner with BIDS on initiatives to assist businesses minimise waste to landfill and avoid cluttering town centres with rubbish bags.
   iv) a requirement that all events on council facilities and/or land be Zero Waste events.
v) council resource recovery facilities be utilised as localised community composting facilities and depots for drink containers (thereby covering their costs by accessing a small percentage of the container deposits).

vi) utilising the waste minimisation levy (and potential increase in funding if the waste levy increases) for an increased emphasis on waste education focussing on waste minimisation.

vii) more public place recycling in high-traffic areas in urban areas and in parks (leveraging off Love NZ initiatives).

viii) increasing public awareness of the five Community Recycling Centres and development of the centre at Western Springs.

ix) litter prevention and education targeted on the city centre particularly focused on cigarette litter.

x) providing innovative waste solutions to multi-unit developments and apartments e.g. worm farms for small balconies,

xi) fund projects that accelerate New Zealand towards becoming a Circular Economy where we keep resources in use for as long as possible.

Advocacy initiatives May 2018 (Tabled)

The following are other advocacy areas for Waitakere Local Board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Advocating to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Community Recycling Centre Drop Off sites</strong> - Secure the acquisition of a second drop-off facility and the completion of a main processing site which, together with the site being developed on Great North Road, will comprise a regional waste management network that will service the needs of Waitakere, Albert-Eden and Puketapapa local boards. This is part of council’s adopted Waste Management and Minimisation Plan forward work programme and the resource recovery network which underpins part of this work.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single Use Plastic</strong> - support mechanisms to reduce single use plastic and eliminate single use plastic bags.</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whau

Resolution number WH/2018/18

That the Whau Local Board:

h) provide the following feedback on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste from businesses and commercial activities</th>
<th>Support proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with businesses on approaches to reduce waste</td>
<td>Support proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community recycling centres</td>
<td>Support proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container deposit scheme</td>
<td>Support proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauraki Gulf Islands waste management</td>
<td>The local board area is outside of proposed targeted zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To approve Auckland Council’s draft submission on the Litter (Increased Infringement Fee) Amendment Bill.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Parliament has requested submissions to the Environment Select Committee on the Litter (Increased Infringement Fee) Amendment Bill (Attachment A). This members bill is being sponsored by the Honourable Scott Simpson (Member of Parliament for the Coromandel Electorate).

3. The bill proposes to alter clauses four and five of the current Litter Act 1979. It is proposed that within each of these clauses the maximum infringement fee for littering be increased from the current $400 to $1,000. The submission period for this bill closes on 14 June 2018.

4. Auckland Council enforcement officers have been implementing the current Litter Act 1979 since amalgamation. The experience and learnings from operating under this legislation on a daily basis have provided staff with a good insight into the limitations of the Litter Act 1979.

5. Staff have prepared a draft submission which supports the intent of this members bill but notes that, whilst increasing fines may go some way to deter offending, increasing the maximum fines alone will not result in an increased number of infringement fines being issued by councils throughout New Zealand (see Attachment A).

6. This is because the level of evidence required under the Act for councils to issue infringements (and successfully defend these, if challenged in court) is high, due to the level and quality of evidence required. For example, in the 2017/18 year to date a total of 1,644 littering or illegal dumping instances have been investigated by council staff. As a result of these 1,644 investigations only 67 infringement fines were issued. The total value of these 67 fines issued is $8,500.

7. The costs and resources required to successfully prosecute offenders who have a history of repeated or excessive dumping are also high. As a result, the council has only an average of two prosecutions under the Litter Act 1979 per year.

8. To address the limitations of the Litter Act 1979, the draft submission advocates for the scope of the members bill to be widened to enable a review of other aspects of the act, including:

   - introduction of a comprehensive national education and behaviour change programme to complement enforcement approaches,
   - review the level of evidence required under the Act to issue infringements, particularly to consider whether a similar level of evidence should be required for minor and major offences,
   - review Clause 15 of the Act, and consider making it possible for councils to assign responsibility for litter thrown from a vehicle to the owner of that vehicle (rather than the current requirement to prove the identity of the person who threw the litter).
   - amending Section 10 of the Act to make it possible for councils to issue infringement notices for litter and rubbish accumulation or storage on private property without having to first secure a criminal conviction.
9. Council enforcement officers work hard to successfully apply the current Litter Act 1979, however, due to the limitations outlined in the draft submission (Attachment A), this is often challenging. It is recommended that the committee approve the attached submission which strongly supports a more comprehensive review of the legislation to make it fit for purpose.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendations
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve the draft council submission on the Litter (Increased Infringement Fee) Amendment Bill and its submission to the parliamentary process

b) delegate approval to the Chair of the Environment and Community Committee and the Chief Operating Officer to make any minor amendments to the submission

c) appoint a councillor to speak at the select committee, if required.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

<table>
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<th>Page</th>
</tr>
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</tr>
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</table>
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Written Submission

for the New Zealand Parliament Environment Select Committee

on the

Litter (Increased Infringement Fee) Amendment Bill

14 June 2018
MIHI MIHI

Ka mihi ake ai ki ngā maunga here kōrero,
ki ngā pari whakarongo tai,
ki ngā awa tuku kiri o ōna manawhenua,
ōna mana ā-iwi take take mai, tauiwi atu.

Tāmaki – makau a te rau, murau a te tini, wenerau a te mano.

Kāhore tō rite i te ao.

I greet the mountains, repository of all that has been said of this place,
there I greet the cliffs that have heard the ebb and flow of the tides of time,

and the rivers that cleansed the forebears of all who came those born of this land
and the newcomers among us all.

Auckland – beloved of hundreds, famed among the multitude, envy of thousands.

You are unique in the world.
INTRODUCTION

1. The Environment Select Committee has called for submissions on the Litter (Increased Infringement Fee) Amendment Bill. The bill proposes to alter clauses four and five of the current Litter Act 1979. It is proposed that within each of these clauses the maximum infringement fee for littering be increased from the current $400 to $1,000.

2. Reducing littering and illegal dumping is a priority for Auckland Council, as identified in both the previous Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2012 and draft Auckland Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018.

3. The feedback Auckland Council has recently received through our consultation on the draft Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 also demonstrated that this is a priority for our communities, with illegal dumping and litter being highlighted by many submitters as an area where more action is needed.

4. Our experience from operating under the Litter Act 1979 on a daily basis has provided the council with a good insight into the limitations of the current legislation.

5. For example, in 2017/2018 to date the council has received and investigated 1,644 complaints regarding littering and illegal dumping. As a result of these 1,644 investigations, for various reasons, only 67 infringement fines were issued. The total value of these 67 fines issued is $8,500.

6. Auckland Council is also only able to carry out two prosecutions, on average, under the Litter Act 1979 per year.

7. This is despite the fact that Auckland Council spends more than $1,000,000 on illegal dumping alone per year, the bulk of which is spent on enforcement staff salaries and removal and disposal costs of illegal dumping.

8. To address these limitations, outlined below are areas of the current Litter Act 1979 that Auckland Council would like to see reviewed by the Environment Select Committee and considered for amendment through this member’s bill.

9. Auckland Council would like to be heard at Select Committee to talk to this submission.

EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT

10. To be successful in combating the littering and illegal dumping problem requires a holistic education and behaviour change programme.

11. Auckland Council’s Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2012 has a focus on working alongside communities towards the goal of zero waste. Current Auckland littering and illegal dumping strategies under this plan prioritise engaging and working alongside our community stakeholders and industry to encourage behaviour change.

12. Whilst infringement notices have a place in responding to the issue of littering and illegal dumping, the drivers behind the action are often complex. Environmental, social and cultural factors all play a role in littering and dumping behaviour. To address this, Auckland Council believes that there is a need for a comprehensive national education and behaviour change programme to complement and support monetary enforcement through levying fines.
EVIDENCE

13. Auckland Council enforcement officers have been working under and implementing the Litter Act 1979 since super city amalgamation, with some legacy councils also actively using the legislation. In the council’s experience, the limitations of the current Act are not around the size of the infringement fine but rather the very high level of evidence required to effectively issue an infringement notice.

14. Although the Act includes the ability for councils to adopt infringement notice provisions, the level of evidence required to support the issuing of these infringements is high. Where an issued infringement notice is challenged, a court process is triggered and so the quality of evidence supporting a council’s case must be to that high standard from the very beginning of the process.

15. Similarly, the degree of evidence required to support an infringement is high, meaning that often witness evidence alone (without say photographic support) is not substantial enough to progress anything more than a warning. This is particularly a barrier when a witness does not want to be identified through any potential court process.

16. Auckland Council would like to see a review of the evidence required to support minor offences, and consideration of whether a different level of evidence could be required depending on the scale of the offending. For example, less evidence could be required for instances such as cigarette butt littering compared with instances such as dumping a trailer load of commercial waste. The current standard in the Act of having a single level of evidence required, regardless of the scale of offending, can result in councils assigning a level of investigation resource that is inconsistent with the offence committed.

OFFENDER IDENTIFICATION

17. In most cases the ability to issue an infringement notice, and associated fine, is dependent on the enforcement officer being able to successfully identify the offender. In the case of litter thrown from a vehicle; whilst the enforcement officer can easily identify the registered owner of the vehicle, unlike speeding or traffic infringements, this information is not sufficient evidence to issue a litter infringement notice.

18. Legal advice received by Auckland Council states that the wording of the Act (Clause 15) requires the enforcement officer to issue the infringement notice to the “person who commits an offence”. This means the enforcement officer is dependent on the registered owner of the vehicle voluntarily taking responsibility or providing details of the actual offender so that an infringement notice can be issued. Responses to these enquiries are often obstructive, making them a resource intensive exercise for councils, and the issuing of infringements as a result is limited.

19. Extending the scope of the members bill to review this clause and make it possible to assign accountability to vehicle owners would aid in changing the culture around littering from vehicles being an accepted social norm.
PRIVATE PROPERTY

20. Section 10 of the Act relates to litter and rubbish accumulation or storage on private property “grossly defacing or defiling” the area. Although these instances occur on private property, with councils’ jurisdiction generally being restricted to public property, the Act does provide councils with a mechanism to address these issues. Under Section 10 councils have the authority to formally notify the owner via writing, who is given 14 days to address the issue, although they are also entitled to request a time extension if required.

21. Failure to comply with this notice is an offence and subject to the issuing of a fine as per Section 10 (11) of the Act. However, unlike other sections in the Act this fine can only be issued as a result of a court conviction, a process that can be lengthy and resource intensive for councils.

22. Amending the act to give councils the ability to assign fines in these cases without securing a conviction would make Section 10 a more useful compliance tool to councils.
Sport and Recreation Community Access Scheme rollover of grants to Auckland Netball and Sovereign Stadium

File No.: CP2018/06192

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To seek approval to extend funding agreements delivering community access outcomes into Sovereign Stadium and the Auckland Netball Centre for an additional year.

Whakarāpopototangā matua / Executive summary

2. The Community Access Scheme is to gain access to non-council operated facilities to support increased levels of sport and recreation participation and reduce inequities of access to opportunities.

3. The funding agreements into Sovereign Stadium and the Auckland Netball Centre were originally for one year - until they could be reviewed against the findings of the Sport Facilities Investment Plan. The Sport Facilities Investment Plan, however, has not yet been completed and adopted.

4. Approval is being sought to extend the agreements for an additional year until the review can be completed.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve the allocation of funding from the existing Sport and Recreation Community Access Scheme budget as follows:

   i) $60,000 to AUT Millennium Ownership Trust to provide community access to Sovereign Stadium from 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019

   ii) $150,000 to Auckland Netball to provide community access to the Auckland Netball Centre from 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019.

Horopaki / Context

5. At amalgamation Auckland Council inherited 14 sport and recreation operational funding agreements. These operational funding streams were evaluated and 11 of the funding agreements were deemed out of scope of the Community Grants Policy due to their primary nature being community access grants to third-parties to deliver asset based services.

6. As a result, the Community Access Scheme was developed and guidelines were approved by Parks Recreation and Sport Committee in July 2015 after Local Board and Sector consultation which included existing grant recipients and key sector partners.

7. The purpose of the Community Access Scheme is to gain access to non-council operated facilities to support increased levels of sport and recreation participation, as well as reduce inequities of access to opportunities.

8. The scheme supports implementation of the Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan. The Community Access Scheme is part of a suite of investment tools that deliver on three (Participation, Infrastructure, Sector Capability) of the four priority areas and key actions of this plan.
9. Specific to the Community Access Scheme is the key priority of:
   Infrastructure: Access to open spaces, harbours, coastlines, waterways and a fit for purpose network of facilities that enable physical activity, recreation and sport at all levels. The Community Access Scheme will support the key actions to:
   - Improve access to new and existing school sport and recreation assets
   - Promote and prioritise investment into partnership facilities
   - Deliver access to a recreation centre and swimming pool network across Auckland
   - Implement the sport code facility plans
   - Address equity of access to facilities

10. The aim is to open up access to facilities where there are gaps in the existing network of facilities provided both by council and the sports sector, encourage greater use of existing assets and support multisport/use facilities.

11. At a meeting of the Environment and Community Committee on 16 May 2017 resolution number ENV/2017/73 was carried to:
   a) approve the allocation of funding from the existing Sport and Recreation Community Access Scheme budget as follows:
      i) $60,000 to AUT Millennium Ownership Trust to provide community access to Sovereign Stadium from 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018
      ii) $40,000 per annum to Avondale College to provide community access to the stadium, hockey turf and six netball courts from 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2020
      iii) $100,000 per annum to Tamaki College Community Recreation Centre Trust to provide community access to Tamaki Recreation Centre from 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2020
      iv) $90,000 per annum to East City Community Trust to provide community access to ASB Stadium from 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2020
      v) $80,000 per annum to Waiheke Recreation Centre Trust to provide community access to Waiheke Recreation Centre from 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2020
      vi) $325,000 per annum to Te Puru Community Charitable Trust to provide community access to Te Puru Community Centre from 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2020
      vii) $150,000 per annum to Kolmar Charitable Trust to provide community access to Kolmar (Papatoetoe Sports Centre) from 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2020
      viii) $150,000 to Auckland Netball to provide community access to the Auckland Netball Centre from 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018.

12. Two of the grants approved in the resolution were for only one year periods. They were:
   - AUT Millennium Ownership Trust for access to Sovereign Stadium
   - Auckland Netball for access to the Auckland Netball Centre

13. The rationale for one year only investment rather than the three year terms afforded to the other recipients was to await direction provided by the Sport Facility Investment Plan before considering longer term investment.
Facility Backgrounds

14. Sovereign Stadium is located on Rangitoto College land that is leased to AUT Millennium Ownership Trust. The stadium fulfils both a local and sub-regional role in the provision of athletics facilities. Council has had a community access arrangement with the Stadium since 1990. Since 1997, Council’s operational funding has been approximately $58,000. AUT Millennium Ownership Trust provides community access to the athletics track and sports field. On average the stadium has 30,000 community visits per annum.

15. Auckland City Council granted $10 million to the construction of the Auckland Netball Centre. The facility partnership funding agreement outlines the community access requirements. The centre comprises of three indoor and 30 outdoor courts. Since 2010 council has provided operational funding to Auckland Netball of $150,000 per annum to support community access to the outdoor courts when not booked.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

16. It was anticipated that the Sport Facilities Investment Plan would have been completed in time to provide guidance on the future investment into both the Auckland Netball Centre and Sovereign Stadium. However this plan has not yet been completed with estimated completion and potential adoption in mid to late 2018.

17. Given no further policy guidance on the investment into sport facilities is available the Community Access Scheme guidelines (attachment A) has been used as the basis for evaluation potential investment.

18. Both facilities form important parts of the sport facility network in Auckland and provide significant community access.

19. Interim 2017/2018 reporting by Auckland Netball indicates strong performance against KPI’s with 435,473 visits to Auckland Netball sites (in 2017) and an increase in team numbers from 957 in 2016 to 981 (in 2017). In 2017, the total participation and membership was 31,027 individuals.

20. Interim 2017/2018 reporting by AUT Millennium of Sovereign Stadium indicated strong performance against KPI’s with 40,635 users (from July to December 2017); in an annual survey 80% of stadium users rated the facility good or excellent in terms of overall quality. The Stadium is available for free public casual use for 50% of its opening hours and provides opportunities for school aged children in Upper Harbour to participate in physical activity, at the same or at similar levels as previously provided (60+ schools/10,000+ children per year).

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

21. Consultation with local boards on any renewal of Community Access Scheme funding into either has not occurred since the adoption of the resolution by the Environment and Community Committee to provide one year of investment.

22. In 2017, when consulted, the Orakei Local board supported an increase in investment into the Auckland Netball Centre. Also, the Upper Harbour Local Board supported the investment into Sovereign Stadium.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

23. The Auckland Netball Centre supports initiatives that increase Māori participation in sport and recreation such as, providing coaching support for Aotearoa Māori netball teams, scholarships for Māori players and engaging with Te Wananga O Aotearoa to increase participation in social leagues. Ngati Whatua is also involved in competitions at the Centre.
Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications
24. The Community Access Scheme has budget available to grant to both Auckland Netball and AUT Millennium Ownership Trust.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks
25. The financial risk to council is mitigated through the practice of paying the annual grant in two part-payments. This enables staff to withhold payment if late or substandard reports are received or the organisation’s performance is poor.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps
26. Following the funding decisions by this Committee, Auckland Netball and AUT Millennium Ownership Trust will be notified of the outcome.
27. Funding agreements and key performance indicators (KPI’s) will be prepared for the community access scheme in consultation with the relevant local boards.
28. Local Board workshops will be scheduled to define the outcomes and key performance indicators for the community access scheme funded facilities within their respective areas.
29. As part of the accountability, community access arrangements are obligated to provide council with user numbers on a monthly basis and regular reports which include financials, KPI progress updates and participation data.
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Sport and Recreation Community Access Scheme guidelines

Purpose
The purpose of the Community Access Scheme is to gain access to non-council operated facilities to support increased levels of sport and recreation participation and reduce inequities of access to opportunities. The scheme will support implementation of the Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan.

The aim is to open up access to facilities where there are gaps in the existing network of facilities provided both by council and the sports sector, encourage greater use of existing assets and support multisport/use facilities.

Context and strategic alignment
a) The Auckland Plan sets out a single vision to make Auckland the world’s most liveable city over the next 30 years, to 2040. The particular priorities in the Auckland Plan that the Community Access Scheme impacts the delivery of are:
   - Provide quality opportunities for all Aucklanders to participate in Sport & Recreation
   - Optimise sport and recreation facilities use
   - Provide social and community infrastructure for present and future generations

b) The Auckland Sport & Recreation Strategic Action Plan (ASARSAP) sets out how the priorities and strategic directions of the Auckland Plan will be put into action. The Community Access Scheme is part of a suite of investment tools that deliver on three (Participation, Infrastructure, Sector Capability) of the four priority areas and key actions of this plan. Specific to the Community Access Scheme is the key priority of:

   Infrastructure: Access to open spaces, harbours, coastlines, waterways and a fit for purpose network of facilities that enable physical activity, recreation and sport at all levels. The Community Access Scheme will support the key actions to:
   - Improve access to new and existing school sport and recreation assets
   - Promote and prioritise investment into partnership facilities
   - Deliver access to a recreation centre and swimming pool network across Auckland
   - Implement the sport code facility plans
   - Address equity of access to facilities

c) The Te Whai Oranga - Māori Sport & Recreation Plan, developed as an action of the Auckland Sport & Recreation Strategic Action Plan will guide thought-leadership to empower participation in Maori sport and recreation and improve Māori health and well-being.

d) I am Auckland – the Children and Young Peoples Strategic Action Plan outlines Auckland Council’s region-wide commitments to children and young people in Auckland. Specific to the Community Access Scheme is the key priority area of:
Auckland is my playground: This means: We provide a range of opportunities for sport, recreation, arts and culture, which are easy for children and young people to take up.

e) Whilst the priorities for funding from the scheme will be set regionally, the increased access will be provided locally. This means the Community Access Scheme will align with Local Board Plans and support delivery on sport and recreation participation priorities from ASARSAP at the local level such as:

- Meet the needs of local diverse communities such as LGBT
- Providing a range of easily accessible and safe activities for children and young people
- Encourage active communities and use of active transport methods

Principles
The following principles will guide decision-making:

- A focus on outcomes
  Enabling community access through grants is a means, not an end in itself. We will invest in facility access based on the outcomes for sport and recreation participation and improving equity of access to facilities geographically, to low participant communities, and by opening up opportunities to more sports/recreation activities and supporting facilities to provide community access.

- Fairness and equity of opportunity
  The Community Access Scheme grants will enable the reduction of inequities of access, and in turn increase opportunities to participate in sport and recreation.

- Make the best use of resources
  We will maximise the recreation and sport benefits for Aucklanders within the resources available, making the best use of every dollar spent to deliver good value and high quality experiences.

- Be inclusive
  When making investment decisions we will recognise the recreation and sport preferences of all Aucklanders, taking into account the diverse make-up of our communities including different ethnicities, ages, abilities and socio-economic status.

- Enabling Māori outcomes and valuing Te Ao Māori
  The Community Access Scheme will support Auckland Council’s commitment to Māori and support positive outcomes for Māori in and through sport and recreation by investing in eligible organisations that help achieve this objective. Matauanga Māori / Māori knowledge and world views will be respected. We will ensure that we:
    - Engage effectively with Māori to identify investment opportunities to increase access
    - Provide appropriate capacity building support to those invested in to support improved wellbeing through increased Māori participation in sport and recreation

Scope and eligibility
The Community Access Scheme is primarily targeting regional gaps in sport and recreation facility provision and/or improving equity of access through local solutions. For organisations to be eligible for investment, they must propose a solution to meet an existing or identified need in the Sport Facility Investment Plan and/or Community Facility Network Plan or demonstrate improving equity of community access.
The scheme is complementary to the Regional Grants Programme that provides for grants to regional organisations providing sport and recreation opportunities and investment in strategic partnerships with organisations that coordinate and build the capability of the sector. At the local level, local boards also have the discretion to provide funding support to local sport and recreation providers and facility operations.

**Who is the scheme targeted at**

The investment will be targeted primarily at facility providers such as community trusts, marae, and schools, tertiary institutes, sports clubs and sports centres. Private sector providers will also be considered in some circumstances. Investment may also be made in regional or national sporting associations where a gap in provision or equity of access issues exists in a code. There may be times when these associations are best placed to distribute the funding to get the most equitable impact from the investment.

**What we will fund**

Operational investment will be made in facilities to:

- fill a specific gap in sport provision as identified in the Sport Facility Investment Plan by providing funding to increase access to prioritised sport and recreation activities or targeted populations
- improve the use of existing facilities by providing funding to expand community access
- support the start-up phase of multisport facilities by providing a finite and reducing operating subsidy to maximise their use.

**What we will not fund**

Investment will not be made in facilities for:

- capital works
- access to sports fields and sports field maintenance. The Sports Field Capacity Development Programme identifies gaps in provision and sports field development priorities. Where partnership opportunities exist to fill these gaps there is an opportunity for Council to partner with external providers through providing maintenance services, refurbishments and other support to secure and support access.

**Prioritisation criteria**

We will prioritise investment where:

- there is a known or identified geographic gap in the provision of council recreation facilities
- the Sport Facility Investment Plan identifies a priority action to respond to current sport facility needs
- new and emerging sports can be accommodated
- there is a potential to address an identified equity of access issue
- barriers to access can be greatly reduced e.g.: cost, cultural, physical, transport
- partnerships with other organisations are leveraged and multi-use of facilities can occur
outcomes for Māori sport and recreation participation will be improved

• priority outcomes of partners in the sector such as Sport NZ and Aktive Auckland Sport & Recreation can be impacted e.g: participation rates for:
  ○ young girls (10-18)
  ○ young people (5-18) in lower socio economic areas
  ○ Asian people, particularly Indian
  ○ Pacifica people, particularly Samoan

**Investment approaches**

The scheme contains two distinct types of investment: direct investment into eligible facilities for a period of time and investment made as a result of targeted expressions of interest to fulfil priority gaps may be one-off or over a period of time.

**Direct investment**

Auckland Council will enter into multi-year funding relationships with a small number of identified eligible facility providers including those under legacy agreements (where they continue to be eligible) that best deliver the outcomes of the scheme, align to the principles and address the priority criteria.

**Targeted expressions of interest**

On a three yearly basis, expressions of interest may be called to address targeted facility access issues for example in a geographic area, for a type of facility or to increase access to a particular sport and recreation activity or targeted populations. This may result in multi-year funding agreements being put in place to support access or one off grants for a specific purpose.

**Monitoring and reporting outcomes**

Outcomes achieved through investment via the Community Access Scheme will be monitored through standard Funding Agreements with all organisations. These will contain a regular reporting approach and key performance indicators (KPI's) to measure community access impact. Measures will cover:

- Auckland Plan targets for sport and recreation
- Participation rates of targeted populations
- Māori outcomes for sport and recreation
- Value for money
- Satisfaction levels of customers and/or participants
- Diversity of activity on offer
- Affordability and accessibility

As the outcomes of these partnerships will benefit the local community, local boards will be involved in setting targets and KPI’s for organisations invested in.

**Approval**

Approved by the Parks, Recreation and Sport Committee 20 July 2016

Resolution number: PAR/2016/49
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To seek approval to engage on a draft Facility Partnerships Policy.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. Auckland Council intends to meet more facility needs through partnerships in future, as a way of ‘doing more with less’ and enabling communities.

3. In 2017 staff developed the first draft of a new regional policy (Attachment B) to guide the selection and support of facility partnerships. Informal feedback from council staff and local boards in February 2018 has further refined and improved the draft policy.

4. Staff also engaged with Māori to explore specific opportunities and barriers for facility partnerships with Māori. Attachment C outlines the findings from this engagement.

5. With the committee’s approval, staff will undertake public consultation from June to August 2018. We will report the draft policy and public feedback to local boards for their formal feedback in August and September 2018.

6. There are two key risks relating to the decision to proceed to consultation:
   - consultation may create an expectation that new funding is available
   - existing facility partners may be concerned about the impact on those arrangements.

7. Staff will carefully manage communications during consultation to clarify the scope of the policy and avoid reputational risk to council.

8. Subject to the outcomes of the consultation period, a final policy will be brought back for the committee’s consideration before the end of 2018.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve the draft Facility Partnerships Policy for public consultation and formal local board engagement from June to August 2018.

Horopaki / Context

9. Auckland Council provides a wide range of community, arts and sports facilities. Around 300 are operated by community organisations through ‘facility partnerships’ with the council.

10. The council has signalled more facility needs will be met through partnerships in future, as a way of ‘doing more with less’ and empowering and enabling communities.

11. A cross-council team began work on a regional policy to guide the selection and support of facility partnerships in 2016. Findings from the discovery phase were reported to the Environment and Community committee in February 2017 (ENV/2017/9).

12. Staff tested a first draft of the new Facility Partnerships Policy with over 200 council staff and local board clusters in February 2018. The draft was well-received, and has been further refined and improved in response to the feedback provided.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Facility partnerships benefit the council and the community

13. Auckland Council supports facility partnerships because they can:
   - leverage external investment and community effort
   - empower communities, and help us respond to Auckland’s increasing diversity
   - optimise the existing facility network, and reduce the need for new facilities.

Facility partnership selection and management ad-hoc and inconsistent

14. Discovery work in 2016 and 2017 identified a range of issues that prevented the council from realising the full potential of facility partnerships.

15. Currently, facility partnership decisions are made on an ad-hoc basis. Often the lifetime costs and benefits of the partnership have not been fully considered, or how these relate to network gaps and evolving community needs.

16. Investment opportunities and selection decisions lack transparency, and our management processes tend to be uncoordinated and inconsistent. Many partners report that they feel ‘under-prepared’ and ‘insufficiently supported’ by council to deliver successfully.

17. Areas identified as needing improvement included:
   - no shared understanding of ‘partnership’
   - many partnerships aren’t getting what they need to succeed
   - the council and its partners aren’t playing to each other’s strengths
   - the council needs to ‘partner on the inside’ if it is to partner on the outside
   - we don’t always count the true costs of partnership, or see the real value
   - we can’t measure success without defining clear outcomes
   - partnerships with Māori should be founded on Te Tiriti principles and shared values
   - marae are more than just ‘facilities’: they have a special role and significance for Māori.

Proposed policy provides strategic approach with tailored process

18. Staff have developed a new policy (Attachment B) to respond directly to these findings.

19. The proposed approach will enable the council and partners to make more informed and strategic investment decisions. Advice will be based on clearer evidence of need and impact, comprehensive costings, as well as emphasise viability and sustainability.

20. The new approach introduces a more transparent and contestable selection process. Requirements will be tailored to reflect the scale, complexity and risk of each proposal. The policy also better coordinates staff expertise and support to improve partners’ experience and build capability.

21. The draft policy proposes:
   - a focus on shared outcomes
   - partnerships that recognise, value and honour Te Ao Māori (Māori world view)
   - multiple partnership models, with fit-for-purpose arrangements
   - ‘proactive’ and ‘responsive’ partnership tracks
   - principles to shape eligibility and investment priorities
   - valuing (and costing) in-kind support
   - a stronger focus on the partnership relationship
   - greater acknowledgement of the complexity of developing/managing assets.
22. A summary of key policy positions relating to these themes is provided in Attachment A.

23. The draft policy outlines and guides six key dimensions of facility partnership:

24. Local boards have a strong interest in facility partnerships, which are seen as an important mechanism for responding to local community facility needs within financial constraints.

25. Staff have engaged with local boards informally throughout this project, including discovery work in 2016, development of the approach in 2017, and testing in 2018. Local board views and concerns have helped shape the draft policy.

Key themes of local board feedback

26. Key themes from discussions with local boards during the development phase include:
   - clear outcomes and strong relationships are most important for successful partnerships, and should be a focus for the new policy
   - facility partnerships should be seen as ‘core business’, and allocation of council resources (including staff time) should reflect this
   - commercial activity in facilities should be discouraged where it compromises their focus on ‘public good’. However, many members do support appropriate revenue-generating activities where these help facilities to be financially sustainable
   - we should be responsive to community priorities, but take a strategic, network-level approach to investment is also important
   - council should take a flexible approach to partnering that prioritises impact and accepts some risk. We should invest more in capacity-building.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

27. Marae are a focal point for Māori social, economic, environmental and cultural development, and are specifically identified in the council’s Community Facilities Network Plan as potential facility partners.
28. In 2017 staff undertook additional engagement with Māori, with a focus on marae, to ensure that the new policy would take into account any special context, barriers or opportunities for facility partnerships with Māori. A summary of the findings is provided in Attachment C.

29. The draft policy reflects these findings and commits the council to partnering with Māori in ways which align with the Treaty Principles, and reflect the distinct characteristics of marae.

Out of scope findings: closer relationships with Māori and involvement in policy-making

30. In addition to the findings specific to the facility partnerships kaupapa, staff heard that the council’s relationships with Māori generally need to improve, and Māori want to be more involved in developing policy that particularly interests or impacts them.

31. These findings will be shared with the relevant parts of the council. Work is already underway to address some of these concerns, for example development of a new Māori engagement portal, and additional relationship-building activities with mataawaka marae.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

32. Public consultation and engagement activities will be resourced out of existing baselines.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

33. Engagement could create expectations that there will be an increase in facility partnerships funding. There may also be concerns that the new policy will impact existing arrangements.

34. Staff will manage reputational risk to council by clearly communicating the funding available and how this will be allocated. Staff will also clarify that the policy will only apply to new facility partnerships, or partnerships already scheduled for review.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

35. If the committee endorses the draft policy, staff will undertake public consultation and formal engagement with local boards and interested advisory panels between June and August 2018. We anticipate the primary audience for the public consultation to be community and sector organisations, schools and marae.

36. Planned public consultation activities will include:
   - online submissions via Shape Auckland and a People’s Panel survey
   - consultation events with community and sector organisations, schools and marae
   - sessions with key national and regional stakeholders, including other major funders.

37. Local board engagement will include:
   - workshops in July and August 2018 timed to follow public consultation events so boards can review local community feedback prior to their workshop
   - The draft policy reported to local board business meetings in August and September 2018 to seek formal feedback on the proposed draft policy approach.
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Facility Partnerships Policy

High level summary of key proposed policy positions

| A focus on shared outcomes | When selecting, managing and evaluating partnerships, we will prioritise the outcomes delivered (i.e. community benefits), not just the outputs (e.g. a new building).
|                            | We will partner based on aligned values and a shared vision.
|                            | We will only enter facility partnerships to develop an asset where an asset-based solution is essential to delivering the outcomes. |
| Recognise, value and honour Te Ao Māori | We will enter facility partnerships with Māori that align with Treaty Principles and provide for tino rangatiratanga.
|                            | We will acknowledge the special significance and role of marae. |
| Multiple models, fit-for-purpose arrangements | We will provide clear pathways for a variety of partners, facility types, partnership structures and investment mechanisms.
|                            | We will ensure our processes and requirements take account of each individual partnership’s scale, complexity, risk and the partners’ capability. |
| Proactive and Responsive partnership tracks | ‘Proactive’ partnerships. Council will seek partnerships through an open tendering process to address network gaps.
|                            | ‘Responsive’ partnerships. Council will also consider partner-initiated funding requests at set times to feed into the Annual Plan. |
| Investment principles to shape eligibility and priorities | We will take a principled approach to facility partnership investment decisions, and invest strategically, equitably, wisely and sustainably.
|                            | We will invest in existing spaces in preference to building new facilities.
|                            | We will support businesses / commercial activities playing a role in enabling viable facility partnerships in certain circumstances. |
| Valuing (and costing) in-kind support | We will estimate the value of ‘in-kind’ investment on both sides (e.g. use of council land, volunteer effort) to support better assessment of costs and benefits.
|                            | Access to council expertise can be critical to our partners’ success. Where necessary we will build capability support into business cases. |
| Greater focus on the partnership relationship | We will resource quality relationships over time, acknowledging these are foundational for successful partnerships.
|                            | We will allocate a lead relationship broker to every partnership to ensure joined-up support and a better partnering experience. |
| Acknowledge the complexity of developing and managing assets | We will ensure community partners are well-equipped and/or supported to design, build, operate and maintain quality facility assets.
|                            | We will ask better questions and involve subject matter experts earlier to support decision-making and reduce wasted effort on both sides. |
Community facilities are...

Places and spaces where Aucklanders can participate, play, learn, share, improve their health and wellbeing, celebrate and belong. They include...

- Community centres, hubs, halls and mobile facilities and special purpose facilities (e.g. youth centres, men's sheds)
- Marae and cultural centres
- Libraries
- Arts centres and performing arts centres
- Indoor sports centres like multi-sports centres, swimming pools, leisure centres, indoor courts / gymnasiums
- Outdoor facilities like sports fields, skate parks, playgrounds, splashpads and outdoor courts
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1. The purpose

Why we have facility partnerships

Through facility partnerships, the council may invest in tangible things, like buildings, equipment, staff salaries and services. But what we are really investing in is the short, medium and long-term benefits these things will deliver: ultimately, a better quality of life for our communities.

We provide facilities not for their own sake, but for what they enable people to do and achieve, and because they make Auckland a better place to live. Community facilities contribute to building strong, healthy and vibrant communities and foster belonging and pride. They are an important part of realising the vision for Auckland as a ‘world class’ city. The council has already set a number of specific priorities around the outcomes that Aucklanders most need and want to see delivered through facilities.

We seek facility partnerships because they can enable the council and the community to provide more of the facilities Auckland needs, faster and more effectively. This aligns with our obligations under The Local Government Act, which requires the infrastructure we deliver to meets current and future needs, in a way that is most cost effective for households and businesses.

Given that these outcomes and benefits are the purpose of facility partnerships, they're an important factor in our selection, management and evaluation of facility partnerships.

At the selection stage, a focus on outcomes helps decision-makers target the council’s limited investment where it can have the biggest impact.

At the management stage, the outcomes we’ve agreed will help staff work with facility partners to shape provision, and target access to those the facility is intended to benefit. These outcomes also help us monitor the facility (and the services and activities it enables) throughout its life.

During regular evaluation, we and our partners will be assessing if the benefits we wanted have been realised, and reflecting on the experience of the partnership itself.
We provide facilities because...

They benefit Aucklanders

- **Supporting local community identity, pride, belonging, participation and improving people's wellbeing**
  - e.g. Auckland Plan, Thriving Communities, I am Auckland, Toi Whetaki

- **Helping Aucklanders to be more active, more often**
  - e.g. Auckland Plan, Sports and Recreation Strategic Action Plan

- **Helping to make arts and culture part of our everyday lives**
  - e.g. Auckland Plan, Toi Whetaki

- **Valuing Te Ao Māori and enabling Māori aspirations**
  - e.g. Auckland Plan, Thriving Communities, I am Auckland, Toi Whetaki, Sports and Recreation Strategic Action Plan

- **Enhancing and protecting our natural environment and our built and cultural heritage**
  - e.g. Auckland Plan, Unitary Plan

---

“We have a lot of new migrants in our neighbourhood. We needed somewhere welcoming for them to go to meet new people and learn about life in Auckland. It helps to bring the community together.”

“My teenagers play sport down there – it’s good for their fitness and confidence, and it helps them learn respect and teamwork. And keeps them out of trouble – there wasn’t much to do round here before!”

“Having the art centre is great for the town – they run lots of classes there, and it’s made the whole place feel more vibrant and alive. Well, you can see – the art has spilled out onto the streets!”

“We run programmes at the marae that improve people’s lives; that build mana and connection with culture. Māori feel more comfortable here; most don’t go to the community centre.”

“The community gardens have really improved the environment down there, and I think it’s changed how people feel about the reserve. They’re growing native seedlings there to replant along the stream banks, and people aren’t dumping rubbish in the stream anymore.”
We seek facility partnerships because they enable us to...

Leverage

- Partnerships can leverage external investment, infrastructure and effort to deliver better community facilities and spread their cost between more stakeholders. This is critical in a context of financial constraints, growing demand, scarce land and increasing construction costs.

- The council, community and sector organisations, iwi, businesses, government agencies and other funders each bring unique and complementary knowledge, skills, networks and strengths to the table.

Empower and enable

- Partnerships are a way for the council to empower and enable communities and build their mana, prosperity, resilience, skills and capacity.

- Partnerships are a tangible way to meet our Treaty of Waitangi obligations to work in partnership with Māori, which go beyond our role relative to other sectors of the community. By supporting Māori-led facilities, we show respect for Māori mātauranga (knowledge), manaakitanga (hospitality) and kaitiakitanga (guardianship).

- Auckland is becoming super-diverse, and community-led, Māori-led or sector-led facilities may be more effective at meeting needs than a council-led alternative.

Optimise

- Partnerships can optimise space and maximise investment, by bringing together multiple groups to share one facility, or by breathing new life into existing assets that the community already use and value, instead of building new ones.

- Investing in partnerships may not require building bricks-and-mortar assets, which reduces financial pressure and delivers a flexible network that can respond faster to growth and change.

“The school has offered the land for the new centre, the council is managing the design and construction, the sports trust has signed up a major donor, and local businesses are providing building materials at cost. And the local community is going to get an incredible facility.”

“Our organisation has a reputation in this community that stretches back decades. We know all the service providers, and can help people get the support they need. But we really value the council’s technical expertise around managing buildings, and the legal and accounting side of things.”

“Our group started as a few volunteers wanting to reduce crime in our town centre, but we ended up registering as a charity and working with local youth, rough sleepers and the long-term unemployed. The men’s shed is going to really enhance the work we can do, but it’s a big step for us.”

“Our users said they didn’t visit the council centre because their English was poor and they felt embarrassed. We offer much the same services and activities, but they are among people of a similar age and cultural background, and they can practice their English together.”

“We welcome everyone who wants to come here – thousands of people do, every year – and we will manaaki our visitors as we always have done. But we would welcome greater council recognition of our role. Funding is a huge help, but for us the relationships and respect are just as fundamental.”
We need a facility partnerships policy for...

**Clarity**
Policy helps develop a shared understanding of partnership, through:
- Establishing clear and consistent language around partnerships
- Setting out why, when and how we will partner, including being both more intentional and more responsive in our partnering with Māori
- Better differentiation of the different types of partnership, reflected in fit-for-purpose decision-making pathways and processes that are proportionate to their scale and risk.

**Strategic decision-making**
Given limited resources, policy helps us partner more strategically, by:
- Aligning our partnerships investment to existing strategies, policies and plans, with a focus on addressing the greatest needs first
- Ensuring we consider the costs and opportunity costs, downstream benefits and savings, trade-offs and risks before making decisions
- Ensuring we’ll see evidence of the outcomes we’ve invested in and the value that’s been delivered, while recognising partnerships can benefit communities in multiple ways.

**Sustainability**
Policy commits us to investing and supporting for success, by:
- Requiring ongoing costs and a realistic business and operating model to be identified, ensuring partners are able to run and maintain safe, quality facilities to the standards the community expects
- Setting realistic expectations of partners and partnerships, ensuring we consider and cost support needs upfront and ‘play to strengths’
- Treating partner relationships with the care and seriousness they deserve, including coordinating our support and advice within council to ensure a consistently good experience for partners.
Facility partnerships and Te Ao Māori

Building on our founding partnership: Te Tiriti o Waitangi

Te Tiriti o Waitangi/the Treaty of Waitangi is our nation’s founding document and recognises the special place of Māori in New Zealand.

Auckland Council is committed to engaging and working with Māori in ways that are consistent with the Treaty Principles. This includes supporting delivery of services by Māori for Māori, based on Te Ao Māori values and practices.

Facilities contribute to Māori well-being by providing spaces to connect, socialise, learn, participate in and celebrate Māori identity and culture. Partnerships enable the council and Māori to share mana, matauranga and resources to support Māori aspirations and deliver Māori outcomes. Facility partnerships provide a way to jointly deliver Māori outcomes through marae, facilities, and other spaces and places.

Delivering Māori outcomes through facility partnerships

Supporting Māori values / directions

- Whanaungatanga / Develop vibrant communities
- Rangatiratanga / Enhance leadership and participation
- Manaakitanga / Improve quality of life
- Wairuatanga / Promote distinctive identity
- Kaitiakitanga / Ensure sustainable futures

- The Māori Plan for Tāmaki Makaurau

Māori outcomes through arts and culture

- Promote and develop marae as regional cultural hubs
- Promote Māori art and culture, locally and internationally through the development of Māori cultural centres

“Māori culture is ‘Auckland’s point of difference in the world’... we are proud of Māori cultural identity and celebrate it.” – Toi Whiti – Arts and Culture Strategic Action Plan

Promoting Māori identity and wellbeing

- Advance Māori wellbeing
- Promote Māori success, innovation and enterprise
- Recognise and provide for Tiriti o Waitangi outcomes
- Showcase Auckland’s Māori identity and vibrant Māori culture

“Kaupapa Māori and Māori-led organisations... continue to be critical to delivery of appropriate and effective services for Māori... Actively partnering with others is a key mechanism for Auckland Council to support Māori identity and well-being.” – The Auckland Plan

Māori outcomes through sport and recreation

- Health and wellbeing for Māori
- Value Te Ao Māori

“We will acknowledge the special role of Māori and enable participation in decision-making, to build lasting reciprocal relationships and improve physical activity outcomes for Māori... This will be achieved through working in partnership with iwi and appropriate organisations.” – Auckland Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan
The Treaty Principles / Te Tiriti Mātāpono

Treaty principles have been recognised and expressed by the Waitangi Tribunal and a range of Courts - the Privy Council, Supreme Court and High Court. The principles bridge the two texts of the Treaty, focusing on the intent of the Treaty and the future.

The Treaty Principles will help guide how the council and Māori work together to establish, shape and manage facility partnership arrangements.

Relevant principles for facility partnerships include:

Rangatiratanga – the duty to recognise Māori rights of independence, autonomy and self-determination, including the capacity of hapū, mana whenua and mataawaka to exercise authority over their own affairs. This principle enables the empowerment of Māori to determine and manage matters of significance to them.

Partnership – the duty to interact in good faith and in the nature of a partnership. There is a sense of shared enterprise and mutual benefit where each partner must take account of the needs and interests of the other.

Active protection – the duty to proactively protect the rights and interests of Māori, including the need to proactively build the capacity and capability of Māori.

Ōriātanga / mutual benefit – to recognise that benefits should accrue to both Māori and non-Māori, to enable both to participate in the prosperity of Aotearoa giving rise to mutual obligations and benefits. Each needs to retain and obtain sufficient resources to prosper, and each requires the help of its Treaty partner to do so. This includes the notion of equality (for example, in education, health and other socio-economic considerations).

Options – recognising the authority of Māori to choose their own direction, to continue their own tikanga (customary practice) as it was or to combine elements of both and walk in both worlds. This principle includes recognition of Māori self-regulation.

The right of development – the Treaty right is not confined to customary use or the state of knowledge as at 1840, but includes an active duty to assist Māori in the development of their properties and taonga (treasured items).

Applying the Principles

We will seek facility partnership opportunities and arrangements with Māori that:

- Recognise Māori rights of independence, autonomy and self-determination.
- Actively build the capacity and capability of hapū, mana whenua and mataawaka.
- Are a shared enterprise, offering mutual benefit to Māori and non-Māori.
- Take account of the needs and interests of Māori partners, and ensure our needs and interests are clear to Māori looking to partner with us.
- Help to achieve equality of outcomes for Māori.
- Assist Māori in the development of their properties and taonga.
- Respect Te Ao Māori and Māori tikanga, including:
  - Accommodating Māori decision-making structures and processes
  - Referring to marae as marae, not facilities, upholding their mana by observing tikanga, and encouraging others to do the same.
  - Acknowledging manaakitanga
  - Acknowledging the needs of iwi, hapū and whanau must take precedence on marae.

Further, we will:

- Acknowledge Māori hold a long-term holistic view of the world, where values and relationships are paramount.
- Acknowledge that individual partnership arrangements need to align with the kaupapa and aspirations of individual hapū, marae or Māori organisations.
- Welcome partnership discussions with marae and Māori facilities already serving their communities, to explore how the council can awhi (support) their activities.
Facility partnerships with marae

We recognise marae as focal points for Māori social, cultural, and economic development.

Marae are specifically identified in the Community Facilities Network Plan as potential partners.

Marae in Tamaki Makaurau may be mana whenua, mataawaka or taurahere, large or small, rural or urban.

Some are primarily gathering places for their iwi or hapu, others are situated within school, church and institutional settings.

Many play a broader community role, hosting a holistic range of activities including
- papakainga and emergency accommodation
- formal and informal gatherings
- language and cultural instruction
- Māori arts and cultural activities
- health and wellbeing centres
- community and rongoā (medicinal) gardens
- whanau-centred social services

Marae have distinct characteristics that facility arrangements will acknowledge and reflect.

Marae are unique.

Marae are inseparable from their whenua, their tupuna, their people and their history.

The word ‘facility’ doesn’t fully express their unique role, or recognise the integral practice of manaakitanga.

Marae are taonga.

Marae have mana, they are a taonga. Marae have specific tikanga that must be followed to uphold their mana.

Marae also contain many taonga, especially in their wharenui, and some have pā or uru pā on their sites that are off-limits for visitors.

Marae are turangawaewae.

For Māori, marae are their home and ‘a place to stand’, and their needs must take precedence.

Marae may be required by iwi, hapū and whanau at short notice – e.g. for tangi – and can’t be available to the community at these times.

<i>Mana whenua</i>: Māori with territorial rights in Tamaki Makaurau, who belong to and derive power from the whenua (land), and who have authority and jurisdiction over the whenua or rohe (territory).

<i>Mataawaka</i>: Māori who are not mana whenua and have not retained their identity and links back to their tribal homelands. Mataawaka or ‘urban’ marae are pan-tribal, and welcome Māori of all affiliations, or none.

<i>Taurahere</i>: Urban Māori who retain their identity and links back to their tribal homelands. Some taurahere groups have whakapapa or historical links to particular sites in Tamaki Makaurau, and have received the blessing of mana whenua to develop marae there.

The council may partner with:

- Iwi and hapu
- Marae (mana whenua, mataawaka or taurahere)
- Other whakapapa-based groups (where members descend from a common ancestor)
- Kaupapa-based Māori organisations (formed around a specific purpose)
- Takiwā-based Māori organisations (focused on a particular place)
2. The model

Shaping facility partnerships

Facility partnerships are not ‘one size fits all’.

The council will consider a wide range of partnership arrangements, within broad parameters. The important thing is not a partnership’s size or shape, but whether it has the necessary ingredients to successfully and sustainably meet the community’s needs.

This section outlines the key decision-making and management stages in our process, and the building blocks of our facility partnership model: Tracks, Types, and Scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACKS</th>
<th>TYPES</th>
<th>SCALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The tracks reflect whether the council or the partner(s) initiate the facility partnership, and how this impacts our investment and decision-making.</td>
<td>Our four broad types of facility partnership are primarily differentiated by the ownership of the proposed facility, and how we invest in it.</td>
<td>Our facility partnership scales reflect the project’s size and complexity, and will shape the level of planning and due diligence we and partners must undertake.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The facility partnerships lifecycle

All facility partnership proposals pass through the same overarching process decision-making process, but what happens at each stage will vary depending on the model of each individual partnership.

Staff will work with potential partners to establish their proposed partnership's Track, Type and Scale, and develop a customised ‘road map’ to help them anticipate the journey ahead.

Stage 1
- Introduce & identify
  - Outline the proposal at a high level and gauge support
  - Early conversations between council and potential partners to scope the facility idea, the outcomes it will deliver and likely investment required

Stage 2
- Strategic assessment
  - Build the case for the proposed facility and partnership
  - Research the need or opportunity to provide an evidence base for the proposed facility and partnership, and make the case for investment

Stage 3
- Initiate / scope
  - Scope the facility, the partnership and funding plan in more detail
  - Flesh out the proposal to outline a high level facility specification, potential location(s), likely governance and operating model and a business plan

Stage 4
- Plan & evaluate
  - Make the business case for the project's desirability, feasibility and viability
  - Prepare and cost facility concept plans, firm up the location, operating model and business plan, and undertake a cost/benefit analysis

Stage 5
- Detailed planning
  - Prepare a detailed project and funding plan and partnership agreement for approval
  - Complete detailed project planning, confirming costs, funding and timetables, obtaining approvals and consents and finalising legal arrangements

Stage 6
- Execute & deliver
  - Execute the project plan, open the facility
  - Complete and sign off any capital works (build and fit-out or re-purpose and retrofit), open the new facility and formally celebrate the launch of the facility partnership

Stage 7
- Review / renegotiate
  - Monitor and periodically review facility partnership ever agreed term
  - Monitor and evaluate facility and partnership performance as agreed to ensure requirements are met, appropriate support is available and outcomes will be delivered

Key Documents at each stage (actual documentation required will vary depending on the individual partnership)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Partnership Canvas</th>
<th>Initial proposal</th>
<th>Full proposal</th>
<th>Feasibility study</th>
<th>Final facility design</th>
<th>Project reports</th>
<th>Performance reports</th>
<th>Performance reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strategic assessment</td>
<td>schedule of spaces, bulk and location plan (if appl.)</td>
<td>high-level funding plan and business plan</td>
<td>business case(s)</td>
<td>detailed project, funding and business plans</td>
<td>performance reports</td>
<td>facility partnership review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs assessment</td>
<td>draft partnership agreement</td>
<td>partnership agreement</td>
<td>performance agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is it a facility partnership?

Auckland Council invests in community outcomes in a range of ways. These include operating facilities and services directly, supporting the community sector’s delivery through grants, partnerships and leases, and procuring services from market providers. The table below shows where facility partnerships fit, and how they relate to these other key mechanisms for investing in outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the council funding or providing?</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services only</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports, arts or community services and activities, directly delivered by the council</td>
<td>Community grants for services and activities delivered by sports, arts and community organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council procures sports, arts or community services and activities from private sector providers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services and assets</strong></td>
<td>FACILITY PARTNERSHIPS with sports, arts and community organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council-owned and operated sports, arts and community facilities</td>
<td>Council procures community access to private sector facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets only</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, open space and non-staffed council facilities (e.g. venues-for-hire)</td>
<td>Community leases for council properties (land and buildings) – occupied by sports, arts and community organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council properties (land and buildings) commercially leased by the private sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who is leading delivery?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council-led</td>
<td>Community-led</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market-led</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This diagram shows some of the particular characteristics or changes in circumstance that could trigger a move between a facility partnership and one of the four other investment mechanisms shown.
### Starting the partnering conversation
Partnerships can be initiated by either the council or the partner(s). The Track a partnership starts on will impact the investment available, and when and how proposals will be accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROACTIVE TRACK</th>
<th>RESPONSIVE TRACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council actively seeks potential facility partners through an open tendering process</td>
<td>Council approaches a potential partner(s), with an opportunity specific to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A potential facility partner(s) approach council, which triggers a tendering process</td>
<td>A potential facility partner(s) approach council, about an opportunity specific to them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Funding
- Fully or partially budgeted through the Long-term Plan<br>  - In-kind support may also be available
- Unbudgeted<br>  - In-kind or contestable funding support may be available

#### Getting started
- Starts with Community Facility Tender (EOIs) (Stage 2)
- Starts with early conversations (Stage 1)

#### Progressing
- Opportunities may be advertised and proposals progressed at any time of the year
- Stage 1 and 2: decisions to progress twice per year<br>  - Stage 3 and 4 proposals requiring funding: decisions to progress once per year
Tracks

Proactive Track

Proactive Track partnership opportunities are aligned to network gaps identified by the council in the relevant network and investment plans.

The council allocates budget to address high priority network gaps through the Annual Plan and Long-term Plan processes. When an indicative budget has been allocated to address a high priority gap, the council will identify those opportunities which may be suitable for partnership delivery, and release a Facility Partnership Tender to call for proposals from potential partners.

As these opportunities have been identified by the council through its own network planning processes, some aspects of the business case for a facility partnership on the Proactive Track will already be in place. These specifications will inform the Facility Partnership Tender, which begins with an Expressions of Interest round (Stage 2), followed by the preparation of detailed project plans and business cases for shortlisted proposals (Stages 3 and 4). Business cases for market and direct delivery options may be considered alongside partnership options.

In some cases, the council may have a specific gap where there are only one or two potential partners due to the nature of the location, activity or population being targeted. In these cases, the council may approach a partner or partners directly to explore the opportunity together.

Decisions to progress Proactive track proposals through the key gates in our decision-making process (Gates 2, 3 and 4) will be made by the relevant decision-maker at regional or local level.

Responsive Track

Responsive Track partnerships are those where a partner identifies a gap or unmet need in their community or sector, and approaches the council for support.

By their nature, there is no ‘budget’ set aside for Responsive Track partnerships, and potential partners will have to do more upfront work to make the case for investment. This includes not only any funding that may be required, but the staff resource to support the relationship over time.

If the investment required is significant, Responsive Track partnerships would need their regional or local decision-maker (as appropriate) to advocate for new funding through the Annual Plan or Long-term Plan process.

However although funding is more limited for Responsive Track partnerships, decision-makers may still be able to commit other kinds of support - e.g. use of council assets, or support from staff - if they accept the idea has merit and meets a genuine community need.

Partners can initiate early conversations on the Responsive Track at any time (Stage 1). Responsive Track Proposals at Stages 1 and 2 will be assessed by staff twice per year, with decisions to progress to the next stage made by the regional or local decision-maker.

In some cases, the decision-maker may agree that the need identified in a responsive Track proposal is a priority, but want to initiate a wider tendering process to explore alternative ways of addressing it before committing to a specific partner or partnership.

Responsive Track proposals at Stages 3 and 4 that require funding will be assessed by staff once per year, prior to the Annual Plan, to enable unbudgeted funding requests to pass through approval Gates 3 and 4 as part of the Annual Plan process.
### Types

**What the partnership will involve, and who owns the facility**

All facility partnerships will fit into one of our four broad types. The types are differentiated by the ownership of the land, and whether we are building new or working with an existing property.

The facility partnership type is significant to our decision-making process, because it will determine the:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DEVELOPMENT partnership</td>
<td>When the council partners with another organisation(s) to: Develop a new facility, or significantly upgrade an existing one, on land owned by the council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ASSET partnership</td>
<td>When the council partners with another organisation(s) to: Develop a new facility, or significantly upgrade an existing one, on land owned by a partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ACTIVATION partnership</td>
<td>When the council partners with another organisation(s) to: Activate a vacant or under-utilised council property as a community, arts or sports facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ACCESS partnership</td>
<td>When the council partners with another organisation(s) to: Open up (or increase) community access to an existing facility owned and operated by a partner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. DEVELOPMENT partnership</th>
<th>2. ASSET partnership</th>
<th>3. ACTIVATION partnership</th>
<th>4. ACCESS partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW FACILITY</td>
<td>NEW FACILITY</td>
<td>EXISTING FACILITY</td>
<td>EXISTING FACILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNCIL LAND</td>
<td>PARTNER LAND</td>
<td>COUNCIL LAND</td>
<td>PARTNER LAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. Five sports codes get together to develop an indoor sports centre on the site of an old squash club on a council reserve.</td>
<td>e.g. New outdoor courts and playing fields for community use are developed on school property owned by the Ministry of Education.</td>
<td>e.g. Artist studios and exhibition space are established in an empty council property.</td>
<td>e.g. A marae is funded to provide bookable community space in a fast-developing rural area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development Partnership</td>
<td>Asset Partnership</td>
<td>Activation Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strengths of this partnership type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>May be able to leverage other government / philanthropic funds towards capital development costs.</td>
<td>May be able to leverage other government / philanthropic funds towards capital development costs.</td>
<td>Majority of investment is in-kind, so lower upfront (cash) cost, reducing cost to ratepayers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Should provide a lower (cash) cost way to address a network gap compared with building a council facility, reducing cost to ratepayers.</td>
<td>Should provide a lower (cash) cost way to address a network gap compared with building a council facility, reducing cost to ratepayers.</td>
<td>Activates existing council property – often well-located with other community infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activates existing council land – often well-located with other community infrastructure.</td>
<td>No reduction of open space.</td>
<td>Can build on existing relationships with proven delivery partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to build capability and capacity of community organisations to meet their own needs, and leverage volunteer input.</td>
<td>No council land involved can mean a shorter process: faster to progress to design and build stage.</td>
<td>Opportunity to build capability and capacity of community organisations to meet their own needs, and leverage volunteer input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term network solution, as the asset will usually be vested to council at conclusion of partnership.</td>
<td>Partner may be an experienced facility operator with proven track record.</td>
<td>Low risk arrangement, either side can exit relatively easily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inexperienced partners may need substantial support to plan, design and build facility, and develop into facility operator role (funding and/or staff time)

Reduces public open space (or other council land)

Additional steps in planning and consenting process where the council is the landowner

Can be complications if commercial activities planned to sustain facility operation, especially if land is held under Reserves Act

If asset paid for by community, need clear governance, legal structure and exit strategy - as the landholder, ownership technically remains with the council

Inexperienced partners may need substantial support to plan, design and build facility, and develop into facility operator role (funding and/or staff time)

Multiple partners involved in funding, owning, managing, using asset and land can make decision-making more complex

Tensions may develop between community and partner use over time (e.g. facilities on school land)

May not be a long-term network solution; community access not guaranteed past partnership term

Smaller partners may need substantial support to develop into facility operator role (funding and/or staff time)

Removes a property from another portfolio (e.g. venues-for-hire)

Property may not be fit for purpose (e.g. accessible) without upfront asset improvements

Tensions may develop between community and partner use over time

Where capital work is required, council as property owner means additional steps in planning, consenting, procurement processes

Activating a council property will impact already stretched maintenance and renewals budget

Presumes existence of partners with desirable facilities + spare capacity

Property may not be fit for purpose (e.g. accessible) without upfront asset improvements

Tensions may develop between community and partner use over time

Not a long-term network solution; community access not guaranteed past partnership term
The size, complexity and risk of the partnership

Allocating each facility partnership a ‘Scale’ is the main way we will ensure our requirements and influence over decision-making will be proportionate to the circumstances.

Fit-for-purpose process

Because no two partnerships are the same, it’s important to ensure that our assessment, decision-making and management processes and practices are fit-for-purpose, and will protect the interests of the council, our partners and our communities.

We won’t over-burden simple, low-cost, low-risk partnerships with excessive costs, processes and paperwork. But we will make sure that we fully investigate and monitor larger, higher risk and more complex partnerships that will receive significant public investment. This is about balancing our ‘empowering and enabling’ role with our obligations as a public entity.

The facility partnership Scale is significant to our decision-making process, because it will determine:

- the planning, financial planning and due diligence we will undertake, and expect partners to undertake
- the documents and evidence we will need to inform our decisions, and how in-depth these will need to be
- any council support available to help partners complete each stage and progress to the next decision gate
- who will make the decision at each gate, and how this will happen
- approximately how long each stage might take and any associated costs (e.g. consent fees, professional services)
- the level of risk management and monitoring we will require
- the level of benefits management and monitoring we will require.

Influence over decision-making

Ideally, all partners would invest equally in a facility partnership, hold equal power, and share the risks equally, but this won’t always be the case. In most facility partnerships Auckland Council has been involved with, the council has been the biggest investor, taken on the most risk, and had the most at stake if the partnership or the facility were to fail.

We will expect a level of influence over key decisions that is proportionate to our level of investment and risk in the partnership, and the capability of our partners.

By ‘key decisions’, we mean those relating to:

- The facility’s location, size, design, construction and fit-out
- The facility’s operating model, financial management and key staff appointments
- The partnership’s legal structure, governance arrangements, and exit provisions.

Staff will work with partners during the early and middle stages of facility partnership development to shape governance and management arrangements that enable our agreed decision-making role.

Even where the council has a greater say in decisions, partners should still benefit from being in the partnership, and feel respected and supported in all of their dealings with us.
### Allocating Scale

There are six determining factors that will determine a partnership’s risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor / Scale</th>
<th>Overall value of investment over first 10 years</th>
<th>Proportion of the total cost council is investing</th>
<th>Complexity / complicating factors</th>
<th>Level of risk to council</th>
<th>Use of council assets</th>
<th>Proven capability of partner(s)</th>
<th>How we see our status within the partnership</th>
<th>Anticipated decision making role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. $&lt; 2m</td>
<td>Low complexity</td>
<td>Low risk for council</td>
<td>Low capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>Low capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>Use of council assets</td>
<td>Proven capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>Low capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>Low capability of partner(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. $2m - $5m</td>
<td>Medium complexity</td>
<td>Medium risk for council</td>
<td>Medium capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>Medium capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>Use of council assets</td>
<td>Proven capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>Medium capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>Medium capability of partner(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. $5m - $10m</td>
<td>High complexity</td>
<td>High risk</td>
<td>High capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>High capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>Use of council assets</td>
<td>Proven capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>High capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>High capability of partner(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. $10m - $20m</td>
<td>Adequate capability, satisfactory track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, satisfactory track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, satisfactory track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, satisfactory track record</td>
<td>Use of council assets</td>
<td>Proven capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>Adequate capability, satisfactory track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, satisfactory track record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. $20m - $50m</td>
<td>Good capability, excellent track record</td>
<td>Good capability, excellent track record</td>
<td>Good capability, excellent track record</td>
<td>Good capability, excellent track record</td>
<td>Use of council assets</td>
<td>Proven capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>Good capability, excellent track record</td>
<td>Good capability, excellent track record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. $50m - $100m</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Use of council assets</td>
<td>Proven capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. $100m - $300m</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Use of council assets</td>
<td>Proven capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. $300m - $1bn</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Use of council assets</td>
<td>Proven capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. &gt; $1bn</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Use of council assets</td>
<td>Proven capability of partner(s)</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
<td>Adequate capability, some track record</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Different partnership proposals will sit at different points on the grid for each of the six factors.

In assessing a specific facility partnership, we will use the highest scoring factor to determine the Scale.

- The higher the Scale, the longer the project is likely to take, and the more costs partners should expect along the way.

- Council guides key decisions in consultation with key partner(s).
The ‘overall level of investment’ will include both capital (construction) and operational (overhead) costs calculated over the first ten years of the partnership. We will also take into account the market value of any assets made available to the partner.

Our ‘proportional level of investment’ will be calculated on the basis of council’s share of the total costs of the project over the first ten years of the partnership.

‘Complicating factors’ could include land status, zoning and condition, numbers and types of partners involved, and the proposed ownership, governance and management model for the new facility. Greater complexity may shift the project into a higher scale, even if the overall value is low.

Where the land or building involved is a council asset, the council has an even greater responsibility to safeguard the wellbeing and interests of the wider community, and consider how the facility partnership may impact them. Accordingly, we will expect to have more influence where council-owned assets are involved.

Our ‘level of risk’ will be assessed by council staff based on the specific circumstances of the partnership, the partners, the facility and the site.

Our ‘partners’ capability’ will be assessed primarily on the basis of their track record of facility delivery and/or service delivery at an appropriate level, and/or whether they have factored in the support of suitably skilled and experienced professionals.
Who makes investment decisions?

Auckland Council has two complementary decision-making parts. The two governance arms each have distinct decision-making responsibilities for facility partnerships.

The governing body...
Focuses on region-wide strategic decisions
Decides where and when the council will invest in the facility network to address gaps and respond to growth

- Develops regional strategies – e.g. for arts and culture, sport and recreation – that set outcomes and priorities for investment
- Sets budget envelopes for overall facility network, and any major facility investments or upgrades through the Long-term Plan
- Govern regional facility partnership relationships, funding or lease agreements and performance reporting

Local boards...
Make most decisions on local places, facilities and activities
May work together to support facilities that benefit several local board areas

- Set outcomes and priorities for local investment through local board plans
- Identify local facility needs and advocate for investment through the Long-term Plan
- Govern local and sub-regional facility partnership relationships, funding or lease agreements and performance reporting
- Allocate local discretionary funding
3. The investment

This section sets out the ways in which we and our partners might invest in facility partnerships, what kinds of partnerships we can invest in, and the principles that will guide that investment.

We will value our ‘in-kind’ support to provide a more accurate picture of our investment.

Where a partnership includes investment ‘in-kind’ – e.g. free or very low-cost use of a council property, technical expertise or ongoing staff support – we will estimate the equivalent market value of the resource and include this in our calculations. We will encourage and support our partners to do the same.

This will enable the council to compare the true cost and value of different partnership options when making investment decisions, and when calculating the returns. In many cases we will want to compare in-house delivery, market provision and a range of partnership options before making investment decisions.
Our investment principles

We will take a principled approach to facility partnership investment decisions. These investment principles underpin our eligibility criteria and investment priorities.

We will:

**Principle 1**
Invest strategically, based on outcomes:
We will invest to deliver the outcomes outlined in our strategies, policies and plans. We will judge success based on the benefits delivered for communities on the ground.

**Principle 2**
Invest to help achieve equity for all Aucklanders:
We will invest to address known community needs and network gaps first. This is about enabling everyone to have access to good quality facilities regardless of their circumstances. Our investments will balance meeting the needs of existing and new communities, and communities of place, interest and identity. This may not mean the same levels or types of provision in every area.

**Principle 3**
Invest wisely, to deliver the maximum value for Aucklanders:
By value, we mean the services, activities and assets (outputs) and the social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits (outcomes) that a partnership will deliver. We will invest in those facility partnerships that provide the best overall return on investment.

**Principle 4**
Invest for sustainability:
We will seek investments that balance our desire to support community-led innovation, with the need to protect the council and the community from risk. We will only invest in facilities we’re confident will be desirable to users, feasible to deliver and viable to operate. We won’t enter partnerships unless we’re confident we can commit to resource an ongoing relationship.
What the principles mean for eligibility

Facility partnerships may take a wide range of forms, reflecting their diverse communities and circumstances. The eligibility criteria for receiving council investment through facility partnerships reflect our investment principles, and our duties and obligations as a local authority.

Ineligible proposals won’t be progressed, although staff may be able to suggest alternative funding partners if the council can’t assist.

Principle 1

Investing strategically

We will **only** invest in:

1. Facility partnerships where the outcomes sought are a **good fit** with the council’s and the other partner(s)’ **kaupapa** (purpose) as set out in our strategies, policies and plans, and the partner(s)’ own vision, constitution, organisational strategy and/or business plan.

We **won’t** invest in facilities that:

2. Primarily deliver **housing, education, health or other services** that are the responsibility of central government, UNLESS the council is a minority investor alongside the relevant central government agencies AND we’re satisfied that our investment will support enhanced community, Māori, arts, sport or recreation outcomes in line with our responsibilities as a local authority.

Once operating, we expect all partnership facilities to be:

3. Non-discriminatory, physically accessible to people of all abilities, and in all other respects compliant with New Zealand (and applicable international) **human rights** legislation.
Principle 2

Investing equitably

We will only invest in:

4. Facilities that address identified facility network gaps or unmet community needs. We will consider the broader picture of provision when assessing ‘need’, including the availability of non-council facilities that are accessible and affordable to the same target users. Our definitions of community are not just place-based, but also encompass communities of identify and interest.

5. Facilities that will be open for use by the wider community. (Facilities may be purpose-built for a particular activity, but shouldn’t be exclusively for the use of the partner organisation(s) and their members, or their membership should be open to anyone who wishes to join).

We won’t invest in facilities that:

6. Are places of worship or other buildings with religious purposes, OR will offer services or activities in order to promote a religion.

7. Are political party offices OR will offer services or activities in order to promote a political cause.

8. Are, or include, commercial premises, unless certain conditions are met (see ‘Facility partnerships and commercial activities’ p.31).

Once operating, all partnership facilities must be:

9. Affordable, i.e. set their fees and charges at or below the level charged by similar community facilities.
Principle 3
Investing wisely

All facility partners must be:

10. A registered charitable organisation, OR agree to invest profit (beyond any agreed cap) back into the facility, or an approved community purpose.

We will only invest in:

11. Developing new facilities where we agree that a new built asset is essential to deliver the outcome, rather than a service, activation or access response.

12. Facility partnerships that we are confident will deliver the same level of service to the community over the same period compared with the alternatives,
   a) AND at a lower total cost to ratepayers (accounting for all forms of support and investment over the life of the partnership, including any opportunity costs),
   b) OR at a similar or higher cost than alternatives, but where additional value will be delivered in return (in line with other strategic priorities).

We won’t invest in facilities where:

13. Analysis shows it would be more cost effective for the council or partner(s) to deliver the facility directly, and there isn’t sufficient extra value gained to outweigh the costs.

Where the facility partnership will include capital works:

14. That are paid for by the council (in part or in full) or involve council-owned property, at any point during the term of the partnership, the procurement of goods and services must align with Auckland Council’s Procurement Policy.

Once operating, we expect all partnership facilities to be:

15. Safe, properly maintained and legally compliant for public use.

16. Willing and able to meet reasonable accountability and monitoring requirements.
All facility partnerships must be:

- Formally constituted organisations with a recognised legal structure.

We will only invest in:

- Facilities that are confident will be financially viable and sustainable.

We won’t invest in facilities that:

- Have joint ownership so where the council would own one level of energy or area of a building or structure and other(s) would own the other.

We are confident will be financially viable and sustainable:

- Endurance plan will be developed and provided to Auckland Council.
Facility partnerships and commercial activity

We recognise businesses and commercial activities can play a role in enabling viable facility partnerships, and we will support this in certain circumstances.

Facility partners may engage in commercial activities to offset their costs.

Council will actively encourage community partners to explore appropriate revenue generation opportunities to help them meet their ongoing operating costs. This could include commercial activities run directly by the partner (e.g. a gallery shop or a coaching programme), a concession run by a private operator (e.g. a café), or operating a social enterprise that supports the facility (e.g. a community garden).

The following conditions will apply to facility partnerships that incorporate commercial activities in their business model, including social enterprises:

1. We must agree that the proposed commercial activity complements the purpose of the facility, and will increase public use and enjoyment of the facility and/or the surrounding site.

2. The zoning of the land must allow commercial activity of the type proposed, OR the land can be re-zoned to allow it, and the relevant decision-maker must support this change (investment in the partnership will remain contingent on this re-zoning).

3. Any commercial activities related to the facility partnership must return all profits to offset the operating costs of the facility, or in the case of a concession run by a private operator, to pay a lease set at market rates.

4. Any surplus generated by commercial activities must be reinvested in the facility, or a community purpose approved by us.

Businesses can be co-investors in facility partnerships.

Council will consider co-investing in a partnership alongside businesses that want to sponsor or otherwise support facilities in their communities. In these cases, Auckland Council’s Strategic Partnerships Policy will apply.

Businesses can express interest in a facility partnership opportunity.

Proposals on the Proactive Track: Businesses can respond to a Facility Partnership Tender advertised by the council. If selected to proceed past the first (EOI) stage, the relevant sections of the Auckland Council Procurement Policy and processes will apply thereafter.

Proposals on the Responsive Track: Auckland Council’s Unsolicited Proposals Policy will apply where businesses approach the council about a facility partnership outside of the Facility Partnership Tender process. Refer to ‘Proactive and Responsive Partnership Tracks’ in section 4: The Model for more information about the Tracks.

From time to time, the council may contract commercial enterprises to manage council facilities through a formal procurement process, with opportunities advertised in the usual way. These are not facility partnerships for the purposes of this policy.
Facility partnerships and commercial activity

Not-for-profit
- Charity supported by grants & donations
  - Sells some good or services to help fund core social mission

Social enterprise
- Charity supported partly by trade
  - Directly fulfils a core social mission through trading
- Social purpose business
  - Trades in order to fund a core social mission fulfilled by others

For-profit
- Socially responsible business
  - Donates to support a social mission fulfilled by others
- Commercial enterprise

Charitable organisations and social enterprises can enter facility partnerships with us, and engage in commercial activities to offset their costs (subject to the conditions outlined on the previous page.)

Businesses can be co-investors, or express interest in an advertised partnership opportunity.
Using the principles to prioritise

In a growing city, with constrained funding and limited land and buildings available for community use, the council can’t support every facility partnership proposal we receive. Decision-makers will consider a range of factors to determine which partnerships will deliver the most benefits for Auckland – both financial and non-financial – and are the soundest choice.

We will prioritise some facility partnership projects over others, in line with the commitments made to Auckland, and with Aucklanders, in our existing strategies, policies and plans. We will identify the partnerships that are most likely to make an impact, in the areas Aucklanders have agreed investment is most urgently needed.

Our priorities directly align with our investment principles, and we expect all successful proposals will address at least one priority. Partnership proposals that meet multiple priorities will have a considerable advantage.

Principle 1
Investing strategically

We will target our investment towards facility partnerships that:

1. Will deliver priority outcomes in line with our existing strategies, policies and plans.
2. Are Māori-led, and/or help to celebrate Māori as Auckland’s unique point of difference in the world, and/or honour documented commitments to Māori made by the former councils in the Auckland region.
3. Will capitalise on opportunities presented by the development or transformation of areas of rapid growth and intensification.

Principle 2
Investing equitably

We will target our investment towards facility partnerships that:

4. Target underserved populations (communities of place, interest and identity).

Principle 3
Investing wisely

We will target our investment towards facility partnerships that:

5. Optimise use of the council’s or the community’s existing facilities and assets, including current facility partnerships that can make the case for further investment.

6. Are for multi-purpose facilities (i.e. which can be used for a broad range of activities), and/or bring together multiple organisations and groups, who would otherwise require separate premises.

Principle 4
Investing sustainably

We will target our investment towards facility partnerships that:

7. Can leverage other sources of income or investment, meaning the council will be covering less than 50% of the construction and/or establishment costs, and/or less than 25% of the ongoing operating costs.

8. Will develop facilities which are environmentally low-impact and sustainable in their design, construction and operation.
Boosting the likelihood of investment

Even after applying our investment principles, eligibility criteria and priorities, our funds and assets will still be oversubscribed. This page outlines other matters our decision-makers will take into account when choosing between partnership proposals.

Staff will look for the following when advising decision-makers:

**Principle 1**
Investing strategically

- Where the partnership will build the capacity, skills and resilience of the partner(s) and the community.

**Principle 2**
Investing equitably

Where the proposed partnership would:

- honour a historical commitment between the council and the partner(s) to work together,
- significantly increase goodwill, confidence or trust in the council within the facility’s host community from a low base,
- otherwise have a significant positive knock-on or ripple effect in the host community.

**Principle 3**
Investing wisely

- Where the partnership would secure a prime location for the facility otherwise unavailable or unaffordable to the council, and this location is likely to be a major contributor to its success.
- Where the partnership facility would likely be better used than a standard council-managed facility of the same type, because the partner(s):
  - have an established reputation with the local community,
  - have better access to the facility’s intended users than the council, and/or are better positioned to provide locally or culturally appropriate services.
- Where one or more partners (including the council) feel they’d need to control the majority of decisions, to an extent that is disproportionate to their level of investment and risk.

**Principle 4**
Investing sustainably

- Where the partnership would leverage an established working relationship between the council and the partner(s).
- Where the partnership would attract significant volunteer input, pro bono expertise, or discounts on goods or services for the facility which are otherwise unavailable to the council.
- Where each partner’s proposed roles and responsibilities reflect their individual strengths.
- Where the proposed partnership is ‘win-win’ and will provide clear mutual benefit for all parties, without undue workload, pressure or risk falling on smaller partners.
- Where there’s either no ability or no desire to adjust the partnership – e.g. its structure, deliverables, investment levels – if circumstances change, or initial expectations prove unrealistic.
4. The relationship

Partnerships may be agreed between organisations – but ultimately, they are formed between people. Relationships are what make partnerships different to contracts, and lift the commitment between partners above a transactional arrangement.

Quality relationships are foundational for a healthy facility partnership: they set the tone for all of the work the partners do together, and are the springboard for any future collaboration. Good relationships are built on trust and good faith, mutual understanding and mutual respect. Good relationships can only be built over time and require ongoing effort.

Auckland Council has committed to taking an Empowered Communities Approach when entering relationships with community-led organisations and projects – including facility partnerships. An empowered community is one where individuals, whānau and communities can influence decisions, take action and make change happen about the issues that matter to them.

The council’s Empowered Communities Approach is based on principles of equity, inclusion and collaboration, and aligns closely with our commitment to realise Māori aspirations and outcomes. Our partnering principles provide guidance to council staff about how to work in ways that are more empowering of communities.

Our partnering principles

Auckland Council will resource and treat facility partnership relationships with the care and commitment they deserve. This commitment to quality partnership relationships means we will:

1. Be open, honest and upfront with our partners (and potential partners) about what we can and can’t commit to and why, and follow through on the commitments we make. We will communicate regularly with our partners, and keep each other in the loop.

2. Take responsibility for ‘partnering on the inside’, acknowledging the council’s size and complexity can make us difficult to partner with. We will prioritise continuity in our relationships, and actively manage the transitions when key people change.

3. Factor in adequate frontline and specialist staff support as part of the business case for any new facility partnership.

4. Recognise and value partners’ financial and non-financial contributions, and the risks all parties take by working in partnership. We will agree roles and responsibilities that play to our strengths, and allow all partners to meaningfully participate in decisions.

5. Support our partners in a way that builds capability in both directions: building the capability of our partners to do things for themselves, and of our own people to work alongside them.

6. Seek to respond together to any challenges we encounter, with formal disputes processes only used as a last resort. We will seek to work through any issues related to differences in our working style and culture.
Potential facility partners
Many different organisations and groups could play a role in providing or investing in facilities for Auckland:

Potential future facility partners for Auckland Council include:

- National and regional organisations in the community, arts and sports sectors
- Iwi bodies, marae and kaupapa Māori organisations
- Tertiary institutions and schools
- Local trusts, societies, cooperatives, groups and clubs
- Facility development trusts (set up to enable smaller organisations to collectively fund, develop, govern and manage a shared facility)
- Social enterprises, or other commercial organisations delivering community outcomes

Potential future co-investors in facility partnerships include:

- Business Improvement Districts (BIDs)
- Government ministries and departments
- Funding agencies / philanthropic bodies
- Post Settlement Governance Entities (PSGEs)
- Private, corporate and philanthropic entities

Our partners’ people can include:

- Boards of Trustees and Boards of Directors – may be paid or volunteers
- Kaumatua, iwi or hapu liaisons
- Management committees for smaller organisations, usually volunteers
- Management staff – e.g. chief officers, directors, general managers and facility managers
- Frontline staff – e.g. reception staff, coordinators, coaches, maintenance and cleaners – paid or volunteers
- Consultants, lawyers, accountants, fundraisers or other contracted professionals
Council support for facility partnerships

The council family includes a range of skilled and experienced staff, each of whom helps to support facility partnerships in different ways. No one group of staff can provide quality support and advice on their own – we need everyone on board to do this well.

Staff involvement includes:

- Having early conversations with potential partners, co-investors and council decision-makers
- Taking lead in preparing and assessing facility partnership proposals and plans, and making recommendations to decision-makers
- Providing technical, financial and legal advice to partners and decision-makers
- Helping to design, plan, cost, convert and project manage facility partnership building projects
- Helping to develop plans and managing funding and lease agreements once a facility is operational
- Helping to build the capacity and capability of partners, when needed
- Evaluating and reporting on the benefits delivered through facility partnerships

Our partners

- Customer service staff
  - e.g. Call centre & service centre staff
- Facility managers, partnership managers & other key staff
- Trust boards, directors, management committees
- Iwi & hapu
- Coaches, tutors, community users & volunteers
- Locally focused advisors
  - e.g. local board staff, local community advisors, council iwi liaisons, brokers
- Communications & engagement advisors
- Policy, strategy & research advisors

Our elected members

- Land, building & asset staff
  - e.g. lease advisors, maintenance staff and contractors
- Specialist staff
  - e.g. arts and culture advisors, sport & recreation advisors, librarians, kaiwhakatere, heritage advisors
- Legal, risk & financial advisors
- Infrastructure, planning & consents advisors

Working directly with partners

Supporting frontline staff & elected members
Our roles and responsibilities

The council is a large and complex organisation, with many different roles it must play simultaneously.

These include regulatory / kaitiaki roles, and empowering / awhi roles. These roles may sometimes be in tension, or even direct conflict.

We can’t avoid this complexity, as each function and role we play is an important part of serving Auckland. But there will be limits to what we can do through partnerships, what we can do with or for our partners, and what our partners can do themselves.

In particular, the council must always:

- Keep people safe
- Ensure we and others comply with the law, and are seen to do so
- Act in ways that are consistent with our duties as a local authority and kaitiakitanga, and in alignment with our own policies and plans
- Balance competing interests among communities of place, interest and identity
- Set out to allocate scarce resources fairly, transparently, and for maximum benefit.

To help manage any tension between our roles we will:

- Be upfront: we will acknowledge, discuss and actively manage tensions as they arise, accepting that in some cases finding common ground will not be possible
- Be coordinated: where our different roles are in tension internally, we will try to ensure this is flagged early and resolved, before (further) commitments are made or work progressed
- Champion where we can’t act: sometimes, we may not be able to partner ourselves, but if we strongly support the kaupapa, we can help bring together others who can.

Lead relationship broker

We know that the council’s large size and complexity as an organisation can make us difficult for partners to build relationships with. Every facility partnership will be allocated a lead relationship broker within the council.

This person:

- Will establish a relationship with the key people in the partner organisations
- Is responsible for assisting the partner(s) to navigate council processes and systems, and accessing and/or coordinating advice from the ‘virtual team’ of specialist and technical staff involved in each facility partnership
- Will be the first port of call for the partner(s), elected members and other council staff interacting with the partnership
- May change over the lifecycle of the partnership, but where this needs to happen the transition will be carefully managed
5. The agreement

Clarifying and formally documenting the legal arrangements relating to the facility and the partnership is an important way to protect the short, medium and long-term interests of all parties.

Facility partnerships are some of the most complex arrangements we enter into, because they cover physical assets, often big investments and usually long periods of time — sometimes generations. The financial stakes are higher, the potential risks are greater, the considerations are more technical, and every choice carries an opportunity cost.

The graphic at right identifies a number of aspects relating to the legal side of facility partnerships, which underpin the formal arrangements Auckland Council can make with our partners and protect everyone’s interests.

As no two facility partnerships are the same, the specific legal considerations will vary between projects. Staff will consult with our in-house legal team and ensure partners and decision-makers understand the potential implications of individual proposals from Stage 2 onwards. All parties must fully investigate and resolve the legal dimensions of a facility partnership to their mutual satisfaction before entering any formal agreement at Stages 3 or 4.
Legal considerations

Organisational types
Auckland Council has specific rules and practices around partnering with some types of organisation – e.g. facility trusts, social enterprises, other types of commercial organisation and schools.

Partnership and facility management structure
The council, partner(s) and co-investor(s) will need to agree and document arrangements for the funding, ownership, governance and operation of the facility. This will include negotiating levels of partner and community access, identifying and mitigating conflicts of interest, agreeing when and how the partnership will be wound up, and if there will be options for early exit.

Financial obligations
Many facility partnerships will involve council grants or contracts for service as part of their funding model. These may be paid out in advance, in arrears, or as the project hits key milestones. Different types of payments have different tax obligations and accounting requirements.

Leasing council property
Partners establishing a facility in a council building will require a commercial lease, community lease or license to occupy the property. Lease negotiations will include expectations and arrangements for property maintenance, renewals and improvements, and any sub-letting or co-tenancy arrangements.

Leasing council land
A partner-owned facility built on council land will require a ground lease, with provisions made for renewing the lease, vesting assets to council or remediating the land at the end of the lease.

Managing risk and disputes
The council and partners will need to identify a range of possible risks early on, monitor these as the partnership proposal progresses, and actively manage them once the facility becomes operational. Partnership facilities will need to be fully insured and legally compliant for public use, with clear operational policies, clearly defined liability and a process for managing disputes.
6. The facility

Land and building considerations

As an experienced facility provider, we understand how much is involved in planning, designing, constructing, running and looking after built assets that will do the job they’re built for, endure thousands of hours of community use, weather and all sorts of change in and around them – year in, year out.

This can be complex, specialised and expensive work. In entering facility partnerships, the council and partners will need to navigate both land considerations (planning, leasing and technical aspects), building considerations (design and construction, leasing, operation and maintenance). As no two facility partnerships are the same, the specific considerations will vary between projects.

We don’t develop community facilities for their own sake, but for what they enable people to do and achieve. We enter facility partnerships to enable activities where a physical space and/or built asset is an essential ingredient, and where this is currently missing.

If the space or asset isn’t critical or is already available, then a service-based solution – such as a new programme in the library, at the mall, or on the internet – might meet the need just as well as developing a new facility, and more cost-effectively. That’s why we will always look for service solutions first, which could include a facility partnership through our Access partnership model.

However many facility partnerships will involve developing new built assets, re-purposing or upgrading existing ones. They may not always involve developing buildings – an outdoor basketball court, for example – but there will always be a physical component.

The land

All facility partnerships have land considerations – they will sit on a specific site that is owned by someone, next to other properties, reached from a particular street, located in a neighbourhood, precinct, suburb and local board area, in the rohe (customary territory) of one or more mana whenua.

The area may have specific cultural, heritage or geotechnical features or significance, and it will grow and develop in accordance with its zoning under the Unitary Plan. Facilities will also take their place in a natural ecosystem – with its own character, behaviour, patterns and vulnerabilities.

The building or asset

A facility’s design, configuration, fit-out and operation can be the difference between a successful facility, an under-used facility, and a failed facility.

If building new, the planning, design and construction are critical phases for the project; they can be costly, complex and involve multiple decisions and trade-offs. Partners will require the support of qualified professionals.

If developing, re-purposing or activating an existing building, it may need renovation, new fittings or equipment, or improvements to come up to specification for public use. It may have special cultural or heritage significance, with added protection under the Unitary Plan. It may have existing tenants, or the potential to sub-let or bring in co-tenants.

All facilities need plans in place to manage regular community access and use, comply with leases and funding agreements, and the ongoing management, maintenance and renewal of the asset to keep it safe and in good condition.
6. The facility

Land and building considerations

1. Land considerations
   - Land classification / status and statutory implications
   - Landowneer permissions
   - Sites of significance to Māori
   - Development restrictions (e.g., parkland, protected trees, viewsheds, height)
   - Coastal inundation, susceptibility to flooding, and other climatic considerations
   - Ecological considerations / impacts
   - Current condition and suitability of the land for a facility (e.g., contours, contamination)
   - Infrastructure and services (utilities, wastewater)

2. Location / site considerations
   - Co-location with other community infrastructure
   - Site position - e.g., street frontage, visibility, proximity to others on site
   - Access and parking, proximity to public transport
   - Local impacts (near neighbours, noise, restricted activities)
   - Suitability for commercial activities (if planned)
   - Impact of new facility on other users or tenants of the site

3. Facility purpose and use factors
   - Overall floor area
   - Layout and configuration
   - Reception, office space, activity areas, kitchen, toilets, changing areas...
   - Fixed vs. flexible spaces
   - Fixtures and fittings
   - Plant and equipment
   - Storage

4. Design factors
   - Quality design on a budget
   - Materials and finishes (cost, aesthetics, and durability)
   - Building footprint and relationship with the surrounding site and area
   - Māori design principles
   - Universal design principles (accessibility)
   - Sustainable design and energy efficiency
   - Preserving heritage features
   - Crime prevention, security, and access
   - Integrated public art, community art
   - Branding, naming, attribution, and signage
   - Landscaping and ongoing site maintenance

5. Building regulations
   - Seismic (earthquake) strengthening
   - Asbestos removal
   - Building Warrant of Fitness
   - Fire safety
   - Health and safety

6. Construction
   - Resource & Building consents
   - Earthworks
   - Choosing and managing suppliers
   - Project and site management
   - Contingencies

7. Facility operation
   - Managing governors (e.g., trustees), facility staff (e.g., managers, tutors) and volunteers (e.g., coaches), including HIJ matters
   - Commercial operations (e.g., cafés, pro shops, social enterprise opportunities)
   - Managing bookings, hireage, and memberships
   - Fees and charges (members and public)
   - Financial management (e.g., accounts, wages, cash handling)
   - Building access and security
   - Maintenance and renewals
   - Cleaning and waste management
   - Promotion and advertising
   - Monitoring and reporting to council and other investors

Technical Support
The council employs expert technical staff across all of these areas. Our staff will consult with all prospective facility partners proposing Scale 3 and 4 partnerships from Stage 2 onwards (see p.13) and provide advice and support to all prospective facility partners (and/or their contracted professionals) from Stage 3 onwards. Our technical staff and contractors will also be responsible for assessing the land and building aspects of facility partnership proposals, advising colleagues and decision-makers on these considerations, processing any relevant permissions and consents, and managing any ongoing asset management responsibilities assumed by the council.

Note: Landowne considerations and approvals (who owns the site) are addressed separately from the regulatory aspects.
Facility Partnerships with Māori

Summary report
# Table of contents

1  Context / Horopaki……………………………………………………………………………………………..3
2  Key findings / Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu………………………………………………………………………6
3  Next steps / Ngā koringa ā-muri…………………………………………………………………………………..16

*Appendices / Ngā tapirihanga*

Appendix A: Summary of findings and responses…………………………………………………………..17
Appendix B: Treaty Principles………………………………………………………………………………………20
Appendix C: Research methodology………………………………………………………………………………21
Appendix D: Research sample and selection criteria…………………………………………………………23
Appendix E: Informant interview discussion guide…………………………………………………………..25
1 Context / Horopaki

Summary of background

Auckland Council operates or supports a wide range of community facilities, including community centres, arts and cultural facilities, libraries, sports fields and swimming pools.

Most are owned and directly managed by the council, but around 300 are owned and/or operated by community groups, sports organisations and schools. These arrangements come in many shapes and sizes, and are collectively known as ‘facility partnerships’.

The Community Facilities Network Plan (adopted 2015) states the council will meet more facility needs through partnerships in future, but noted there was no consistent policy for selecting and supporting them. In 2016, a project was initiated to develop a new Facility Partnerships Policy.

Facility partnerships could provide a valuable mechanism for the council to partner with Māori, to support tino rangatiratanga and to enable positive outcomes for Māori. Facility partnerships with marae are an obvious starting point.

However our stocktake had identified fewer than five facility partnerships with Māori out of 300+ in our existing portfolio. We wanted to make sure that the new policy properly considers any special context, barriers or opportunities for marae or Māori organisations.

To achieve this, we met with seven marae and three Māori organisations to explore how facility partnerships might fit within Te Ao Māori, and insights from these conversations were refined at four findings hui with a wider group. This report summarises what we learned through this work.

1.1 Project background and context

Community facilities are an important part of realising our vision of Auckland as a world class city. They contribute to building strong, healthy and vibrant communities by providing spaces where Aucklanders can connect, socialise, learn and participate in a wide range of social, cultural, art and recreational activities.

Auckland Council operates or supports a wide range of facilities that benefit the community, including community centres, venues for hire and rural halls, arts and cultural facilities, libraries, recreation centres, sports fields and swimming pools.

Most of these facilities are owned and directly managed by the council, but around 300 are owned and/or operated by community groups, sports organisations and schools. A number of these are sited on council parks or in council-owned buildings, or were built or operate with some financial assistance from Auckland Council (or its predecessors). These arrangements come in many shapes and sizes, and are collectively known as ‘facility partnerships’.
The Community Facilities Network Plan states the council will meet more facility needs through partnerships in future, as a way of ‘doing more with less’ in a growing city, and empowering communities that want to actively contribute to their own development.

However, it noted that the council currently has no consistent policy for selecting and supporting facility partnerships. Following the adoption of the plan in 2015, a project was initiated in 2016 to develop a new regional Facility Partnerships Policy.

1.2 Facility partnerships with Māori

Auckland Council recognises Te Tiriti o Waitangi / the Treaty of Waitangi as the founding document of Aotearoa New Zealand, and as establishing an enduring partnership between Māori and the Crown. The council has committed to engage and work with Māori in ways that are consistent with a Treaty-based relationship.

Facility partnerships could provide a valuable mechanism for the council to partner with Māori, to support tino rangatiratanga and to enable positive outcomes for Māori in line with this commitment.

The Treaty Principles provide an overarching context for all our relationships with Māori, and need to guide how the council and Māori work together to establish, shape and manage facility partnership arrangements in future (relevant Treaty Principles are listed at Appendix B).

Facility partnerships and marae

Marae are specifically identified in the Community Facilities Network Plan as potential community facility partners, and are an obvious starting point for exploring facility partnerships with Māori. Marae are already a focal point for Māori social, economic, environmental and cultural development, and ‘enabling Māori aspirations for thriving and self-sustaining marae’ is an Auckland Plan priority.

Valuing marae is also a tangible way of recognising Māori perspectives and preferences in providing for their own health and welfare needs. In supporting marae and other Māori-led facilities, the council demonstrates respect for matauranga Māori (knowledge), kaitiakitanga (guardianship) and manaakitanga (hospitality).

1.3 Rationale for this research

The first phase of the Facility Partnerships Policy project included a stocktake of existing facility partnerships. During this process, fewer than five formal facility partnerships with Māori organisations were identified by council staff, out of the 300+ in our current portfolio.

The council does provide grants to marae each year through the Cultural Initiatives Fund, but we found investment provided in this way is not characterised by either the council or marae as a ‘facility partnership’. These grants are ring-fenced for capital improvements to marae buildings,
and are not tagged to the marae playing a formal role as facilities within a regional network, or delivering particular outcomes in return for the investment. Further, the Cultural Initiatives Fund does not provide for an ongoing partnership relationship with the marae alongside the grant.

In developing the new policy approach, we wanted to understand why so few marae or Māori organisations have sought formal facility partnerships with the council in the past, and make sure that the new policy properly considers any special context, barriers or opportunities for those that may be interested in them in future.

1.4 Summary of methodology

During Phase 1 of the Facility Partnerships Policy project we conducted key informant interviews related to a sample of 10 partnerships. During Phase 2, we selected an additional sample of seven marae and three Māori organisations to enable us to specifically explore a Te Ao Māori perspective.

Where possible, we also interviewed the council staff members who ‘hold’ the relationship, or who have the most in-depth understanding of their interactions with the council (past and present), to provide an internal perspective.

The project team analysed the interviews, and collectively identified common themes, issues and challenges, opportunities and benefits. We then held four findings hui to test our draft insights with a broader roopu (group). Additional issues raised at hui are incorporated into our findings.

The key stages of the research are outlined in more detail in Appendix B.

1.5 Out of scope feedback

Our conversations with Māori were wide-ranging, covering not only experiences of ‘partnering’ with the council, but broader issues around the council’s relationships with Māori in Tāmaki Makaurau.

Although some of this feedback was beyond the scope of the Facility Partnerships Policy Project, it has been captured here as a full account of what we heard, and what we committed to our informants to ‘take back’ and share with the wider organisation. Feedback that is related to a partnerships kaupapa but out of scope for the Facility Partnerships Policy specifically is included separately at the end of the Findings section, and noted in the summary (Appendix A).

This broader feedback will be of interest and value for council staff currently holding relationships or with obligations to hold relationships, for the governing body and local boards, and for the Independent Māori Statutory Board.
2 Key findings / Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu

This section summarises the common themes that emerged from 11 one-on-one interviews, which were then further refined and expanded by 39 participants at four findings hui.

It is intended as an account of ‘what we heard’ from Māori we spoke to, and is not assumed to represent the views of all Māori. Although summarised and themed by staff, it is written from the perspective of our research participants.

Summary of key research findings

The research findings directly related to the Facility Partnerships Policy kaupapa have been grouped under the following key themes:

- Marae are more than just ‘facilities’.
- Māori -led facilities (especially marae) are already delivering outcomes in their communities and want more recognition and support from council.
- Partnerships should be founded on Te Tiriti principles, shared values and a long-term vision.
- Successful partnerships rely on enduring relationships.
- The relationship between mana whenua, mataawaka Māori and the council is complex and needs careful navigation.

Additional (out of scope) research findings

- Generally, council relationships with Māori need to improve, starting with better consultation and engagement.
- Māori want to be more involved in developing policy that particularly interests or impacts them.
Findings on the Facility Partnerships kaupapa

2.1 Marae are more than just ‘facilities’

For Māori, marae are at the centre of Te Ao Māori and cannot be labelled simply as ‘facilities’. The pākeha concept of a facility is seen as a very limited one, which doesn’t adequately convey the special role and significance of marae for Māori.

What we heard:

- **Marae are inseparable from the whenua, the tupuna (ancestors), their people and their history.** Marae are homes; they have mana; they are a taonga (treasure).

- **Marae often support a holistic range of functions, services and/or activities.** For example they may provide housing (papakainga) and emergency accommodation, host formal and informal gatherings, offer language and cultural instruction in a whanau-centric learning environment (e.g. kohunga reo, puna reo), act as a centre and showcase for Māori arts, and deliver or host social services.

- **Marae often hold relationships** with iwi, other marae, the wider Māori community, their local community, and also local and national organisations, central government and the council. Because of this, they often have broad oversight of issues and initiatives in their area.

- **Each marae is different.** They serve different communities in different ways, and have different tikanga, history, aspirations, capacity and governance structures.

- **The marae is turangawaewae: a place to stand for Māori.** Marae serve the needs of Māori first and foremost, and if a marae is needed by the iwi and hapu, this must take precedence.

- **Marae have specific tikanga (protocols) that must be followed** by visitors to show respect and uphold the mana of the marae. Marae contain many taonga, especially in their wharenui (meeting house), and some have uru pa (burial grounds) on site.

“Marae are being repeatedly referred to as ‘facilities’ – that is a very broad and pākeha word. Marae is the term [that] should be used.”

“For Māori, your marae is your ‘community centre’... If we have too fixed an idea of what a ‘community facility’ is, what has to happen there, or how it supports itself... we may miss the opportunity.”

“It would be silly to identify all marae as ‘the same’. Ensure this does not happen.”

“Our obligation to the community should not take precedence over our tikanga and traditional practices.”
• Marae have a strong tradition of manaakitanga (hospitality) and hosting guests may incur costs that are not covered by hireage fees. Traditionally, visitors offer koha voluntarily to acknowledge these efforts, but many non-Māori don’t understand or account for this. Sometimes manaakitanga appears to be unintentionally exploited by the council.

How the Facility Partnerships Policy can respond:

Any partnership arrangements with marae must fully acknowledge their place within Te Ao Māori. This includes:

• Not defining marae as ‘community facilities’. Marae are unique, even if they fulfil some of the same roles as facilities.

• Committing to uphold the mana, tikanga, and mataranganga Māori of marae, including ensuring council staff understand their special role and significance. Pā sites are tapu, and visitors must respect cultural safety requirements.

• Recognising that a marae may be needed by the iwi and hapu, sometimes at short notice (for example to host tangi) and ensuring allowances are made for this.

• Valuing and resourcing the knowledge, time and travel of Māori providing manaakitanga on marae, and helping educate the wider community to do the same.

Some of these considerations may also be relevant when planning the development of facilities to be operated by Māori organisations.

2.2 Value the outcomes that marae and Maori-led facilities are already delivering

There is a perception that the council prefers to develop new facilities from scratch; “reinventing the wheel” rather than investing in supporting and improving what already exists.

Marae in particular are already active in the community space, and are playing an emerging role in supporting cultural learning and understanding in an increasingly diverse city. Many marae want the council to recognise the value they provide and build on
their strengths. This includes providing them with support and resources to fulfil their role more effectively.

**What we heard:**

- **Many marae have a broader focus already;** they are welcoming spaces for the whole community, not only Māori – for example working with local schools, and hosting wananga, programmes and events.

- **Marae take pride in their manaakitanga,** and in sharing their strong connection to the whenua and mātauranga Māori with newer residents.

- **Marae fulfil work in the community that the council and other agencies do not do.** Further, some Māori feel more comfortable accessing services through their marae or a kaupapa Māori facility or provider.

- **Marae are charitable organisations run by volunteers** and it can be difficult to meet the expectations of their own people, the wider community and the council. Further, as Auckland has grown and changed, some iwi and hapū members have had to move out of their rohe (customary territory) and must travel back to look after the marae and manaaki visitors. This makes it more difficult to expand the role of the marae.

- **Marae aren’t fully reliant on the council to sustain them.** Marae rely on others within their immediate community to support each other – including ‘marae to marae’. However, the council should ensure the protection and sustainability of marae in the same way it recognises, resources and helps to maintain other community infrastructure, like sports clubs and community centres.

**How the Facility Partnerships Policy can respond:**

- **Council needs to look for opportunities to increase the use and capacity of existing facilities** (in the broadest sense) that are serving the community – not always look to create new ones.

- **The council could play a useful role in supporting marae staff and volunteers** to build their capacity and capability,
e.g. through access to training, specialist expertise (e.g. HR, building compliance) and back office support. These non-financial forms of support would be highly valued.

- The council could also proactively notify marae of council employment and procurement opportunities in their area. This would honour the relationships, acknowledge existing skills and expertise, help to sustain the marae, and support the local economy.

2.3 Partnerships should be founded on Te Tiriti principles, shared values and a long-term vision

Genuine partnerships provide an opportunity for the council to honour its Treaty obligations, and give effect to commitments made to Māori. To be meaningful, a partnership must be founded in shared values and a long-term vision. Māori must have an active decision-making role if they are to exercise tino rangatiratanga.

What we heard:

- Experiences of ‘partnerships’ and other relationships with the council feel unbalanced, as “Council has all the control.” For Māori, the word ‘partnership’ implies shared power, and reciprocal relationships based on Te Tiriti. Shared power is about acknowledging the mana motuhake of Māori.

- Under Te Tiriti o Waitangi, mana whenua should not be considered one of many ‘stakeholders’. The relationship with, and responsibility for place that mana whenua have as kaitiaki in Tāmaki Makaurau is unique.

- Māori are their own experts who conceive of the world through a holistic lens. Social, cultural, environmental and economic dimensions are interconnected. This way of thinking cuts across council’s organisational boundaries, and extends before and beyond the council’s timelines – it is holistic and intergenerational.

“It’s not all about money, it’s about help. The council could use its power to make things easier for us... you have a massive team behind you, we don’t.”

“Marae have similar aspirations for the community, just how we get there is different.”

“Walk alongside us (don’t tell us what to do).”

“It’s not just about the marae for us, it’s about the environment, it’s everything – our thinking goes out like this, it goes out to the people, out to the land, out to the moana... We come as a whole, as opposed to a portion.”
• Shared values and aligned outcomes should always be the starting point for any partnership: alignment comes first, relationships second, working out the details third.

• To realise meaningful outcomes through a partnership, there needs to be a long-term vision and commitment. However, change on both sides is inevitable over longer timeframes, and neither side should be locked in forever.

How the Facility Partnerships Policy can respond:

• Partners need to be conceived of as equal and active participants, negotiating the way forward together. This aligns with the Treaty partnership and Treaty Principles.

• Facility partnership arrangements need to strongly align with the kaupapa and aspirations of the particular iwi and marae involved. In most cases iwi governance / post-settlement governance entities should be involved before detailed discussions with marae.

• Identifying shared values and outcomes should be the starting point for any partnership discussion, facility-based or otherwise.

• Opportunities to renegotiate a partnership should be planned in to allow for change over time

• Skill and talent sharing between marae, and between marae and the council, would help to improve relationships and capability. This would enable both sides to move towards genuine partnerships.

2.4 Successful partnerships rely on enduring relationships

Māori think inter-generationally and value enduring relationships. Most marae want to establish / maintain long-term relationships with the council that go beyond any particular issue, project or activity. These relationships would provide the right basis for a facility partnership discussion. Too often relationships with the council are perceived as short-term, project-based and transactional.

“The most important thing is to have an aligned vision, aligned outcomes we want to achieve, aligned aspirations, a shared kaupapa.”

“We want to retain the right to be selective and take bookings that align with our values and kaupapa... it’s not just somewhere to run a birthday party.”

“No-one should be able to sign things away for long periods of time – we risk making others who come after us clean up our mess if we’ve got it wrong.”

“A marae is not a venue for hire. It comes with a relationship that should be nurtured.”
What we heard:

- Some longstanding relationships between Māori / marae and the council have been lost since amalgamation. Not all have been re-established, but there is a desire on both sides to do so.
- There is an uneven distribution of relationships across the council and across iwi. For example, some iwi have relationships with senior leaders at the council, while others do not.
- Many marae – mana whenua and mataawaka – would like to establish closer relationships with their local board(s). Effort needs to be made to maintain these relationships through and between election cycles.
- Relationships can be lost due to turnover of key people on either side, or where the relationship has been formed around a specific project that comes to an end. These relationships aren’t always handed over well.
- Without a relationship agreement (or MOU, or other formal document) it can be more difficult to maintain the relationship when key people change.

How the Facility Partnerships Policy can respond:

- The council needs to take a long-term perspective, and build enduring relationships with marae and Māori organisations. This would provide the best basis for a facility partnership.
- Initial discussions need to occur at the right level (e.g. rangatira to rangatira / chief to chief).
- The complexity of the council’s structure and its size makes the organisation difficult to navigate. It would be helpful to have one central point of contact between each marae/iwi and the council.
- Written agreements / MOUs may help support [partnership] relationships between council and marae / Māori organisations, to provide a reference point and ensure the commitments made remain clear and will endure. This

“Mutual respect is critical to partnership, and building a deep and lasting relationship. People carry the information and knowledge between them... We don’t want tick-box, transactional relationships.”

“Council should be brokering introductions between local board leaders and marae, particularly mataawaka marae.”

“Local boards need to stick to scheduled meets with the community [and] make an effort to visit mataawaka marae.”

“Formal documents are paramount [to sustaining relationships; given there is likely to be change on both sides... enabling] succession is key.”
would reduce the impact of staff turnover and organisational change on both sides.

2.5 Navigating relationships with mana whenua and mataawaka

The relationship between mana whenua and mataawaka Māori in Tāmaki Makaurau can be complicated. The Treaty creates different obligations to mana whenua and mataawaka. This space needs careful navigation, and is often not well understood by pākehā. Māori spoke of the need for the council to carefully consider how to adapt their approach to recognise and respect the differences, while fostering collaboration between the two.

What we heard:

- Mana whenua and mataawaka engagement needs to be well thought through. The council’s approach can sometimes conflate these two groups together when they should be treated separately. At other times, differentiating the two may lead to unnecessary divisions.

- The complex relationship dynamics between mana whenua and mataawaka can complicate engagement with Māori around something like facility partnerships, which are both place-based and outcome-focused.

- Mana whenua and mataawaka need to be given sufficient opportunity to discuss the right approach themselves, prior to engagement and decision-making.

How the Facility Partnerships Policy can respond:

- Where appropriate, the council could resource marae, mataawaka and mana whenua to create / design their own process for working together. This approach was used successfully by Te Ora o Manukau in 2012.

- The council could look for other ways to broker opportunities for collaboration (e.g. around engagement, facilities, services) between mana whenua and mataawaka, where this is desired by Māori.
Out of scope findings

2.6 Improving relationships between the council and Māori, starting with better consultation and engagement

Generally speaking, council consultation and engagement with Māori is perceived as too fragmented, transactional and ‘one-way’, and can end up feeling like a ‘tick box’ exercise. Before the council can enter into effective partnerships with Māori, a council-wide effort is needed to build stronger relationships beyond the scope of ‘consultation’.

Through recognising Te Ao Māori, developing robust and respectful consultation procedures and empowering Māori to take a more active role in decision making, Auckland Council has the opportunity to lead the way in this space.

What we heard:

- Consultation processes appear disconnected and do not always involve the right people. Sometimes the council say they have consulted with Māori, but they have only engaged with some mana whenua groups (and not others, or mataawaka). Some groups seem to have more privileged access to the council than others.

- The council needs to get better at closing the loop after consultation: sharing how people’s feedback was used and how the council has responded to it. This ensures Māori are kept involved and their time and effort is respected.

- When marae (and Māori generally) are asked to consult again on topics they’ve previously been consulted on, this worsens the perception that their relationships with council are disconnected and transactional. This also creates frustration that previous feedback has not been properly recorded or actioned.

- Recording all interactions with marae would allow other areas of council to consult this information prior to planning engagement with Māori. This would allow other

“We are a treaty partner. Some staff still don’t grasp that concept. More education is needed, so people stop looking at us as the annoyance on the side that they have to engage with.”

“The council regularly wants us to consult – giving of our time and knowledge – but we do not get compensated. Shared power starts with koha.”

“We want to feel when we’re having a korero with somebody about an issue, that it’s actually been taken on board, and elevating to wherever it needs to go to get answers.”
teams to have the required context and understanding of any previous issues, and enable them to be better prepared.

- **Marae are well placed to disseminate information about council consultation and engagement opportunities**, and coordinate participation by their iwi and hapu. Council could better capitalise on these networks in planning and delivering engagement.

### 2.7 Working with Māori to develop future policy

*Some marae would welcome the chance to be more actively involved in strategic conversation and policy development related to issues that particularly interest or impact Māori.*

**What we heard:**

- **Many marae have skilled people with the right capabilities to participate in strategy and policy discussions.** Marae tend to be very well networked and can more easily discuss issues and agree collective positions with their own people than the council can.

- **Collaborative policy-making** could provide an opportunity for the council to work with Māori directly about issues that affect them. There may be a cost associated with this, in terms of supporting Māori capacity to engage.

> “Local people are in the best position to know what is missing and what is needed and how to build on what’s already there, so meaningful open-minded engagement is important. These may not be quick conversations.”

> “Marae development cannot and should not be dictated by council, but rather supported and led by marae.”
3 Next steps / Ngā koringa ā-muri

The insights from this work have been able to feed into the main policy development process, which has continued to run alongside the research.

The Facility Partnerships Policy responds to the findings in the following ways:

A dedicated ‘Facility partnerships and Te Ao Māori’ section:

- Outlines the relationship between this policy and the Treaty of Waitangi
- Acknowledges the special significance and role of marae for Māori
- Signals how facility partnerships with Māori, and especially marae, may need to differ from other partnerships.

Quality relationships are fundamental to the new approach, and one of the ‘six dimensions of partnership’ that shape the policy. For example:

- The policy’s emphasis on enduring, two-way relationships founded on shared goals and values.
- The need to allocate sufficient resources to support relationships and a commitment to factor this into future facility partnership decisions.

Other key ways that the policy approach addresses the findings:

- Partnerships with Māori-led organisations are an investment priority.
- A commitment to invest in existing spaces in preference to building new facilities.
- A commitment to capacity building for less experienced or lower capacity partners, for example volunteer-led organisations.
- Acknowledging that non-financial support — for example access to council expertise — is highly valuable to partners, and an important way that the council can invest.

Further detail is included as Appendix A.

This report will be provided to the Environment and Community Committee alongside the draft Facility Partnerships Policy. The findings report will also be shared with our research participants.

The out-of-scope findings will be shared with the relevant parts of the council organisation. Work is already underway to address some of these findings, for example:

- Development of a new Māori engagement portal
- Further clarification of the funding process and criteria for Marae Development grants
- Additional relationship-building activities with mataawaka marae.
### Appendix A: Summary of findings and responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS What we heard from Māori</th>
<th>POLICY RESPONSE: How the policy addresses this</th>
<th>Potential responses that are beyond the policy scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Marae are more than just ‘facilities’**.  
Marae are taonga and inseparable from their whenua, tupuna, people and history.  
Marae play a more holistic role for Māori than community facilities do for pākeha.  
Marae are diverse, not a homogenous group.  
A marae’s primary responsibility is to Māori.  
Tikanga needs to be observed on marae.  
It is traditional for marae to manaaki visitors and although this has a cost, it tends not to be reflected in venue hire fees. | The policy speaks directly to this finding, in order to:  
- Demonstrate our understanding of the special significance and role of marae for Māori  
- Increase staff and elected member understanding of this special significance and role  
- Outline how facility partnerships with marae may need to differ from other partnerships  
- Encourage marae and Māori-led organisations to seek facility partnerships with the council. | The council could provide / improve access to guidance for staff relating to:  
- the special significance and role of marae for Māori  
- the tikanga that may apply on marae  
- where staff can access support or advice when dealing with specific marae.  
The council could provide more opportunities for staff to attend marae:  
- in the course of their work (to increase Māori responsiveness and to build relationships with marae)  
- to build individual cultural competency.  
The council could proactively work with marae to provide opportunities for staff that are culturally safe for both sides. |
| **Marae and Māori-led facilities are already delivering outcomes in their communities.**  
Many marae have a broader focus already and welcome the whole community.  
Marae do work in the community that the council and other agencies does not do.  
Most marae are run by volunteers with limited capacity.  
Marae’s existing role should be supported, like other community infrastructure. | The policy states we will invest in spaces that people already use and value, in preference to building new facilities.  
Partnerships with Māori-led organisations are an investment priority. The policy encourages facility partnerships with marae in recognition of their existing and potential role.  
The policy acknowledges that non-financial support – e.g. access to council expertise – is highly valuable to partners, and an important way that the council can invest in facility partnerships. | The council could better recognise the wider role played by marae and support them in this, e.g. work by the Civil Defence and Emergency Management team to explore the role of marae in building community resilience.  
The council could also support marae in practical ways, e.g. access to training, or notification of local procurement opportunities. |
### FINDINGS What we heard from Māori

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnerships should be founded on Te Tiriti, shared values and long-term vision.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Partnership’ implies shared power, with partners as equal and active participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kaitiaki role of mana whenua is unique in Tāmaki Makaurau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Ao Māori is holistic and intergenerational, which doesn’t align well with council’s organisational boundaries and timelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared values and aligned outcomes should be the starting point for partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term commitment and vision is needed, but with flexibility to adapt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY RESPONSE: How the policy addresses this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The policy states that Auckland Council is committed to engaging and working with Māori in ways that are consistent with a Treaty-based relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A focus on long-term outcomes is also fundamental to the new approach. In future, all facility partnerships will be founded on shared goals and values, and this will be the focus for early discussions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential responses that are beyond the policy scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Auckland Plan and Māori Responsiveness Plans set out principles and expectations relating to the council’s relationship with Māori under Te Tiriti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This includes supporting delivery of services by Māori for Māori, based on Te Ao Māori values and practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relationships are the foundation for partnership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marae see deeper, enduring relationships as the basis for facility partnerships.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some marae feel relationships have been lost post-amalgamation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an uneven distribution of relationships across the council and across iwi. Māori want more engagement ‘rangatira to rangatira’, and with local boards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council has high staff turnover, and its large size makes it difficult to navigate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written agreements may help support relationships by providing a reference point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, relationships with Māori need to improve, starting with better consultation and engagement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Relationships are fundamental to the new policy approach, and one of the ‘six dimensions of partnership’ that shape the policy. |
| Resources to support enduring relationships will be factored into future facility partnership decisions, e.g. dedicated relationship holders. |
| Written agreements will be prepared for all future facility partnerships. |

| The council could improve ‘BAU’ relationships with marae and Māori-led organisations by: |
| Nominating staff to hold and manage relationships |
| Establishing stronger relationships between marae and elected members, especially local boards |
| Supporting closer collaboration between marae |
 Council could improve consultation and engagement with Māori / marae by: |
| Improving coordination of Māori engagement |
| Exploring how marae could support Māori engagement |
| Ensuring we ‘close the loop’ with Māori following consultation and engagement. |
### Facility Partnerships with Marae – Summary Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINDINGS What we heard from Māori</th>
<th>POLICY RESPONSE: How the policy addresses this</th>
<th>Potential responses that are beyond the policy scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The relationship between mana whenua and mataawaka and council is complex and needs careful navigation. The two groups shouldn’t be conflated, or unnecessarily divided. Mana whenua and mataawaka want the opportunity to agree their own approach.</td>
<td>The policy outlines the distinction between mana whenua and mataawaka. Mana whenua, mataawaka and taurahere marae / organisations are invited to consider facility partnerships.</td>
<td>The council could provide / improve access to guidance for staff relating to the differences between mana whenua and mataawaka and the implications of this. Prior to engagement and decision-making, the council should provide sufficient opportunity for mana whenua and mataawaka to discuss the right approach and convey this to council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori want to take a more active role in policy-making around issues of particular significance to them. Many marae are eager and capable to participate in strategy / policy discussions. There may be a cost associated with supporting Māori capacity to engage.</td>
<td>The proposed decision-making process provides flexibility to umbrella facility partnerships with a broad range of Māori organisations. If needed, an alternative process taking specific account of the needs and interests of marae could be developed during implementation, in partnership with Māori.</td>
<td>The council could explore future opportunities for a collaborative policy-making with Māori. Marae are interested in supporting iwi and hapu to engage in strategic conversations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Treaty Principles

Treaty principles have been recognised and expressed by the Waitangi Tribunal and a range of Courts – the Privy Council, Supreme Court and High Court. The principles bridge the two texts of the Treaty, focusing on the intent of the Treaty and the future.

The Treaty Principles will help guide how the council and Māori work together to establish, shape and manage facility partnership arrangements.

Relevant principles for facility partnerships include:

- **Rangatiratanga** – the duty to recognise Māori rights of independence, autonomy and self-determination, including the capacity of hapū, mana whenua and mataawakawa to exercise authority over their own affairs. This principle enables the empowerment of Māori to determine and manage matters of significance to them.

- **Partnership** – the duty to interact in good faith and in the nature of a partnership. There is a sense of shared enterprise and mutual benefit where each partner must take account of the needs and interests of the other.

- **Active protection** – the duty to proactively protect the rights and interests of Māori, including the need to proactively build the capacity and capability of Māori.

- **Ōritetanga / mutual benefit** – to recognise that benefits should accrue to both Māori and non-Māori, both would participate in the prosperity of Aotearoa giving rise to mutual obligations and benefits. Each needs to retain and obtain sufficient resources to prosper, and each requires the help of its Treaty partner to do so. This includes the notion of equality (for example, in education, health and other socio-economic considerations).

- **Options** – recognising the authority of Māori to choose their own direction, to continue their own tikanga (customary practice) as it was or to combine elements of both and walk in both worlds. This principle includes recognition of Māori self-regulation.

- **The right of development** – the Treaty right is not confined to customary use or the state of knowledge as at 1840, but includes an active duty to assist Māori in the development of their properties and taonga (treasured items).
Appendix C: Research methodology

1. Research and advisory group formed
The research was designed, overseen and delivered by a cross-council project team with representatives from the following departments:

- Community and Social Policy
- The Southern Initiative
- Operations Māori Responsiveness Hub (Nga Waka Angamua)
- Māori Strategy and Relations (Te Waka Angamua)

2. Collated information about marae and Māori organisations, to inform sample
The team collated and reviewed information about marae in Tamaki Makaurau.

Additionally, we identified a small number of Māori organisations that have a facility-based component to their work and some form of relationship with council, comparable to the facility partnerships we researched during our first research phase.

3. Criteria developed and sample selected
A comprehensive set of criteria were developed and applied to help us select as ‘representative’ a sample as possible, acknowledging all marae and organisations would have a different experience and aspirations. We selected a sample of eight marae and four Māori organisations to provide a range of unique perspectives (refer Appendix D).

4. Representatives from selected marae / organisations and council counterparts identified
The team approached the marae / organisations to explain the research and request an interview. Seven marae and three organisations agreed to participate.

5. 11 key informant interviews held to discuss:
- The current role of the marae / organisation in the community
- Their aspirations for the future development of their marae / organisation
- Their past and present relationships with the council (or its predecessors)
- Perceptions of the strengths / advantages and challenges / disadvantages of working with the council
- Conceptions of ‘partnership’
- What marae / organisations would need or expect from council, if they were to enter into a ‘facility partnership’ with us.

(Refer Appendix C for a full list of questions.)

6. Interviews analysed, common themes identified and summarised
The team analysed the interviews, and collectively identified common themes, issues and challenges, opportunities and benefits. These were summarised in draft findings.

7. Draft findings taken to hui for validation

The team held findings hui at four of the participating marae to test the insights we had identified from the interviews with a broader roopu. We contracted specialist Kaupapa Māori designers from the Nga Aho collective to help design and facilitate the hui.

The hui were shaped partly in response to what we had learned through the informant interviews. For example, we:

- Participated in formal powhiri / mihi whakatau, and observed proper tikanga on the marae (including having kaikorero and kaikaranga to represent us)
- Laid down koha for our hosts in addition to venue hire fees, and offered native seedlings and kai to manaaki (show hospitality to) all attendees
- Invited staff from other council teams with a facility-related kaupapa that might have information or resources of interest to attendees (e.g. resource consents, civil defence and community grants). The intention was that they could learn from discussions, establish kanohi-te-kanohi (face-to-face) relationships and provide advice to attendees as a further form of koha for attendees’ time. A total of 20 council staff attended marae (in addition to policy staff, project team and facilitators).

Each hui was guided by our hosts and followed a different format.

A total of 39 people attended hui on behalf of marae, Māori organisations and agencies. Although our findings were validated by the feedback we received from participants, additional issues were also raised and are captured in this report.

8. Insights from discussions and hui used to shape the Facility Partnerships Policy

9. Findings shared through this report

10. Draft Facility Partnerships Policy shared at consultation hui

A hui will be convened as part of our consultation and engagement phase, to close the loop on the research and seek feedback on the draft. Participants in this research and those who attended our insights hui will be encouraged to attend.
Appendix D: Research sample and selection criteria

There are a diverse mix of mana whenua, mataawaka and taurahere marae\(^1\) in Tamaki Makaurau, which range from small rural marae to large urban marae. Some are primarily gathering places for their iwi or hapu, or are situated within school, church and institutional settings. Others play a broader community role, for example hosting organisations, services and activities onsite.

Although every marae is unique, we worked with a cross-council team to identify a research sample that would include marae with as wide a range of characteristics as possible.

The variables we considered in selecting the sample were:

- Location – across the Auckland region, and mix of urban and rural
- Iwi affiliation – mana whenua, mataawaka and taurahere
- Use of the marae – whether the marae primarily serves the needs of iwi and hapu, or plays a wider role in the community
- Land ownership – Māori, council or privately owned
- Size of the marae (property and number of buildings / onsite facilities)
- Financial support from council (current and past)
- Age – from ancestral marae to newly established / emerging marae

Marae in our research sample

- **Hoani Watiti Marae**, Pan-tribal / Ngati Whatua Kawerau a Maki, Glen Eden
- **Mataatua Marae**, Ngati Awa ki Tamaki Makaurau te Hapu, Mangere
- **Puatahi Marae**, Ngati Whatua, Kaipara Coast
- **Paoa Whanake Marae**, Ngāti Paoa, Point England
- **Ruapotaka Marae**, Pan-tribal / Nga Hau E Wha, Glen Innes
- **Tahuna Pa**, Waiohua Tainui, Awhitu

---

\(^1\) *Mana whenua*: Māori with territorial rights in Tamaki Makaurau, who belong to and derive power from the whenua (land), and who have authority and jurisdiction over the whenua or rohe (territory).

*Mataawaka*: Māori who are not mana whenua in Tamaki Makaurau and have not retained their identity and links back to their tribal homelands. Mataawaka or ‘urban’ marae are pan-tribal, and welcome Māori of all affiliations, or none.

*Taurahere*: Māori in urban areas who retain their identity and links back to their tribal homelands. Some taurahere groups have whakapapa or historical links to particular sites in Tamaki Makaurau, and have received the blessing of mana whenua to develop a marae for their Auckland-based members.
* Umupua Marae, Ngai Tai ki Tāmaki, Maraetai

* Hosted findings hui

**Māori organisations in our research sample**

- **Te Roopu Waiora**, Manukau
  
  _Te Roopu Waiora Trust is a unique kaupapa Māori organisation founded in 2001 and governed by whanau with physical, sensory and intellectual disabilities._

- **Te Whare Wananga O Wairoa**, Howick
  
  _Te Whare Wananga O Wairoa is a whare built in the Emilia Maud Nixon Garden of Memories which hosts Māori education programmes._

- **Tāmaki Herenga Waka Trust**, Auckland-wide
  
  _The Tāmaki Herenga Waka Trust is a charitable trust established to support the revitalisation of a visible and vibrant ‘culture’ of waka for the benefit of all Aucklanders._

* Hosted findings hui

**Additional marae and organisations that attended hui**

- Manurewa Marae
- Papakura Marae
- Te Atatu Marae
- Te Herenga Waka o Orewa Marae
- Papatuanuku Kokiri Marae
- Te Aroha Pā marae
- Ngai Tai ki Tamaki
- Ngā Kaitiaki Trust
- Healthy Families
- Te Puni Kōkiri
- Whanau Community Native Tree Nursery
Appendix E: Informant interview discussion guide

Questions that guided our discussions with marae and Māori organisation representatives:

1. **Role**
   - Role in relation to this marae / organisation
   - Role in the community that marae / organisation currently plays
   - Current experience / relationships with Auckland Council [or other large organisations if no relationship with council]

2. **Collaborative relationships / partnerships**
   - Describe what ‘partnership’ means to you?
   - What makes a good relationship?
   - Support [your marae/org] would want to receive from council if entering a ‘facility partnership’?

3. **Positives**
   - What do you see as the strengths or opportunities of working with Auckland Council?
   - How can we build on / maximise these strengths?
   - What would make [your marae/org] more likely to enter into a ‘facility partnership’?
   - What strengths do you think marae offer as community facilities?

4. **Challenges**
   - What do you see as the challenges of working with Council? How might these be mitigated?
   - What would make [your marae/org] less likely to enter into a relationship like this?
   - What would be non-negotiable for you in entering into a ‘facility partnership’?
   - What concerns would you have in entering this kind of relationship?
   - Are there any specific things about marae that we need to consider if entering into this kind of arrangement? (i.e. Tangi getting priority, maintaining the tikanga and mana of the marae etc.).

5. **How could Auckland Council play a role in supporting you in these aspirations?**
   - What are the specific aspirations for [your marae/org]?
   - What would an ideal ‘facility partnership’ look like to you?
Investing in Aucklanders Community Engagement Findings

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. This report seeks approval to develop and run a series of inclusion pilots to increase Aucklanders sense of belonging and participation.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. Staff have engaged with 650 diverse Aucklanders to hear what makes them feel they belong and identified the enablers and barriers to inclusion. Many of them were Aucklanders who do not usually talk to council.
3. This engagement is part of a council resolution to look at how Auckland could become a friendlier city for a range of populations, including older people.
4. Key findings from the engagement include:
   • simple acts of kindness, events and whānau gatherings help create a sense of belonging
   • community places, activities and social networks enable inclusion
   • feeling unsafe, discrimination, physical, health and economic conditions are barriers to inclusion.
5. Participants expressed their care for each other and their concern about inequality. They also want to see inclusion activities as an everyday rather than occasional experience.
6. To implement the engagement findings, staff propose a series of inclusion pilots. The pilots will test what activities and interventions reduce barriers and increase inclusion.
7. Prototyping and testing what works and what doesn’t in quick learning loops will increase the potential success of pilots. This will enable council to understand what is effective and make decisions about whether to replicate or scale up activities elsewhere.
8. The pilots will be implemented over the next 18 months within existing baselines. Staff will make the most of our existing services and resources and work with partners.
9. There is a risk that there might be more interest in pilots than there are resources. This risk will be managed through clear communication about the pilot purpose, approach and future opportunities.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve the start of up to five inclusion pilots within existing baselines that help Aucklanders feel an improved sense of belonging and participation by removing barriers (like feeling unsafe and discrimination) and enhancing enablers (such as community places, activities and social networks). The pilots will:
   i) align with Auckland Plan outcomes
   ii) focus on those most in need
   iii) be developed with target populations and partners
   iv) make the most of existing services and resources
   v) recognise Māori needs and the specific manaakitanga role Māori play.
Horopaki / Context

10 In September 2016, the Regional Strategy and Policy Committee considered a proposal to become a member of the World Health Organisation’s Global Network of Age-Friendly Cities and Communities.

11 The committee resolved to progress the intent of the framework (to become a friendlier city for a range of populations, including older people) through council's existing strategy and policy frameworks (REG/2016/92).

12 In response to this, staff are undertaking the ‘Investing in Aucklanders’ project to identify what could be done to make Auckland a more inclusive and friendly city.

13 This project is aligned to the Belonging and Participation outcome in the refreshed Auckland Plan publicly consulted in March 2018.

14 Using an appreciative inquiry method, staff engaged with over 650 diverse Aucklanders in 37 workshops. We heard from many Aucklanders who do not usually talk to council.

15 Through this engagement, we learned about Aucklanders’ experiences of inclusion and belonging along with the enablers and barriers to this.

16 In April 2018, a workshop and walkthrough were held with a small group of participants and council’s advisory panel members. There was strong validation for the findings and that the views and voices of Aucklanders were well represented.

17 The engagement findings report is provided in Attachment A.

Summary of key findings

Importance of simple acts of kindness, events and whānau gatherings

18 We asked Aucklanders to describe what it feels like to belong and be included.

19 The impact of simple acts of kindness and the importance of events and whānau gatherings stood out as common triggers to feeling included in many of their stories.

Aucklanders care about others and are concerned about inequality

20 From their stories Aucklanders:

- expressed a strong sense of care and concern for others
- recognised the need to make an effort with one another and the importance of working at living well together
- expressed curiosity and keenness to learn and share with others
- identified inequality as the underlying factor that is holding Aucklanders back.

Participants identified five characteristics of inclusion

21 When analysing their collective stories they identified five top characteristics of inclusion:

- empathy – understanding and acceptance
- inclusivity – unity, trust and cohesion
- diversity and culture – spirituality, ethnicity and language
- sense of belonging – sharing, connectivity and relationships
- celebration and commemoration – events, festivals and different ways to commemorate.

Moving inclusion from an occasional to an everyday experience

22 Aucklanders noted that their experiences of inclusion are usually occasional and that they would like inclusion to be a more ‘everyday’ experience (refer Attachment B).
Key barriers and enablers to inclusion

Housing, transport and safety are essential conditions for inclusion

23. Aucklanders consistently identified housing, transport and safety as the top three essential conditions for inclusion. Without these belonging and participation is very difficult.

Community places, activities, and social networks are important enablers

24. The enablers of inclusion are: community assets, events, places, spaces and programmes.

25. Community connectors are also highly valued as human enablers of inclusion; these are people who regularly co-ordinate and bring others together.

26. Aucklanders said that social connectedness and building networks provides people with multiple opportunities to participate and this contributes to their ability to lead happy and healthy lives.

Feeling unsafe and discrimination are key barriers

27. The top barriers to inclusion are: feeling unsafe, discrimination, prejudice and environmental impacts that undermine wellbeing.

More understanding, universal design and better employment opportunities are important

28. Other key areas they identified were: developing more mutual understanding and awareness among Aucklanders, implementing universal design, employment opportunities and work experience for youth.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

29. The findings from this work has given us insights into Aucklanders direct, lived experiences of inclusion, including those we do not usually hear from. This provides a solid base to identify potential improvement activities.

30. Staff propose that the next step is to design and run a series of inclusion pilots that test different ways to increase Aucklanders sense of belonging and participation by removing barriers and enhancing the enablers of inclusion.

31. The focus will be on Aucklanders most in need such as those who feel excluded, lonely and have less social connections and equity of outcomes.

32. Staff are proposing that the pilots use the following approach:

| Outcome focus | • align with the Auckland Plan outcomes  
| • base pilots on evidence of what works or is promising  
| • provide clear intervention logic and/or theory of change |

| Equity | • prioritise those most in need |

| Community centric | • use design-led methodology; working with partners and members of the target population  
| • work on the barriers, enablers (including human) and the characteristics of inclusion identified in the findings |

| Effective and sustainable | • address challenges shared by more than one population group  
| • partner with others.  
| • learn what works as we go, test, refine, adapt  
| • make the most of our existing services, assets and resources |

| Te Ao Māori | • recognise Māori needs and the specific manaakitanga role Māori play. |
33. To manage scope and resources, the pilots will be developed within a set of parameters (refer Attachment C):
   - pilots will test interventions and activities to increase inclusion based on a series of prototypes, testing and learning loops
   - a maximum of five inclusion pilots will be undertaken over the next 18 months
   - pilots will be dependent on community interest, resource availability and buy-in.

34. Prototyping and testing what works and what doesn’t in quick learning loops increases the potential success of the pilots.

35. Using pilots will also reduce the risk of investment in future activities that do not make an impact on increasing inclusion.

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

36. In October 2017, staff held workshops with local boards at their cluster meetings. Local board member insights were consistent with the community engagement findings.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

37. Five hui were held to gain insight into Māori perspectives of belonging, participation and to identify inclusion enablers and barriers. Three key themes emerged:
   - the significance of the whenua and looking after natural resources. All groups talked about the relationship between the environment, wellbeing of people and having the ability to fulfil obligations and responsibility to take care of the land
   - concern about the impacts of economic and social issues on the health and wellbeing of Māori including homelessness, poverty, suicide rates and the cost of living. For rangatahi the impacts of drugs, alcohol and fast food on wellbeing. All are concerned about the value of diversity not being at the expense of Māori
   - acknowledging and valuing Māori language, identity and culture are vital to wellbeing and belonging, as well as being and living as Māori.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

38. The proposed pilots will be designed and developed within existing baselines. It is estimated that the pilot development phase will require one full time equivalent staff.

Ngā raru túpono / Risks

39. There is a risk that there might be more interest in pilots than there are resources. This risk will be managed through clear communication about the pilot purpose, approach and future opportunities.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

40. The pilots will be designed and implemented over the next 18 months. Regular progress updates will be provided to this Committee.
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The Belonging and Inclusion Pilots

What are we proposing?

The proposed next step is to design a series of pilots to test interventions that could increase belonging and inclusion, especially for those most in need.

The interventions would be based on the problems people face when they don’t feel included (such as loneliness) as well as fostering the enablers of inclusion (such as simple acts of kindness and the role of community connectors).

Why is this important?

The Auckland Plan Belonging and Participation outcome and the Thriving Communities Action Plan provides the high level guidance for council’s goal to make Auckland a friendlier and more inclusive city.

To foster greater inclusion and an increased sense of belonging for all Aucklanders we need to focus resources and tailor the design and delivery of services. This will help ensure everyone has opportunities to participate and feel they belong.

Through the Investing in Aucklanders project staff have identified both barriers and enablers to inclusion that can be the starting point for designing and testing potential solutions.

Developing and trialling interventions first that are focused on problems/opportunities and targeted to specific groups will enable us to test what works, refine and adapt and where pilots are effective look at opportunities to replicate or scale-up elsewhere.

How will we go about it?

The pilots will be based on the following approach.

Outcome focus

- Interventions will be outcome-focused, based on evidence of what works or is promising.
- There will be a clear intervention logic/theory of change for each pilot aligned to outcomes.

Equity

- We will focus on those most in need first, consistent with the Auckland Plan.

Community-centric

- Interventions will use design-led methodology and be developed with potential partners and members of the target population (including our advisory panels).
- We will work on key issues/challenges (barriers) or opportunities (enablers) identified in our findings, for example the issue of loneliness for older people.

Effective and sustainable

- We will pilot interventions, through prototyping and testing what works (and what doesn’t) in quick learning loops, enabling us to refine and adapt - increasing the potential for success.
- Where pilots are effective we can look to replicate or scale up elsewhere.
- To maximise impact we’ll tackle challenges shared by more than one population group.
• We will look to partner with others (internal and external) to leverage resources and ensure ongoing buy-in and ownership.
• We will look to make the most of existing services, assets and resources.

Te Ao Māori

• We will work with Māori to develop specific interventions tailored to their needs.
• We will look at ways to acknowledge the specific roles iwi play in supporting inclusion and belonging of others.

The scope of the pilots will be managed within a set of controlled parameters.

• a maximum of five inclusion pilots undertaken over the next 18 months within existing baselines and resources
• pilots will be dependent on community interest, resource availability and buy-in.

An example pilot – Addressing loneliness among older Aucklanders

Innovate Change; a social enterprise dedicated to improving social connectedness, recently completed a co-design discovery process called Generations. This is a social innovation project to develop solutions that build social connectedness for older New Zealanders. This project provided an opportunity for a council policy staff and a local board member to participate in a design process and have

The insights and opportunities report relating to social isolation and loneliness of older people has just been published. Innovate Change is now seeking partners to design specific solutions to the social isolation and loneliness challenges they identified.

This work is well aligned to the Investing in Aucklanders engagement findings and the proposed approach and could be a potential pilot initiative.
The inclusion experience

Things that increase sense of belonging

I can celebrate and commemorate at a traditional Samoan funeral
I feel proud to be Māori when I am at a Māori event where my roo, culture and identity are respected
I can be with lots of different people and see lots of people like me
I can go to lots of different places to do stuff with my friends, family and others
Random acts of kindness like my neighbour helping me mow my lawn when I broke my leg last summer
I can practice my religion openly

Exciting events I look forward to when we come together to be part of something "bigger than myself"

The little but regular reminders that I belong

Occasional things I encounter that make me feel less welcome

I am not accepted for who I am and who I am
I am wary of wearing what I want in case I get abused
I see rubbish that's been dumped on my street
It is expensive to use public transport when you have a big family
I have a place to call home, but seeing homelessness is a reminder of the inequity in this city
My sense of safety, limits the places where I can go

Things that decrease sense of belonging

Occasional

Everyday

I enjoy family barbecues at the park
I can vote without being a citizen
Work opportunities are hard to come by
I can't access services as easily as everyone else
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Environment and Community Committee
Next Steps: Investing in Aucklanders - Belonging and Inclusion Pilots

What are we proposing?
The proposed next step is to design a series of pilots to test interventions that could increase belonging and inclusion, especially for those most in need.
The interventions would be based on the problems people face when they don’t feel included (such as loneliness) as well as fostering the enablers of inclusion (such as simple acts of kindness and the role of community connectors).

Why is this important?
The Auckland Plan Belonging and Participation outcome and the Thriving Communities Action Plan provides the high level guidance for council’s goal to make Auckland a friendlier and more inclusive city.
To foster greater inclusion and an increased sense of belonging for all Aucklanders we need to focus resources and tailor the design and delivery of services. This will help ensure everyone has opportunities to participate and feel they belong.
Through the Investing in Aucklanders project staff have identified both barriers and enablers to inclusion that can be the starting point for designing and testing potential solutions.
Developing and trialling interventions first that are focused on problems/opportunities and targeted to specific groups will enable us to test what works, refine and adapt and where pilots are effective look at opportunities to replicate or scale-up elsewhere.

How will we go about it?
The pilots will be based on the following approach.

Outcome focus
- Interventions will be outcome-focused, based on evidence of what works or is promising.
- There will be a clear intervention logic/theory of change for each pilot aligned to outcomes.

Equity
- We will focus on those most in need first, consistent with the Auckland Plan.

Community-centric
- Interventions will use design-led methodology and be developed with potential partners and members of the target population (including our advisory panels).
- We will work on key issues/challenges (barriers) or opportunities (enablers) identified in our findings, for example the issue of loneliness for older people.

Effective and sustainable
- We will pilot interventions, through prototyping and testing what works (and what doesn’t) in quick learning loops, enabling us to refine and adapt - increasing the potential for success.
- Where pilots are effective we can look to replicate or scale up elsewhere.
- To maximise impact we’ll tackle challenges shared by more than one population group.
- We will look to partner with others (internal and external) to leverage resources and ensure ongoing buy-in and ownership.
- We will look to make the most of existing services, assets and resources.

**Te Ao Māori**

- We will work with Māori to develop specific interventions tailored to their needs.
- We will look at ways to acknowledge the specific roles iwi play in supporting inclusion and belonging of others.

The scope of the pilots will be managed within a set of controlled parameters.

- a maximum of five inclusion pilots undertaken over the next 18 months within existing baselines and resources
- pilots will be dependent on community interest, resource availability and buy-in.

### An example pilot – Addressing Loneliness among older Aucklanders

Innovate Change; a social enterprise dedicated to improving social connectedness, recently completed a co-design discovery process called Generations. This is a social innovation project to develop solutions that build social connectedness for older New Zealanders. This project provided an opportunity for a council policy staff and a local board member to participate in a design process and have

The insights and opportunities report relating to social isolation and loneliness of older people has just been published. Innovate Change is now seeking partners to design specific solutions to the social isolation and loneliness challenges they identified.

This work is well aligned to the Investing in Aucklanders engagement findings and the proposed approach and could be a potential pilot initiative.
Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To provide a progress update on the Thriving Communities Action Plan and seek agreement to the recommended improvements.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. In 2017, we reviewed progress on the Thriving Communities Action Plan (the plan), council’s strategic action plan for community-led development and social change. The full status report is presented in (Attachment A).
3. We found that council is working well across the six focus areas of the plan and has fully completed six of the 24 action points.
4. We are making good progress in many of the other areas, particularly around strengthening support for the voluntary and community sector.
5. Place-based, community-led ways of working in areas of highest need, for instance by the Southern Initiative and Community Empowerment Unit, are delivering real change on the ground.
6. Further improvements could be made to: build leadership and awareness, drive delivery aligned to outcomes, embed community-led ways of working and better understand impact.
7. We recommend implementing these improvements, including an update of the plan, and the development of a monitoring and evaluation framework.
8. Future engagement with communities to update the Thriving Communities Action Plan may risk consultation fatigue. We will draw on recent engagement insights to reduce the nature and scale of engagement activities undertaken.
9. If approved, staff will implement the improvements and update the Thriving Communities Action Plan over the next 18 months.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) endorse the Thriving Communities Action Plan Status Report and its key findings.

b) agree to improvement areas to strengthen delivery of the Thriving Communities Action Plan, summarised as follows:
   i) build leadership for and awareness of the Thriving Communities Action Plan
   ii) focus on improving outcomes for those most in need, aligned to the Auckland Plan
   iii) further embed community-led ways of working across the council
   iv) improve evaluation so we are clearer on the impact we are making.

c) agree that the improvement actions include an update of the Thriving Communities Action Plan, a monitoring and evaluation framework, and other details as outlined in Table 1 of this report.
Horopaki / Context

10. The Thriving Communities Action Plan was developed with the goal of mobilising all parts of Auckland Council to work in community-centric ways, to support community-led development and achieve better social outcomes.

11. To assess the council’s progress under the plan, and its overall reach and impact, a progress update was undertaken in 2017.

12. Key findings from this research are outlined below. Please refer to the status report (Attachment A) for the full findings.

Key findings

Recognition of the value of the plan and impact in specific areas

13. Thriving Communities is seen as providing a useful framework for creating an enabling council – a blueprint for staff to empower local communities.

14. The plan has had a tangible impact on certain council groups and initiatives.

The council is making good progress against the action points

15. A stocktake of council activity highlighted a range of work, completed or in progress, which addresses the plan’s action points. Examples include the adoption of the Community Facilities Network Plan, Community Grants Policy and the adoption of the living wage.

We are working in more community-centric ways, but this could be more widespread

16. Delivery on key actions demonstrates a positive shift in the council’s approach to working in more community-centric ways.

17. The stocktake and snapshots show that place-based and community-led approaches, such as through the Community Empowerment Unit and the Southern Initiative, are delivering significant change for communities.

18. Feedback has indicated that while delivery is aligned with the actions in Thriving Communities, it hasn’t necessarily been driven by the plan.

19. Community-led ways of working are not consistently applied across the council family and we are not making the most of sharing learnings from good or emerging practice.

Lack of leadership and wider awareness of the plan

20. There is a lack of leadership at the right level to drive delivery of the plan.

21. There is also a lack of awareness of the plan across the wider council family and how it aligns with other strategies and organisational initiatives.

22. As a result, uptake and delivery are inconsistent across the council family.

We are not always clear on the impact we are making

23. Council is doing some good work, but we are not always clear on the difference we are making and how to effectively measure and evaluate this.

There is an opportunity to focus on improving outcomes for those most in need

24. Auckland’s context is changing, our diverse population is growing rapidly and there is increasing inequity in parts of Auckland.

25. There is opportunity to update the Thriving Communities Action Plan to give greater effect to this by focusing our collective efforts on improving outcomes for those most in need.

26. This would align to the refreshed Auckland Plan which directs us to ensure all Aucklanders feel they belong and have opportunities to achieve their potential.
Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

27. Staff recommend four key improvement areas to address the review findings:
   - build leadership for and awareness of the Thriving Communities Action Plan.
   - focus on improving outcomes for those most in need, aligned to the Auckland Plan.
   - further embed community-led ways of working across the council.
   - improve evaluation so we are clearer on the impact we are making.

28. Table 1 below outlines the recommended improvement areas and associated actions.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement areas:</th>
<th>Actions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Build leadership for the plan, and better communicate, promote and socialise it. | • create leadership champions to help drive delivery of the plan  
• improve oversight and drive delivery of the plan  
• socialise the plan across the organisation  
• make the plan simpler and more accessible. |
| 2. Target delivery of actions and interventions to achieving Auckland Plan outcomes, with a focus on those most in need. | • update Thriving Communities Action Plan to give effect to Auckland Plan outcomes  
• develop place-based interventions that take a community-centric approach  
• explore the merits of replicating approaches such as the Southern Initiative in other areas of high need. |
| 3. Further embed community-led ways of working across the council family. | • support and deliver the Enabling Council programme  
• showcase good and emerging practice and evidence of the benefits  
• show links to other strategic plans and initiatives. |
| 4. Improve evaluation of the Thriving Communities Action Plan. | • develop an evaluation framework  
• underpin plan with clear evidence base  
• establish regular monitoring process. |

29. A programme of work to implement these recommendations will strengthen the plan’s impact and focus delivery. This will lead to better outcomes for communities.

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

30. We recognise the key role that local boards play in their communities in supporting and empowering community led action.

31. There is an opportunity with an update of the plan to engage with local boards and help shape their future work and plans.

32. Evaluation of the plan will create a stronger evidence base for staff to provide quality advice to elected members to enhance their decision making.
Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

33. At the time of the last census (2013), Māori accounted for 10.7% of Auckland’s population.
34. There are significant economic, social and health disparities between Māori and the wider Auckland population.
35. Feedback from the status update highlighted that the plan needs to include more content specific to Māori and that there should be dedicated outcomes for this group.
36. Future engagement as part of updating the plan will include mana whenua and mataawaka to ensure their voices are heard and adequately reflected.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

37. Staff and resources will be required to implement the recommendations contained in this report, including the update of the plan. These will be met within existing baselines.
38. Any new initiatives identified through future implementation of the improvement areas and actions will be reported for specific decision-making. Any funding would be considered through future Annual Plan and Long-term Plan processes.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

39. Future engagement with communities as part of updating the Thriving Communities Action Plan may risk consultation fatigue.
40. We can draw on recent public engagement, such as from the Auckland Plan consultation, Investing in Aucklanders, and the findings of the Empowered Communities Approach evaluation, to help inform the update. This will reduce the nature and scale of engagement activities undertaken.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

41. If approved, staff will implement the improvements and update the Thriving Communities Action Plan over the next 18 months.
42. Staff will report back to the committee to provide an update on progress or to seek decisions if required. Annual status reports on progress against the plan will also be provided.
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1 Purpose

The Status Report reflects on how the Thriving Communities Action Plan is being implemented across the council, showcases successful work against the plan’s action points and makes recommendations for the plan going forward.

2 Background

People are at the heart of the Auckland Plan. Engaged and enabled communities underpin Auckland’s vision of becoming a world-class city.

Auckland Council has an important role to play in building thriving communities. Informed by communities, stakeholders, partners, the Auckland Plan and The Long-term Plan (LTP), the Thriving Communities Action Plan was adopted by the council in April 2014. The plan was developed with the goal of mobilising all parts of the organisation to work in community-centric ways. This in turn would increase the council’s ability to support community-led development and achieve better social outcomes.

Thriving Communities is a sister strategy to I Am Auckland: The Children’s and Young People’s Strategic Action Plan. The two plans were intended to complement each other as they share similar intentions, philosophies, aspirations and goals, with a particular focus on Aucklanders who are most in need.

Unlike other council strategic action plans, that incorporate the broader sector, Thriving Communities focuses on actions specifically for Auckland Council. It identifies changes to be made across the organisation to better support community-led development and social change.

The plan helped provide the thinking and impetus behind the development of the Empowered Communities Approach (ECA). The ECA model was developed and approved by Auckland Council’s Regional Strategy and Policy Committee in July 2015. This was followed in 2017, by the Enabling Council initiative.

A range of strategic initiatives have since followed within the revised Organisational Strategy, ECA and Enabling Council focussed on engaging communities and creating an enabling council. This review establishes Thriving Communities current reach in light of these, identifies issues in operationalising the plan and proposes a number of potential improvements for the future of the plan.
3 Key findings and recommended improvements

3.1 Summary

Since it was adopted in 2014, the council has made some good progress against delivering actions in the Thriving Communities Action Plan and is generally working in more community-centric ways. There is broad agreement that the plan is an important framework for creating an enabling council that empowers local communities.

However, there is still more that could be done to embed this way of working across council and opportunities to apply the learnings from good practice (such as The Southern Initiative) to other areas of the region.

There is an opportunity to renew the Thriving Communities Action Plan; to clarify its role and links to other strategic plans and initiatives; and focus delivery and actions towards achieving the new Auckland Plan outcomes, in particular, ensure we focus on those most in need.

The plan needs a clear leadership champion to help drive awareness, uptake and delivery. We also need to better communicate the plan, making it simpler and more accessible; and improve the way we evaluate and measure the impact we are making.

All of which, would lead to improved outcomes for communities.

3.2 Key findings

Recognition of the value of the plan and impact in specific areas

There is general agreement on the importance of Thriving Communities. The plan is seen as providing a useful framework for creating an enabling council – a blueprint for council staff to empower local communities. The plan has had a tangible impact on certain council groups and initiatives.

The council is making good progress against the action points

A stocktake of council activity, since the launch of Thriving Communities, highlighted a range of work, completed or in progress, which addresses the plan’s action points. Examples of achievements include the adoption of the Community Facilities Network Plan, Community Grants Policy and the increasing importance placed on social and cultural outcomes in the procurement process.

The council is working in a more community-centric way

Work completed against the action points demonstrates a shift in the council’s approach to working with communities. The development of the Empowered Communities Approach and Enabling Council programme highlights a growing commitment to empowering communities by supporting the council to adapt existing behaviours and processes to be more community focused. Consultation and engagement with communities as part of the Facility Partnerships Policy project and in the development of spatial plans are examples of these behaviours in action.
Community-centric work not always directly influenced by the plan

Interviews and workshops with council staff indicated that delivery in other areas has not necessarily been directly influenced by the plan, but rather reflects a general shift in commitment by the council to community-led approaches.

Commitment to community-led ways of working still needs to be further embedded

While there are areas of good practice and community-facing staff and units are familiar with the plan and actively using it, other groups require further support to apply these practices. Some staff expressed a need to better understand the thinking behind Thriving Communities, and the evidence base underpinning it, with some managers concerned about the strain enabling-approaches would place on staff and resourcing.

Lack of leadership and awareness of the Thriving Communities Action Plan

Familiarity with Thriving Communities varies significantly across the council. While some were aware of the plan, they felt they were lacking a comprehensive understanding of its role and importance relative to their particular area of work.

Lack of awareness of the plan was, in part, attributed to a lack of leadership at the right level and limited oversight and coordination to drive delivery.

Lack of understanding of how the plan fits in with other plans and strategies

There is some confusion around the continuing relevance of the plan and its role within wider council strategy, given subsequent strategic and operational changes. Some respondents thought the Empowered Communities Approach (ECA) had replaced Thriving Communities, while others felt overwhelmed by the number of strategies and initiatives at the council.

New and emerging issues need to be included in the plan

There is consensus that since the launch of Thriving Communities, new issues, such as housing and diversity, have emerged in Auckland that need to be addressed in any future update to the plan.

A need to refine the plan and improve accessibility

The need to simplify or remove some of the actions in the plan was common feedback from staff, who found the length and number of actions reduced the accessibility of the report. In some instances, it was considered some actions could be merged, while others that had successfully been completed, could be removed.

The plan requires an evaluation framework

There is currently no established evaluation system for measuring the success of work in support of the plan. Thriving Communities provides suggestions on the evaluation tools that could be employed, leaving teams to decide how, or even if, they are to evaluate their work. Feedback indicated that it would be useful to provide concrete information on what successful outcomes look like for each action point and guidance on how, or what, units should/could be doing in terms of monitoring and evaluation.
3.3 Recommended improvements

This report recommends four key improvements to deliver more impact aligned to council’s strategic outcomes and priorities; increase awareness; and drive delivery of the Thriving Communities Action Plan across the council family.

Improvement 1:
Create leadership champions and better communicate the Thriving Communities Action Plan to help build awareness and drive delivery.

- Identify and establish political and executive leadership champions for the plan
- Improve oversight and drive delivery: monitor and report progress.
- Better communicate, promote and socialise the plan across the council family

Improvement 2:
Target delivery of actions and interventions to achieving Auckland Plan outcomes, with a focus on those most in need.

- Update the Thriving Communities Action Plan to develop and prioritise actions and interventions that give effect to the new Auckland Plan outcomes - this could include, for instance, developing an intervention programme to increase inclusion and belonging tailored to specific population groups.
- Develop place-based interventions that take a community-centric approach to improving outcomes in areas of most need – for instance, examine the merits of replicating or scaling-up initiatives such as The Southern Initiative elsewhere in the region.

Improvement 3:
Further embed community-led ways of working across the council family to achieve better experiences and outcomes for communities.

- Support and deliver the Enabling Council programme, which is driving internal change to make council more enabling
- Show links to other strategic plans and initiatives to help drive focus and alignment
- Share good/emerging practice and evidence of benefits to encourage more uptake.

Improvement 4:
Improve evaluation of the Thriving Communities Action Plan to better understand impact

- Develop an evaluation framework with outcomes, measures and accountabilities
- Underpin the plan with clear evidence and latest community development practice
- Establish regular monitoring and reporting process
4 Methodology

A project team was formed with representatives from Community Policy, the Community Empowerment Unit, and Local Board Services. A mixed-method approach was adopted to understand the current role and influence of the plan. This approach included:

- strategic analysis of citations in key related strategies and documents
- a high-level stocktake to assess how we are tracking in delivering the plan against each action point
- semi-structured interviews with 18 managers across Auckland Council, and its associated Council Controlled Organisations. The interviews were designed to assess the strategic role and relevance of Thriving Communities and explore opportunities for the plan in the future.
- workshops with frontline staff in key delivery areas to assess delivery to date and current familiarity with the plan.

4.1 Scope

Thriving Communities focused on internal actions for Auckland Council. Consequently, external engagement was out of scope for this phase of work, with the focus of this report to establish current council delivery on actions.

5 Strategic Context

The Auckland Plan sets the high-level outcomes for our communities. The Thriving Communities Action Plan details the actions to be taken to deliver on the people-focused goals and outcomes of the Auckland Plan.

The plan prompted the development of the Empowered Communities Approach and recognised that the Community Facilities Network Plan was an important way to support thriving communities. A range of policy work currently under way will further support actions within Thriving Communities. These include the Facility Partnerships Policy, Investigation of Social Return on Investment measurement and research into social enterprise in Auckland.
Figure 1 below: Shows how councils’ various strategic plans fit together

Thriving Communities was foundational to the adoption of the Empowered Communities Approach, which sets out how the council aims to work with and support communities in their development. This in turn has driven the Enabling Council programme which focusses on improving the internal council processes and ways of working, in line with the objectives of the organisational strategy.

Figure 2: Shows how the Empowered Communities Approach relates to Organisation Strategy
6 Current State

6.1 Progress overview

Thriving Communities has six key focus areas:

- Facilitate grassroots action
- Strengthen support to the voluntary and community sector
- Enable social innovation and social enterprise
- Maximise positive socio-economic impacts
- Work in a holistic and integrated way
- Support staff to be community centric

Each focus area contains a number of action points, which Auckland Council has signed up to. The visual below provides a high-level overview of progress against the 24 action points in Thriving Communities.

**Facilitate grassroots action**

- **Action 1:** Facilitate and enable resident and community-led development
- **Action 2:** Support community-led placemaking
- **Action 3:** Enable match funding
- **Action 4:** Ensure our community facilities are fit-for-purpose
- **Action 5:** Showcase Auckland’s resident and community-led initiatives

- ✔ Completed
- ✅ Making good progress
- 🤣 Starting to make progress
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 6:</th>
<th>Provide capacity- and capability-building support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 7:</td>
<td>Investigate asset transfers and other options for communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 8:</td>
<td>Improve our funding processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 9:</td>
<td>Develop a Community Facilities Network Plan that includes key voluntary and community sector facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enable social innovation and social enterprise**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 10:</th>
<th>Promote social innovation and social enterprise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 11:</td>
<td>Support Auckland’s social entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 12:</td>
<td>Provide capacity- and capability-building support for social enterprise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maximise positive socio-economic impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 13:</th>
<th>Improve socio-economic impacts through procurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 14:</td>
<td>Continue to be an advocate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 15:</td>
<td>Increase work-experience opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 16:</td>
<td>Role-model working conditions that promote staff well-being and are family-friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 17:</td>
<td>Investigate the living wage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ✔ Completed
- ✅ Making good progress
- 🧈 Starting to make progress
## Work in a holistic and integrated way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 18</th>
<th>Promote and enable multi-purpose social infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 19</td>
<td>Implement a whole-of-system approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 20</td>
<td>Improve council engagement with communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Support staff to be community centric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 21</th>
<th>Work through the transformation projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action 22</td>
<td>Increase learning and development opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 23</td>
<td>Support collaborative and empowering practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 24</td>
<td>Foster employee volunteering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Completed
- Making good progress
- Starting to make progress
6.2 Implementation update

The following high-level stocktake provides commentary and examples of how Auckland Council is delivering against the actions of Thriving Communities, in each focus area. Case studies of initiatives in each area are also included.

Key take-outs:

- The council is working well across the six focus areas and has completed six of the 24 action points and has made good progress in many of the others.

- The council has been particularly successful in strengthening support for the voluntary and community sector, completing three of the four actions. Successful work in this area includes:
  - developing the Community Facilities Network Plan
  - improving funding processes, including developing the Community Grants Policy.

- There are areas of good and emerging practice across the council family particularly the work of The Southern Initiative and the Community Empowerment Unit, and these could potentially be replicated in other places in the region.

- There are some action areas where council could focus more effort, for example on enabling social innovation and social enterprise, specifically:
  - developing channels for recognising and rewarding social innovation
  - using learnings from the success of The Southern Initiative to develop systems and programmes to provide capacity and capability building support for social enterprise across Auckland.
Facilitate grassroots action

“We will have a wide range of approaches in how we work with communities, will share learning and experiences, and give priority to community-led development by providing every opportunity for communities to drive and ‘own’ their development.” Thriving Communities, 2014

Action 1: Facilitate and enable resident and community-led development
To give effect to the objectives in Thriving Communities, the Community Empowerment Unit (CEU) was set up in 2015 to deliver the Empowered Communities Approach (ECA). The CEU is responsible for working across council to build understanding of ECA in practice and support its implementation internally and within Auckland’s communities. It is also driving the Enabling Council programme which is focusing on internal improvements to council processes, so we can work more effectively with our communities.

Action 2: Support community-led placemaking
Placemaking is a central initiative in the CEU business plan. A community-led placemaking group was set up in 2013 and created a placemaking toolkit to develop community understanding of placemaking, showcase best practice and provide practical advice.

Many local boards have encouraged and supported innovative approaches to community-led placemaking (17 in the 2017-2018 financial year). A number of council staff and elected members have undertaken training in community placemaking methodologies, alongside their community partners, and have been trialling new approaches.

Community-led placemaking is central to the spatial plans of the Plans and Places team. For instance, local communities were involved throughout the development of the Newton-Eden Terrace Plan. From public idea sessions during the initial drafting of the plan to the re-scoping of the plan following public engagement, stakeholders and the general public were provided with six distinct opportunities to input, review and guide the overall direction of the plan.

Action 3: Enable match funding
The Community Grants Policy has provision for local boards to adopt match-funding and the Community Grants team have developed supplementary guidelines for this. To date, while local board plans mention and encourage match funding, no local boards have created separate grants rounds for match funding. Some boards do have a condition in their funding agreements that applicants are required to provide 40-50 percent of their project costs as part of their local grant funding round.
Action 4: Ensure our community facilities are fit-for-purpose

Achieving fit-for-purpose facilities is an ongoing challenge due to the high number and age of many of council’s facilities, the ongoing financial pressures and the growing and changing needs of our communities.

The Community Facilities Network Plan (CFNP) and accompanying action plan, was adopted in 2015 to guide council’s investment in the provision of community facilities. A key objective of the plan is to ensure we develop fit-for-purpose, integrated and connected community facilities.

Council’s Strategic Asset Management Plan (SAMP) 2015-2025, which provides direction and priorities for investment in our existing building and land assets also aims to give effect to this.

Key principles in the asset management plan direct the council’s investment to develop suitable community facilities by:

- ensuring assets are fit-for-purpose for their defined activity, including lifting levels of service
- identifying opportunities to provide flexible, integrated and connected facilities

Alongside actions and measures in the network plan and in the SAMP, council is also exploring opportunities to divest or optimise under-performing facilities and reinvest in new or improved services and facilities that will achieve better community outcomes.

Action 5: Showcase Auckland’s resident and community-led initiatives

Auckland Council is continuing to develop its online presence. The Communications team maintains social media accounts for the 21 local boards, as well as overall council social media. Our Auckland is a website showcasing both council and community-led projects, events, activities and provides a weekly email update to subscribers.
Sandringham Project in Community Empowerment
Reserve development

In 2015, the Albert-Eden Local Board set aside $25,000 for the community to develop their own vision and plan for Sandringham to enrich their community and enhance the area.

A group of residents came together to form the Sandringham Project in Community Empowerment (SPICE) group which was tasked with spearheading the process. The group’s first project was focused on the Sandringham Reserve, and its playground, which was due to be renewed by mid-2016.

SPICE used a range of creative techniques to engage with the community, including holding a Flower Carpet Festival and surveying the people who attended, asking local school children to draw pictures and tell stories about their hopes and needs, and displaying options for feedback and voting on nearby shop hoardings.

Local people were asked about their desires for the local park in the village centre, and these results were used to brief artists whose designs were voted on. The winning design included a pebble-mat for the entrance to the park, made by pupils at the local school with the artist’s help.

With the support of the local board, the Arts, Community and Events department and the Parks team worked alongside SPICE to make the community’s vision for the new reserve and playground come alive.

On 11 September 2016, the transformed Sandringham Reserve was officially reopened. The new and improved playground provides for a wider age range, with children between the ages of 1-12 able to enjoy it. By using an Empowered Community Approach, the completed reserve includes features that were important to locals, such as a new performance stage, picnic areas, improved landscaping and lighting, a drinking fountain, adventure play areas for children, a vibrant community art mosaic and other features that reflect the diversity of Sandringham. Consequently, the new playground is well-used by locals and visitors.

Aligns with Actions 1, 2, 3 and 5
Strengthen support to the voluntary and community sector

“Auckland’s voluntary and community groups and non-government organisations are subject-matter experts on many issues and are important partners to council. Our support of the voluntary and community sector is crucial to progressing community and social development.” Thriving Communities, 2014

Action 6: Provide capacity and capability-building support
There are over 188 activities involving capability and capacity building in the Arts Community and Events (ACE) work programme for 2017/2018. Examples of these activities include:

- The Young Enterprise Scheme: a year-long programme where students turn ideas into actual businesses, compete with real products and services and experience profit and loss
- Landowner Assistance Programme: assistance programme to support private landowners to care for and protect lava rock forests on their land

A regional community development grants programme was set up to support the implementation of the Thriving Communities plan. The priorities for receiving a grant directly relate to capacity and capability-building support. A few examples include:

- Community capacity building initiatives
- Increasing community collaboration
- Increasing diverse community participation

Action 7: Investigate asset transfers and other options for communities
As the majority of council owned buildings are located on reserve land, it is usually not possible to carry out asset transfers. While it is possible to transfer improvements on the land, the land itself cannot be transferred. The Community Occupancy Guidelines set out rules and criteria for subsidised leasing, long-term leasing and right of renewal and places the focus on achieving community outcomes through our leasing programme.

An on-going council project has been working on developing a more standardised model for managing rural halls, with direct community involvement. Two rural-halls advisor positions have been created with the task of supporting communities to manage these facilities.

Community Policy have been leading a project to develop a Facility Partnerships Policy for Auckland Council. The projects purpose is to develop policy that will improve the council’s approach to selection, establishment and management of facility partnerships.
Action 8: Improve our funding processes

The Community Grants Policy (CGP) came into effect in July 2015, streamlining over 70 different legacy grant schemes. The policy aims to create a transparent, financially responsible approach, focusing grants on achieving outcomes.

At a local board level, two main schemes are offered, Quick Response Local Grants (up to $2000) and Local Grants (over $2000). The Quick Response grants were introduced to enable a quicker and easier application process and more efficient turnaround time. These grants will also decrease the cost on applicants in complying with the programme criteria and administrative costs. Provision for match funding has been discussed under Action 3.

At a regional level, 6 grants programmes are available, aligned to the following areas: arts, events, recreation, community development, heritage and environment.

A recent progress review has found that in general the CGP is working well and policy objectives are being met. Customer satisfaction has increased and there has also been greater understanding among applicants of the eligibility, requirements and process for grant funding applications.

Action 9: Develop a Community Facilities Network Plan that includes key voluntary and community sector facilities

The Community Facilities Network Plan (noted under Action 4) covers a range of community facilities including:
- arts and culture facilities
- community centres
- libraries
- pools and leisure facilities
- venues for hire (community or rural halls).

This includes both council owned and operated facilities as well as council supported facilities that are governed, managed and/or owned by community organisations.

The plan also acknowledges the important role other non-council facilities play in the community including marae, schools and church halls. In determining what provision council needs to make we consider the role of these other providers and the opportunities to partner to deliver better outcomes.
Kaipātiki Community Organisation
capacity building programme

In 2016 the Kaipātiki Local Board set aside funds to provide training for committees and staff of community organisations, to strengthen their governance and management. Community Empowerment staff worked with the community and local board to provide a programme of training workshops, covering areas as HR, Health and Safety, conflict resolution and marketing. These workshops were well received by the community, and the local board extended the funding for 2017-2018. This provided an opportunity to check with the community organisation as to their priorities: what training and resources they wanted and how to develop them.

While the workshops were well received, communities felt they needed further support in anticipating, preparing for and responding to a range of situations that could emerge within their daily work.

In response, the community, supported by Community Empowerment staff, established a multi-faceted programme to strengthen their capacity, share skills and strengths, and build connectedness and social capital. The programme includes:

- an online platform – community managers can access up to date information and support as they need it
- key speakers – to inspire and inform
- participating in and attending events - sharing experiences and learning across communities, nationally and internationally.

Workshops will still have a place within the overall programme. Where possible they will provide opportunities for local groups to share their expertise and experience: communities already have a wide range of skills, strengths and knowledge – the challenge can be to find ways to share these and learn from each other.

Aligns with Action 6
Enable social innovation and social enterprise

“Business as usual’ is not addressing our tough social, environmental, economic and cultural challenges. Social innovation and the growing number of social enterprises can help address some of these and are important tools in social and economic development.”
Thriving Communities, 2014

Action 10: Promote social innovation and social enterprise
Currently, Social Enterprise Auckland and the Akina Foundation are key bodies for the development and promotion of social enterprise in Auckland and New Zealand. Auckland Council are part of a working group with both groups (see Action 12 commentary for further detail).

Social innovation and social enterprise are also a key focus for The Southern Initiative (TSI), which has enabled the development of a number of social enterprises, such as Fale Kofi, a coffee kiosk at Ōtāhuhu Station (see snapshot overleaf for details) and UpSouth, a crowd empowerment platform for young people to express their creativity, share ideas and earn money from providing input.

Action 11: Support Auckland’s social entrepreneurs
The Community Grants Policy enables individuals and groups to apply for grants specifically for social innovation or enterprise.

Council procurement strategy encourages innovative approaches to making the procurement process affordable, such as partnering with social enterprises.

The Community Empowerment Unit also support social entrepreneurs e.g. by sponsoring learning and networking events.

Action 12: Provide capacity- and capability-building support for social enterprise
The council is involved with two working groups related to social enterprise.

- The Social Outcomes and Smart Procurement Working Group was set up to share information across the council about upcoming smart procurement activity across the council group and to identify opportunities for delivery of social / economic / environmental / cultural outcomes.

- The Social Enterprise Network includes internal and external representatives, working to establish objectives in the social enterprise area to support the creation of an approach/strategy to support social enterprises in the future.
Fale Kofi

Social Enterprise in Ōtāhuhu

The new Ōtāhuhu Train Station opened in October 2016. As the build approached completion, Auckland Transport considered trialling the lease of a small coffee area with a social enterprise, rather than going immediately to competitive tender.

Fale Kofi, operated by local Pasifika social enterprise Affirming Works, opened in early 2017 on a six-month trial to test and prototype a social enterprise alternative to the usual coffee franchises. Fale Kofi is underpinned by a determination to showcase good environmental practice, provide healthy food options, and reflect Auckland’s unique point of difference as the largest Pacific hub in the world.

Fale Kofi is the result of collaboration between The Southern Initiative (TSI) and two South Auckland Māori and Pasifika local enterprises working with Auckland Transport and championed by the Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board. TSI provided $25,000 in start-up capital for the venture as well as business planning, product development, marketing and communications support. Fale Kofi employs one full-time and one part-time staff member each day. The kiosk is staffed by local tertiary students who also work as mentors through Affirming Works.

The kiosk was designed and built by Roots Creative Entrepreneurs, who tapped into the ideas and energy of local students who took part in its construction. The Fale Kofi kiosk has a Māori and Pasifika aesthetic and used recycled and upcycled materials in its construction.

The pilot period recently concluded and Affirming Works, with TSI support, tendered for and won the three-year lease at the station, proving that a social enterprise can successfully compete in open, competitive tendering processes. TSI and Auckland Transport continue to support Fale Kofi to grow to the next level of delivery and viability.

This is a story of many mutually reinforcing elements – an initial opportunity and willingness to test a different approach from Auckland Transport, investment and ongoing support from TSI and the energy of local Māori and Pasifika entrepreneurs.

Aligns with Actions 10, 11, and 12
Maximise positive socio-economic impacts

“Auckland faces significant socio-economic challenges. To create the world’s most liveable city, we must act with urgency to build a strong, inclusive and equitable society that ensures opportunity for all, particularly those most in need.” Thriving Communities, 2014

**Action 13: Improve socio-economic impacts through procurement**

The council procurement strategy, last updated in 2017, states that opportunities for social, economic, environmental and cultural interests and outcomes are to be actively considered. The council’s Sustainable Procurement Framework was approved in December 2017. The framework requires the council’s procurement to meet organisational objectives while having the least negative and most positive impact on economic, environmental, social and cultural wellbeing. The objective of the framework is that sustainable procurement becomes ‘business as usual’ and that all procurement activities enable significant and sustainable positive impact on wellbeing.

**Figure 3: Sustainable Procurement Framework**

**Action 14: Continue to be an advocate**

Auckland Council continues to play a significant role in advocating to central government on behalf of Aucklanders and local government on a wide range of issues that impact on the lives and living standards of Aucklanders. The council has been instrumental in drawing attention to the issue of homelessness in Auckland, co-launching the Housing First Auckland pilot, which aims to get 400 people off the streets.
The council regularly makes submissions to central government on legislation or national policy. Recent examples include submissions on the New Zealand Disability Strategy and the Child Poverty Reduction Bill.

**Action 15: Increase work-experience opportunities**
In 2014, Auckland Council launched the Career Pathways programme. The programme consists of three distinct streams - cadet, intern and graduate-catering for the different skills and qualification levels of youth. There has been a concerted effort to recruit Māori and Pacific Island youth, with the recruitment process involving engagement with iwi and community networks and incorporating te reo Māori in advertising/marketing.

**Action 16: Role-model working conditions that promote staff well-being and are family-friendly**
Auckland Council has introduced a number of measures, supports and policies under this action. These include a flexible working policy – providing the means to apply for a variation in working hours and location, the living wage (detailed under Action 17 below) and a dedicated Health, Safety and Wellbeing Team.

The council has also recently developed a Diversity and Inclusion Framework that has a range of internal facing initiatives to encourage an inclusive work environment for council staff.

Within this space, six council units have received Rainbow Tick certification\(^1\) and three more are currently working through the certification process. Workplaces are awarded a Rainbow Tick if they can demonstrate that they understand, value and welcome sexual and gender diversity.

**Action 17: Investigate the living wage**
The 2017/18 Annual Budget included the introduction of a Living Wage for Auckland Council. Phased implementation of the Living Wage began in September 2017 and is due to be completed by September 2019. The minimum wage of $18.00 will be increased each year, until it reaches $21.00.

---

\(^1\) These are: People & Capability, Libraries & Information, Arts, Community & Events, Communication and Engagement and Transformation.
Three Kings Building  
*Deconstruction: Recovery and Salvage*

Auckland Council’s Waste Solutions team, together with the Puketāpapa Local Board and The Southern Initiative, has achieved positive social and environmental outcomes from the demolition of a council-owned building in Three Kings.

As part of the wider demolition project, social enterprises and community groups were invited to tender for a contract to divert salvaged building materials for reuse or recycling. *TROW Group*, a Pasifika and Māori civil construction company based in Ōtāhuhu, won the contract for salvaging and disseminating materials, and partnered with Earth Action Trust.

Keen to support local people into training, the local board put forward $5,000 to provide employees with personal protection equipment, first aid training, site safe licencing and drug testing. *TROW Group* approached the local WINZ office requesting clients for the project.

The value of this project extends well beyond the initial $45,000 committed by council and the local board, and includes the following outcomes:

- The men recruited for this project received training and employment. This has enabled them to go on to secure further employment at living wage rates, and both now have permanent accommodation.
- The materials salvaged from the building have been successfully re-purposed elsewhere, including kitchen facilities and insulation at Te Puea Marae, materials for use in schools in Māngere and Te Atatu, wall cladding and timber framing for Pacific churches in South Auckland, and recycling by *Tat-Upcycle*, a community social enterprise in Waitakere.
- The saving in landfill space and costs, with three tonnes of waste diverted from landfill.
- The lead contractors are now looking at opportunities for re-purposing materials at similar sites.

The success and attention given to this project has ignited interest elsewhere in council, and other contractors are seeing the opportunity that deconstruction and re-purposing can offer.

*Aligns with Actions 13, 15 and 17*
“Community feedback was very strong on this issue. We are committed to a holistic approach to working with communities, that mirrors how communities function, and which is seamless and integrated over the full range of council activities.” Thriving Communities, 2014

**Action 18: Promote and enable multi-purpose social infrastructure**

The Community Facilities Network Plan directs council to focus investment on integrated and multi-purpose community facilities. The aim is to provide convenient opportunities for the community to participate in a range of activities. Recent examples of multi-purpose infrastructure include Toia, a combined library, pool and leisure centre in Otahuhu and Te Oro, a music and arts centre in Glen Innes, which is located adjacent to the library. New multi-purpose facilities are currently in development in Westgate, Takini and Flatbush.

The Community Services division of council has developed a co-located community facilities operational framework. The purpose is to create a collaborative and place-based approach to service delivery within co-located council facilities to maximise the benefits of co-location and deliver a more integrated experience for customers and communities. This new way of working is being trialled in Otara and other pilots across the region are underway.

**Action 19: Implement a whole-of-system approach**

The Engaging and Enabling Communities workstream is identifying what the council needs to do internally and externally to improve council engagement with communities. This work aligns with one of the six pillars of the Organisational Strategy to ‘engage and enable our communities.’

The Community Empowerment Unit are beginning to embed the Empowered Communities Approach (ECA) and are leading the Enabling Council programme. This work includes exploring barriers and enablers to council being a more enabling council with a view to identifying improvements we can make to our systems, processes and the way we work.

**Action 20: Improve council engagement with communities**

Citizen Value and Engagement (CVE) are working on a variety of initiatives to improve council engagement with communities. This includes:

- a new Engagement Performance Framework that provides guidance and direction on council’s approach to engagement
- an engagement calendar to ensure we are coordinated in our approach (to help avoid engagement fatigue or duplication)
- a staff engagement hub – an intranet-based resource to provide consistent step-by-step guidance to staff undertaking engagement
- an engagement network to share and promote good practice
Engagement Awards to recognise and reward examples of good engagement practice across the council family

A recent example of improved engagement practice was the approach to the 2016 elections. Democracy Services has a long-term focus on voter participation, aiming to reduce barriers to participation, support a candidate pool that reflects Auckland's communities and ensure electors understand what the council does and how it works. The 2016 elections programme strategy, which featured the 'love bus,' reached out to communities who traditionally participate in lower numbers. The 2016 election turnout increased from 35.5% to 38.5% in 2013, bucking the overall downward trend of voter participation nationally and internationally.
Te Kākano
Better services for Tamariki and whanau Māori

In 2016, Community and Social Policy (CSP) carried out research to identify how whānau and tamariki Māori were using council services and how these might be improved to better meet their needs.

Following the research, a framework was developed which aims to guide the council’s service design practice using a kaupapa Māori approach. In partnership with Service Strategy and Integration (SS&I) the Te Kākano framework is being tested through five pilots, across Auckland. Staff, mana whenua and mataawaka informed the selection of the pilots.

SS&I and CSP worked closely with mana whenua and mataawaka to ensure that whānau voices were central to the pilot design. Māori codesign specialists and kaupapa Māori evaluators were contracted to ensure the design process:

- encourage whānau to participate
- respect tikanga and kawa at hui and wananga
- used matauranga Māori methods, including:
  - Whakawhanaungatanga: investing time getting to know and trust each other to encourage deeper engagement and openness from participants
  - Nga Hinengaro: co-creation and ideation
  - Nga Puawaitanga: sharing final ideas
- enabled all design team members to feel comfortable using matauranga Māori design

Mana whenua and mataawaka already active in the sector welcomed this new approach from council and its focus on genuine engagement from a Te Ao Māori perspective.

Staff involved in front-line service delivery gained a deeper understanding of what is important to whanau and tamariki Māori to grow participation and engagement in council services.

Stakeholders in the community were brought together around a common kaupapa and supported to contribute to the outcomes identified by whānau.

The pilots are now shifting into service delivery, with ongoing support to be provided by the council. An independent evaluation will be undertaken by matauranga Māori specialists through to 2020.

Aligns with action 18 and 20
Support staff to be community-centric

“To be able to drive forward the actions in the focus areas, put the principles into practice and deliver great results for both council and communities, our organisational culture must shift to being relationship-focused with a ‘can do’ attitude.” Thriving Communities, 2014

Action 21: Work through the transformation projects

To support the realisation of the Organisational Strategy (included above), four transformation focus areas have been created. Each area has its own specific work programmes and initiatives to support the council to adopt more community-centric ways of working. An example for each area is listed below:

Engaging and enabling communities

Te Toa Takitiri
- A series of cross-council group work streams that will lift economic, social and cultural well-being, improve our effectiveness for Māori and maximise post-Treaty settlement opportunities.

Customer friendly services

Consenting made easy
- Make the consenting process easier, faster and more efficient for customers.

Making our size work

Non-general rates revenue
- Investigate and develop revenue streams to decrease the general rates burden

High performance culture

Digital HR and future workforce
- Digital tools and a workforce design to ensure our workforce is set up to deliver our three-year strategy.
**Action 22: Increase learning and development opportunities**

Tupu is the name of the Learning Management System (LMS) that has been rolled out across Auckland Council to help staff take charge of their learning, growth, and career development. It was launched in July 2017 and offers courses that support staff to become more community-centric. These include courses on te reo Māori, tikanga, and cultural competency.

A three-year development programme called Kura Kāwana has been running since 2017 to support elected members as governors and decision-makers. To date members have attended a range of Kura Kāwana sessions including integrity and conflict of interest, Obligations and Opportunities: Māori, Te Tiriti/the Treaty and Auckland Council, workshop for chairs, workshop for deputy chairs and Getting to Grips with Governance.

**Action 23: Support collaborative and empowering practices**

As well as the Community Empowerment Unit, the Organisational Strategy speaks to this action with Step 1: Engage and Enable our Communities, and Step 4: Value and empower our people.

An Engagement Performance Framework is also being developed by Citizen Value and Engagement, which will allow us to measure how departments are doing across a raft of engagement indicators.

**Action 24: Foster employee volunteering**

The Council has a policy that encourages staff to take one day a year as paid Community Day leave to support volunteering in the community. Since the adoption of Thriving Communities, Community Day leave has been promoted on the intranet, and through Chief Executive update emails. The table below demonstrates a marked improvement in uptake of the Community Day opportunity since 2013 (although this fell slightly in 2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Number of Employees who took Community Day Leave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/2018</td>
<td>1/07/2017</td>
<td>13/12/2017 (Today)</td>
<td>609 [Please note this figure is only for 5 months as the year compared in June]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/2017</td>
<td>1/07/2016</td>
<td>30/06/2017</td>
<td>1312 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total staff numbers: 6091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>1/07/2015</td>
<td>30/06/2016</td>
<td>1205 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total staff numbers: 6102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/2015</td>
<td>1/07/2014</td>
<td>30/06/2015</td>
<td>1318 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total staff numbers: 5998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/2014</td>
<td>1/07/2013</td>
<td>30/06/2014</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kotahi Profile
Community Day Promotion

Kotahi is the name of the Auckland Council intranet. It is used to profile organisational news and events and is often used to advertise the Community Day opportunities.

In May 2017, the Design Review Unit from Auckland Design Office were featured online braving the wet weather and embarking on a team Community Day at Long Bay Regional Park.

"Using your Community Day as a team event can be a lot of fun" says Anita Sanghera, Business Co-ordinator for Auckland Design Office.

The park rangers needed a helping hand to move 3500 potted native trees and shrubs from their yard to new planting areas ready for a mass community planting event on Sunday 14th May.

The article explains that the rangers gave great instructions about where to plant each tree species, so Council staff were instantly upskilled with new knowledge. The day was described as a ‘festival of mud’, where the team members shared laughs, fresh air and a hearty BBQ together.

The rangers were very pleased with the team effort and Stephanie McLeod one of the rangers said: "I wanted to pass on a huge thank you to your team for their help on Friday at Long Bay Regional Park. It was wonderful to have them here. Getting around 3500 plants laid out is a big task, everyone worked really hard and we couldn’t have done it without you all!"

In September 2017, Stephen Town also featured the Executive Leadership Team’s Community Day at the Auckland City Mission in his update email to all staff.

Each of these features contains links to ideas and contacts to follow up with about a range of voluntary opportunities available.

Aligns with Action 24
7. Internal stakeholder feedback

Semi-structured interviews were carried out with 18 managers across Auckland Council, and its associated council-controlled organisations. The interviews were designed to assess the strategic role and relevance of Thriving Communities and explore opportunities for the plan in the future. Questions were structured around the following key themes:

- Familiarity with Thriving Communities
- Use of Thriving Communities
- Importance of Thriving Communities
- Issues
- Suggested improvements

The second part of the engagement involved workshops with frontline staff in key delivery areas to assess delivery to date and current familiarity with the plan. Following a presentation, staff completed a questionnaire covering the same themes as the manager interviews and participated in a facilitated group discussion, expanding on their responses to the questionnaire.

This section presents the findings from this engagement. It summarises feedback on what is working well and what could be areas for improvement.

Key take-outs:

- The intent of Thriving Communities is highly valued – the action plan is anchored in local needs and community practices and aspirations.
- Thriving Communities has been a key starting point for subsequent work such as the Empowered Communities Approach (ECA).
- While important work has been carried out which aligns with the actions in the plan, this hasn’t necessarily resulted directly from the plan.
- Commitment to community-led ways of working needs to be further embedded, this requires evidence of the benefits and understanding of the resourcing implications.
- There is a need to increase awareness of the plan and make it a simpler and more accessible document.
- The plan’s linkages to other key strategic plans and organisational initiatives needs to be clearer.
- Content needs to be refreshed to reflect relevant and emerging community issues.
- The plan requires clear measures and an evaluation framework to underpin delivery.
7.1 What’s working well?

Recognition of the value of the plan and impact in specific areas

Across the interviews and staff workshops there was general agreement on the importance of Thriving Communities. Managers view the plan as a key guide for council community engagement. Some recognised the link between the plan and other strategies/approaches and view Thriving Communities as the foundation document in this space.

‘Really important document for those with eye on this kind of thing…a guiding document.’ Manager

‘The Empowered Communities Approach, it was about the realisation of the Thriving Communities Action Plan.’ Manager

Clear framework for creating an enabling council

In regard to its practical use, the plan is seen as providing a useful framework for creating an enabling council. The plan is a blueprint for staff across the council, including local boards and CCOs, to enable and empower local communities.

‘It describes an enabling council… as a framework I think it works really well.’ Manager

‘[The plan sets] alignment and direction.’ Staff member

‘A framework to help the rest of the organisation to come to working in this way.’ Manager

Noticeable impact on certain groups

Some of those interviewed spoke of the tangible impact the plan has had on certain areas of the council. The influence was particularly noted on frontline staff, as well as various council activities, such as the Southern Initiative.

Staff who were using the plan, referred to particular areas that were referenced or integrated into their work.

‘It’s important to note how much traction it has…amongst people working in this space.’ Manager

‘[Thriving Communities] led to strategic brokers, current local board programme, etc.’ Manager

‘Make reference to it when talking about ECA.’

Council is working in a more community-centric way

A stocktake of council activity since the launch of the plan highlighted a range of work, completed or in progress, which addresses the plan’s action points. Examples of achievements include the launch of the Community Facilities Network Plan, Community Grants Policy and the increasing importance placed on social and cultural outcomes in the procurement process.
7.2 What could be improved?

Awareness of the plan could be increased

Familiarity with Thriving Communities varies significantly across the council. While some were aware of the plan, they felt they were lacking a comprehensive understanding of its role and importance relative to their particular workstream.

‘Exposure to plan? Very little. Have not read it or come across it. Staff in the department know about it but not used in their daily work.’ Manager

‘Why don’t I know about the Thriving Communities Action Plan? How do we become aware of these plans that we could easily miss?’ Manager

Some of those unfamiliar with the plan felt this was because they were new to their role or to the council generally.

‘I have only been here 7 months – not something I have come across in my work space.’ Manager

‘I have only been in the role for a little while. I did not have this on my radar.’ Staff member

Who is driving the plan?

Managers were unclear who or what group had responsibility for Thriving Communities at the council. They were not aware of anyone ‘driving’ the plan through the organisation and who was taking ownership for it.

‘[Challenges] ownership.’

‘What else is driving work in this community space? I don’t know what is being done or who the people are.’

Community-centric work is not always directly influenced by the plan

Interviews and workshops with council staff indicated that much of this work has not necessarily been directly influenced by the plan, but rather reflects a general shift in commitment by the council to community-led approaches.

‘It is embedded in all the work we do – not sure if this is the action plan per se.’ Staff member

Lack of understanding of how the plan fits in with other council plans and strategies

There is a lack of clarity over how the plan relates to other subsequent council initiatives. Interviews indicated confusion between Thriving Communities and Empowered Communities Approach (ECA), with some assuming that ECA had ‘replaced’ Thriving Communities.

‘If we could see some connect across the initiatives/actions and also some shared objectives. They do sit very much as quite separate action plans.’ Manager
‘I was under the impression that ECA is the ‘implementation’ of Thriving Communities so didn’t reference it anymore.’ Staff member

Frontline staff indicated that they struggle with the number, length and complexity of strategic and policy documents. It is hard to keep track of the plans or know when a specific plan is replaced or how they link to another.

‘Council has so many plans and strategies. Sometimes it feels like a flavour of the month approach.’ Staff member

Commitment to community-led ways of working needs to be further embedded

While community-facing staff and units are familiar with the plan and actively using it, other groups require further support in embedding these practices.

Managers felt that community-facing staff tended to understand the approach and respond well, while staff and departments that do not often engage directly with the community require better support.

Of the staff questioned, over one third were not using the plan, with another 9 ‘slightly’ incorporating it into their work. Reasons given for this included a lack of awareness of the plan or perceived lack of alignment with their work area.

‘Currently not well profiled or connected to strategies and plans in use.’

‘I am sure this plan is very important, but it hasn’t translated into the work I do.’

Clarifying the reasoning behind the plan

Interviews and workshops revealed a tension around the intent of community-led approaches, with some questioning if it was to achieve better community outcomes or to increase fiscal savings.

‘From a community organisation point of view, Thriving Communities felt like an opportunity for the council to invest less in community groups.’ Staff member

A need for a stronger evidence base

While the plan and its content may have been influenced by a large evidence base, this is not made clear in the document. Much of the content is not explicitly supported with references, which can have an impact on confidence in Thriving Communities.

‘I couldn’t use this document in my submissions to central government as I can’t see the evidence base that supports it.’ Manager

A high level of trust and investment in the right skills and training is needed

Some managers perceived there to be an inherent risk in taking a community-led approach. They discussed the need to have a high level of trust in their staff who also needed to be flexible and adapt to new approaches.
To support local communities to be empowered to lead would require highly skilled facilitators and staff with strong interpersonal skills.

While managers recognised the plan as delivering cost-savings down the line, there was some agreement that the approach was resource-heavy, and that initially there would need to be significant investment in staff and training.

Content needs to be updated to reflect current issues and context

There was consensus amongst staff and managers that new issues have emerged in Auckland, since Thriving Communities was written, that need to be addressed in any future update to the plan.

a) Diversity

It was felt that the diversity of Auckland is not well represented in Thriving Communities. In particular, it was suggested that there should be more content specific to Māori and Pasifika, with corresponding outcomes.

‘Doesn’t reflect adequately the diversity of Auckland through immigration.’ Manager

‘More Māori outcome specifics.’ Staff member

Some managers felt that the plan could go further in understanding the needs of diverse communities. Communities shouldn’t be categorised solely based on ethnicity, as there can be a number of differences within an ethnic group, for example new Pacific migrants have differing needs from those who have been in New Zealand for a few generations.

b) Housing and homelessness

The housing issue has become acute in Auckland, an issue that encompasses not only the supply of affordable housing, but also the quality of existing housing and strategies for better supporting our homeless population. There is now work underway on a Homelessness Strategic Action Plan and a Mayor’s Housing Taskforce.

Staff suggested that a strategic action plan about communities should acknowledge these social issues and how they create barriers to other social outcomes and make links to other council work to address this.

c) Environment

While the plan is strong on places in terms of the people who live in them, it makes no reference to place as a tangible area. The need for a community action plan to also recognise the contribution to a community made by a healthy, well cared for environment should be included as a central element of Thriving Communities.

‘It’s strong on place as community, but it’s not strong on place as landscape and a thing to be cared for, kaitiakitanga.’ Manager
Plan needs to be refined and simplified
Both managers and staff discussed the need to refine the actions in the plan, with some requesting that they are removed altogether.

‘The actions are good, but the detail is way too prescriptive...high level is better.’ Manager

‘Needs to be simplified down, too many actions.’ Staff member

‘Remove the actions.’ Staff member

The plan requires clear measures and an evaluation system
Both managers and staff felt that the current evaluation system for the plan could be improved. In some instances, there was confusion as to what the outcomes were and how to measure success against outcomes.

‘Improve monitoring and evaluation.’ Manager

‘Develop and monitor more specific outcomes.’ Staff member

Staff wanted actions to be supported with practical examples, so they could better understand what they could/should be doing.

‘[It could be improved if] it goes into examples, gets quite specific.’
8 Recommended improvements

Based on analysis of the progress review and stakeholder feedback, we have identified four key problem or opportunity statements and four improvement areas to address these.

This provides the overarching intervention logic for the recommended improvements.

8.1 Key problem/opportunity statements

1. Lack of leadership and awareness of the Thriving Communities Action Plan

There is a lack of leadership at the right level to drive delivery of the Thriving Communities Action Plan. There is also lack of awareness of the plan and understanding of how it aligns to other strategies and organisational initiatives. As a result, uptake and delivery are inconsistent across the council family.

2. We have an opportunity to focus on improving outcomes for those most in need

Auckland’s context is changing, our population is increasing and becoming more diverse; and there is growing inequity in parts of the region.

The refreshed Auckland Plan directs us to ensure all Aucklanders feel they belong and have opportunities to achieve their potential. There is an opportunity to update the Thriving Communities Action Plan to give greater effect to this by focusing our collective efforts on improving outcomes for those communities in most need.

3. Community-led ways of working are not fully embedded across council

Commitment to and application of community-led and enabling ways of working that underpin the Thriving Communities Action Plan are not consistently applied across the council family. There is more we could be doing to improve communities’ experiences of working with us that will lead to better community outcomes.

We are also not making the most of sharing and applying our learnings from our successes and good/emerging practice.

4. We are not always clear on the impact we are making

Council is doing some good work but we are not always clear on what difference we are making and how to effectively measure and evaluate this. Understanding this is important to ensure we are working on the right things where we can have the most impact; and to underpin the case for ongoing investment.

8.1 Recommended improvements

The following tables outline four areas of recommended improvements to address the key problem statements, using a simple intervention logic.
Improvement 1: Build leadership for the plan and raise awareness of it

*If we:*

Build leadership for the plan, and better communicate, promote and socialise it.

*Then by doing the following:*

- **Create leadership champions to help drive delivery of the plan**
  To ensure cross-council delivery of Thriving Communities, leadership champions are required to help drive it through the organisation. Ideally this would be at both the political/governance and executive/senior management level.

- **Improve oversight and drive delivery of plan**
  Staff need to better coordinate and drive delivery of the plan, with clear monitoring and reporting requirements.

- **Better communicate and promote the plan**
  - **Socialise the plan across the organisation**
    Through regular communications, sharing examples of best practice and incorporating an introduction to the document at all new staff inductions.

  To ensure staff are clear on the role, intent and content of the plan, information sessions could be provided across the council. Joint sessions could be held with other teams (e.g., Community Empowerment Unit) to demonstrate the importance of a community-led approach, clarify the links between Thriving Communities, Empowered Communities Approach and Enabling Council and provide case studies/good practice in this area.

  - **Make the plan simpler and more accessible**
    Update the plan to make the document more accessible for a greater range of people, taking into account their knowledge levels of the subject matter as well as the time they have available.

    Structuring the report to support both a quick overview (for example by providing summary tables, introductions to each section and headings that outline the main point of each section) and deeper dives (through detailed content and links to other key documents).

*So that we will achieve*

- Increased awareness of the plan and its relevance
- Wider uptake and buy-in to the plan across the council family
- Better coordination and delivery of the plan’s actions
Improvement 2: Focus delivery on improving outcomes for those most in need

If we:

Target delivery of actions and interventions to achieving Auckland Plan outcomes, with a focus on meeting our treaty obligations to Māori and on those most in need.

Then by doing the following:

- **Update Thriving Communities Plan to give effect to Auckland Plan outcomes**
  Develop and prioritize actions and interventions that give effect to the outcomes and priorities of the new Auckland Plan – particularly to the Belonging and Participation outcome area.
  
  o This could include, for instance, an intervention programme to increase inclusion and belonging tailored to specific population groups (emerging from the Investing in Aucklanders project).

  o An updated plan should also include:
    ➢ Logic intervention/theory of change for key actions and programmes
    ➢ Reference key issues such as housing and diversity
    ➢ Local communities’ views on the issues that are most relevant to them
    ➢ Engagement with Māori and Pasifika to ensure the plan reflects their needs

- **Develop place-based interventions that take a community-centric approach to improving outcomes in areas of most need.**

This status update indicates that place-based, community-centric approaches such as The Southern Initiative could be a successful model to deliver improved outcomes for other communities of need. The merits of replicating or scaling this approach could be explored in other areas of high need in the region (such as parts of west Auckland).

So that we will achieve

- Improved outcomes for Māori and Pasifika communities and those most in need
- Greater impact in areas of highest need.
- Applied learning from our current successes/good practice
Improvement 3: Further embed community-led ways of working

If we:
Further embed community-led ways of working across the council family.

Then by doing the following:

- **Support and deliver the Enabling Council programme**
  The Community Empowerment Unit are already leading work to look at how council can be more enabling. This includes investigating barriers to the council working in more enabling ways and identifying solutions to reduce these.

  This work could include addressing concerns expressed by some staff over the resourcing implications and other potential risks of working in more enabling ways.

- **Showcase good and emerging practice and evidence of the benefits**
  There are opportunities for council to better showcase good practise and help others across the council learn from what is being achieved. This could include providing more evidence on benefits, role modelling community-centric ways of working and creating opportunities to upscale, replicate or extended good practise elsewhere in the region.

- **Show links to other strategic plans and initiatives**
  Clarifying the connections between Thriving Communities and other strategic plans and initiatives such as the Organisation Strategy and the Empowered Communities Approach will support staff to better understand and implement the enabling council approach and priorities.

So that we will achieve:

- Better experiences for our communities working with us leading to increased trust.
- Improved outcomes for communities.
- Applied learning from our current successes/good practice
- A more enabling council with greater uptake of community-led approaches
Improvement 4: Improve evaluation to measure the impact we are making

If we:

Improve evaluation of the Thriving Communities Action Plan.

Then by doing the following:

- **Develop an evaluation framework**
  
  To support effective delivery of the plan, an evaluation framework needs to be developed to guide how we measure impact. This needs to be underpinned by an intervention logic/ theory of change which shows the link between what we do (actions/investment) and the intended outcomes (in the Auckland Plan and other council strategies and initiatives).

  *This could include working with the Enabling Council programme to develop theory of change and evaluation tools that assist council staff to plan and measure the community benefits and outcomes of projects (pending business case).*

- **Underpin plan with clear evidence base**
  
  There is a need to clearly articulate the research underpinning the principles and actions of the plan. As part of the plan’s update it will be beneficial to add to this evidence base, taking data collected by other agencies and initiatives that clearly demonstrate Thriving Communities in action or support its central tenets. This would also provide an opportunity to incorporate latest thinking around community development practice.

- **Establish regular monitoring process**
  
  The evaluation plan needs to sit with the unit allocated responsibility for the plan. A regular monitoring process should be developed to ensure greater accountability for meeting the Action Plan across the council.

So that we will achieve:

- Wider uptake and delivery of the plan across the council family
- Clear accountability for actions
- Better understanding of the impact we are making
- Applied learning that can be replicated, scaled up/out to other areas of Auckland
9 Summary and conclusion

Since the launch of The Thriving Communities Action Plan in 2014, the council has shown a commitment to community-led ways of working, delivering activities, policies and programmes across the plan’s 24 action points.

Overall, Auckland Council is making good progress and has already completed seven discrete actions. Successes include the introduction of a living wage and the adoption of the Community Facilities Network Plan.

Despite an evident shift in the council’s approach to engaging with communities, this has not necessarily been a direct result of the plan, and there are areas of council that remain unaware of Thriving Communities and its role in shaping a community-led approach. The lack of clear leadership and oversight of the plan, has affected uptake and delivery.

There is a lack of consensus around where the plan sits within wider council strategy, with some overwhelmed by the number of strategies and initiatives at the council. There is confusion between Thriving Communities and Empowered Communities Approach (ECA), with many of the impression that ECA had replaced the plan. Any updates to the document need to ensure it aligns more closely with other council plans and initiatives such as the refreshed Auckland Plan and ECA. Collaboration with the units responsible for these plans, for example through shared staff training, may help in improving understanding of how the plans and initiatives work together.

Commitment and understanding of community-led ways of working varies across the council. There is need to support staff to better understand the thinking behind the plan and the evidence base that underpins the theory. Managers and team leaders also require a clearer picture of resourcing requirements involved in working towards the plan, and support in meeting these needs.

With three years since the launch of Thriving Communities and significant changes in the Auckland context, some of the content also needs updating. There was general consensus that the plan does not address some pressing issues such as housing and increasing diversity. Any updates to the plan need to involve active reengagement with local communities to establish the issues that are relevant in 2018. It will be important to actively recognise the role played by communities in the initial consultation on the plan, highlighting where council have acted on their input and emphasising that the community remains the ones in the driving seat for any future updates. Undertaking this work in the light of the Auckland Plan refresh provides a good opportunity to ensure close alignment between the two plans and that communities’ priorities can be reflected in the action plan.

A refreshed document will need to be accessible to a greater range of people. This could be achieved by refining the list of actions as well as structuring the report to provide multiple entry points for readers, enabling both a quick overview and a deeper dive.
For the council to effectively work towards the action plan, an evaluation system needs to be developed. Currently, the plan does not detail what successful outcomes look like or provide clear guidance on how or what units should be doing in terms of monitoring and evaluation. There needs to be clear indicators for measuring success, with practical examples to aid understanding of expectations of each unit. A regular monitoring process should be developed to ensure greater accountability for meeting the action points across the council.
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240A Bethells Beach, Te Henga - Kāinga Whakahirahira

File No.: CP2018/09102

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To propose that the Minister of Conservation considers revocation of the reserve classification of 240A Bethells Road, Te Henga to enable Te Kawerau ā Maki to develop a marae and papakāinga.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. To inform Committee decision-making on options to facilitate the development of a marae and papakāinga by Te Kawerau ā Maki at Te Henga.
3. Staff recommend that the Environment and Community Committee support the revocation of the classification of 240A Bethells Road, Te Henga under the Reserves Act 1977.
4. Revocation of the Local Purpose (marae papakāinga) Reserve status would remove compliance costs and enable Te Kawerau ā Maki to obtain commercial funding, if needed. Without this step it is unlikely that Te Kawerau ā Maki will be able to develop a marae and papakāinga at Te Henga.
5. There is no legislative requirement to consult the public on the proposed revocation of the reserve status. The main risk to manage is public expectations about ongoing access. Te Kawerau ā Maki have previously expressed a willingness to make the marae facilities available to community when not in use by the iwi.
6. Staff will prepare a report to the 19 June 2018 Finance and Performance Committee to consider disposal of the land to Te Kawerau ā Maki, subject to completion of the required statutory processes.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) recommend to the Minister of Conservation the revocation of the classification of 240A Bethells Road, Te Henga, identified as Section 1 SO 427404 comprising 2.6836 hectares and contained in CFR538253, as a Local Purpose (marae papakāinga) Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.

b) note that there is no legislative requirement to consult the public on the proposed revocation of the classification of 240A Bethells Road, Te Henga, as a Local Purpose (marae papakāinga) Reserve, in accordance with section 24(7) of the Reserves Act 1977 and council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

Horopaki / Context
7. Waitākere City Council and Te Kawerau ā Maki were in discussions over the development of a marae within the traditional heartland of the iwi and in the vicinity of their ancestral village at Waiti since the mid-1990s.
8. The following is a summary of key developments:
   - Waitākere City Council and Te Kawerau ā Maki investigated three possible sites in 1994 and 1995, before Te Henga was identified as the preferred site for a marae
Waitākere City Council allocated $30,000 in the 1995/96 Annual Plan to assist Te Kawerau ā Maki to purchase 240A Bethells Road. This site was also zoned as ‘Marae Special Area’ in the District Plan.

In 1998, Waitākere City Council and Te Kawerau ā Maki entered into a memorandum of partnership, which includes an objective to establish a marae.

Staff investigated the potential to acquire 240A Bethells Road under the Public Works Act 1981 and re-commence negotiations with the landowner. Budget for the acquisition was allocated in 2008/09. There is also a proposal to vest the land with Te Kawerau ā Maki under the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993.

In 2009, Waitākere City Council purchased the 2.6836 hectares site at 240A Bethells Road, Te Henga for ‘community development purposes’.

Waitākere City Council proposed to classify the land as a Local Purpose (marae papakāinga) Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.

The consultation process on the proposed classification generated 104 public submissions and two Ministerial representations.

In 2010, the classification was approved by an independent commissioner on condition that: ‘the council provide in the proposed Deed of Lease, or any agreement entered into with Te Kawerau ā Maki for the use of the reserve, provision for the community to have the opportunity for effective input into the type and scale of the facilities to be built on site’.

On 27 January 2011, approval was granted by the Minister of Conservation for permanent personal accommodation on the reserve (Case No. 2010/11 51) to provide for papakāinga housing.

Te Kawerau ā Maki have previously been offered a ground lease over the land at Te Henga. This option was actively considered, however, to-date the iwi have declined to enter into a leasing arrangement with council.

There are compliance costs associated with the reserve status, including the requirement to develop and consult on a reserve management plan. The reserve status may also limit the ability to obtain commercial funding.

Te Kawerau ā Maki have indicated a preference for the land to be general freehold land in Fee Simple before they develop their marae and papakāinga. In the view of the iwi this would recognise their mana and align with what they hold to be the undertakings given by the former Waitākere City Council.

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

12. Auckland Council is considering a range of options to enable Te Kawerau ā Maki to develop a marae and papakāinga at Te Henga. These options include:

- **Option 1**: To negotiate a long-term ground lease with Te Kawerau ā Maki in accordance with the classification of the land as a Local Purpose (marae and papakāinga) Reserve.

- **Option 2**: To revoke the reserve status on the land and transfer the land to Te Kawerau ā Maki as general freehold land in Fee Simple.

- **Option 3**: To revoke the reserve status on the land and to dispose of the land by way of sale to Te Kawerau ā Maki.

13. Option 1, outlined directly above, represents the status quo.

14. Whereas, Option 2 appears to accord with the resolutions of the former Waitākere City Council and the Waitākere Local Board [WTK/2018/47] refers.

---

1 Negotiations between the landowner and Te Kawerau ā Maki were unsuccessful.
15. Option 3, however, has largely been discarded because it does not align with the decisions of the former Waitākere City Council.

16. This report seeks support for the revocation of the classification under the Reserves Act 1977. This would provide a first step towards implementation of options two and three outlined above, but is not dependent on any decisions regarding the disposal of 240A Bethells Road.

There are several factors for the Committee to consider, including alignment with the Auckland Plan, legislation and the Unitary Plan

17. There is clear evidence of the longstanding intent of the Waitākere City Council to support, and then acquire land, to enable the development of the marae.

18. Auckland Plan directives ‘support marae development to achieve social, economic and cultural development’ (Directive 2.4). Directive 2.1 is to ‘investigate and implement a suite of options to support papakāinga development on both traditional Māori land and general land’.

19. Provision of land for a marae for Te Kawerau ā Maki appears to be aligned with the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area Act (2008).

20. Section 29(1) of the Act acknowledges Te Kawerau ā Maki (alongside Ngāti Whātua) as tangata whenua of the heritage area, with a particular historical, traditional, cultural, or spiritual relationship with any land in the heritage area.

21. Any deed of acknowledgement developed under section 29 “must identify any specific opportunities for contribution by the tangata whenua to whom the deed relates to the management of the land by the Crown or the Council” [section 29(5)(d) refers].

22. The Minister of Conservation has previously given approval in accordance with the Reserves Act 1977 for permanent personal accommodation on the reserve (Case No. 2010/11 51) to provide for papakāinga housing.

23. The objectives, policies and rules of the Unitary Plan: Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose enable marae, papakāinga and other activities on the site.

There is ample provision of open space provision in Bethells Beach

24. Potential disposals of open space, such as a transfer, are assessed against the criteria in the Parks and Open Space Acquisition Policy and the Open Space Provision Policy.

25. There is ample provision of open space provision within this area. Local residents and the wider community have access to Te Henga Park, Te Henga Recreation Reserve and Lake Wainamu Scenic Reserve within a 400 metre radius of 240A Bethells Road.

26. The parcel of land has a very narrow access (approximately 5.8 metres wide and 395 metres long), which limits the utility of the open space and poor crime prevention through environmental design outcomes.

27. A range of other factors need to be considered prior to disposal, including the possible future development of the area and the potential for increased demand for parks and open space.

28. Given that Te Henga is situated within the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area there is limited growth and potential for future development.

29. Community views and preferences are another consideration. Local residents of Bethells Beach attended the 24 May 2018 meeting of the Waitākere Ranges Local Board and spoke during Public Input in support of efforts to facilitate the development of a marae and papakāinga by Te Kawerau ā Maki at Te Henga.

30. A summary of the disposal assessment is provided in Table 1 below.
Staff recommend that the Committee support the revocation of the reserve status. It aligns with the wider strategic objectives of Auckland Council and there is ample provision of open space within this area.

There is no legislative requirement to consult the public on the proposed revocation of the classification.

Whether council needs to engage with the community depends on:

i) the extent to which the council already knows the current views and preferences of the people who may have an interest in the decision

---

2 Based on the average household size of 3.0 in Auckland at Census 2013.
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Item 15

ii) the nature and significance of the decision
iii) the costs and benefits of any consultation process or procedure
iv) whether there are statutory exemptions negating the requirement to engage with the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors to consider</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| i Views and preferences of interested parties | • Aucklanders were consulted over an 11-week period in 2013 during the development of the Unitary Plan, including the Special Purpose – Maori Purpose Zone.  
• The Waitākere Ranges Local Board has considered reports and passed several resolutions to enable the development of a marae and Papakāinga at Te Henga.  
• The proposal is consistent with the Local Purpose (marae papakāinga) Reserve status, which was previously subject to public consultation.  
• Members of the local community have publically supported the proposal. |
| ii Significance of the decision | • Council’s threshold for determining ‘significance’ includes transferring the ownership or control of strategic assets, however, this only applies to the network of 3571 local parks not a single asset |
| iii Costs and benefits | • The costs of consultation are estimated to be $20,000 including developing collateral and staff time. This does not appear justifiable given previous engagement and recent public input. |
| iv Statutory exemption | • There is no requirement to consult on the revocation of Local Purposes Reserves in accordance with section 24(7) of the Reserves Act 1977. |

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

35. The Waitākere Ranges Local Board has sought to enable the development of a marae and Papakāinga at Te Henga.

36. In May 2013, the Local Board recommended that staff enter into formal discussions with Te Kawerau ā Maki Iwi Authority to develop a ground lease over the land at Bethells Beach [WTK/2013/93 refers].

37. In October 2014, the Local Board recommended a four step process by which the land at 240A Bethells Road, Te Henga, could be transferred to Te Kawerau ā Maki for the purposes of a marae and Papakāinga [WTK/2014/161 refers].

38. The Local Board, at its meeting of 24 May 2018 resolved that it:

• supports the possible revocation of the classification of 240A Bethells Road, Te Henga, identified as Section 1 SO 427404 comprising 2.6836 hectares and contained in CFR538253, as a Local Purpose (marae papakāinga) Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977.
• supports the possible transfer of the 240A Bethells Road, Te Henga, identified as Section 1 SO 427404 comprising 2.6836 hectares and contained in CFR538253, to Te Kawerau ā Maki as general freehold land in Fee Simple for the purpose of constructing a marae and Papakāinga.
39. Local residents of Bethells Beach attended the 24 May 2018 meeting of the Local Board and spoke during Public Input in support of efforts to facilitate the development of a marae and papakāinga by Te Kawerau ā Maki at Te Henga.

 Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

40. Te Kawerau ā Maki have clearly stated their aspirations to establish a marae within their traditional heartland and in the vicinity of their ancestral village at Waiti. They have also noted that they are the only mana whenua group without an iwi-based marae.

41. Te Kawerau ā Maki have indicated a preference for the land to be general freehold land in Fee Simple before they develop their marae and papakāinga.

42. Revocation of the Reserves Act 1977 classification would be a step towards iwi achieving this objective.

43. On 10 May 2018, the Chairpersons of the Environment and Community Committee, Councillor Penny Hulse, and the Finance and Performance Committee, Councillors Ross Clow, wrote to Te Kawerau ā Maki. The purpose of this letter was to outline the steps that council proposes to undertake to enable the development of the marae and papakāinga at Te Henga.

44. A formal response from Te Kawerau ā Maki will be provided at the Committee meeting to inform decision-making.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

45. 240A Bethells Road was acquired for $935,000 (inclusive of GST) in 2009.

46. An indicative valuation, based on council’s geographic information system data, records a rateable value of $650,000. This valuation reflects the zoning of the land as a Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose and Outstanding Natural Features and Landscape Overlays, as well as the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area Overlay.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

47. The main risk is to manage is public expectations about future access. Te Kawerau ā Maki have previously expressed a willingness to make the marae facilities available to community when not in use by the iwi.

48. The independent commissioner hearing submissions to the reserve classification process set a condition that the local community should have an input to the type and scale of the facilities to be built on the marae site. This condition has been met as part of the consultation process to develop the Unitary Plan. The policies and rules of the Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose control the type and scale of buildings and activities that can be undertaken on the site.

Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

49. Staff will prepare a report for the Finance and Performance Committee on 19 June 2018, seeking a decision on the possible disposal of the land to Te Kawerau ā Maki.

50. Implementation will be subject to the completion of required statutory processes and a decision by the Minister of Conservation. Council is not able to guarantee these outcomes.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.
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Auckland’s waters strategy: Proposed scope, timeframe and budget

File No.: CP2018/05712

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report

1. To approve the proposed scope, timeframe and budget for the development of an Auckland’s waters strategy.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary

2. The health of Auckland’s waters is a critical issue. Both freshwater and marine environments in Auckland are under pressure from historic under-investment, climate change and rapid growth. The draft Auckland Plan 2050 identifies the need to proactively adapt to a changing water future and develop long-term solutions.

3. In response to these challenges, this Committee has requested the development of a strategy for Auckland’s waters. The purpose of the strategy is to provide strategic direction and priorities for the council group to meet the challenges and opportunities for improved management for water in all its forms. It will establish the outcomes needed for Auckland’s waters, as part of implementation of the Auckland Plan.

4. This report describes the proposed scope, timeframe and financial implications for the development of this strategy. After considering three options, staff recommend a streamlined approach to preparing the strategy.

5. The preparation of the strategy will draw on existing materials, including the results of recent public consultations on the 10-year budget and Auckland Plan and other engagements with specific communities, to develop a first draft for adoption for consultation by December 2018.

6. The draft will focus on outcomes needed for Auckland’s waters across five draft themes: water resources, water and recreation, water and ecosystem health, water and cultural health and water resilience and natural hazards.

7. Feedback on the draft strategy will be analysed in early 2019 before a final version is recommended to this Committee for adoption by June 2019.

8. The preparation of the Auckland’s waters strategy will cost approximately $440,000 in operational expenditure. These funds have been included in the next ten-year budget.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendations

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) note that the Auckland Plan sets the strategic direction for Auckland Council’s work on water.

b) approve the scope of the Auckland’s waters strategy, namely to:

i) establish the outcomes needed for Auckland's waters, across the five draft themes (water resources, water and recreation, water and ecosystem health, water and cultural health, and water resilience and natural hazards)

ii) outline the issues, opportunities and challenges to achieving those outcomes

iii) identify and prioritise strategic actions for long-term water infrastructure decisions through robust option assessment approaches, including funding approaches, methods and resilience for infrastructure delivery, public health impacts and regulatory tools
iv) articulate the council group’s direction and strategic approach to water management through adoption of a complete strategy by June 2019.

c) approve the targeted approach to engagement for Auckland’s waters strategy, using the feedback gathered through the Auckland Plan and 10-year budget processes to develop an initial draft of the strategy.

d) confirm that the Auckland’s Waters Political Reference Group be made up of the Chair of Environment and Community Committee, the Deputy Mayor, and the chairs of Watercare, Auckland Transport and a representative of the Kaitiaki Forum.

e) note that the cost of delivering the strategy is approximately $440,000 in operational expenditure and that budget for this is included in the draft Long-term Plan 2018-2028.

Horopaki / Context

Background

9. The health of Auckland’s waters is a significant issue. Decades of pressure have had negative impacts on water quality, and on freshwater and marine environments. This pressure will continue to increase if changes are not made to the way that water is valued and managed. Population growth and climate change will further amplify the challenges, with greater demand for water services, and an increased risk of flooding and coastal inundation.

10. The Auckland Plan’s Focus Area Five identifies the need to proactively adapt to a changing water future and develop long-term solutions. Other focus areas speak to the need to future-proof Auckland’s infrastructure, make sustainable choices, and fully account for past and future impacts of growth.

11. This reflects the challenges of water management in Auckland and responds to various legislative drivers, such as the Resource Management Act and Public Health Act. It also responds to public opinion. Aucklanders have clearly signalled that they want healthy waterways and beaches, and reliable water supply and wastewater systems.

12. The development of the Auckland’s waters strategy was initiated at the Environment and Community Committee meeting on 12 September 2017. The committee noted that water is often described and managed in a compartmentalised way, breaking water into different categories, such as stormwater, wastewater and drinking water. An overarching strategy for Auckland’s waters, in all their forms, was identified as a way of ensuring the full range of desired outcomes for water are defined and achieved in an integrated way.

13. The concept of an Auckland’s waters strategy was further endorsed at the Finance and Performance Committee meetings on 6 November 2017 as part of the response to the Three Waters: Value for Money: Section 17A review, and again on 27 February 2018.


15. A number of key drivers also give weight to the timely development of this strategy. These include heightened public awareness of water quality risks and strong support for improvements to water quality through the ten-year budget, central government initiatives (such as the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management and the Department of Internal Affairs review of three waters outcomes) and the need to update existing strategies due to significant population growth.
Development of the strategy is able to draw on existing extensive work undertaken by the council and council controlled organisations. Various water-related strategic plans, asset management plans and work programmes are already in place in different parts of the council group.

The value of the Auckland’s waters strategy will be in framing and aligning the different water-related activities of the council group with the outcomes of the Auckland Plan. This will enable more coherent decision-making and investment planning, while catering for a changing water future. The strategy will also set the direction for the council group, offering guidance for how utilities and infrastructure are planned and managed.

It is expected that the Auckland’s waters strategy will define the approach to water taken in other strategies and subordinate plans as they are subsequently developed and reviewed. For example, the Auckland's waters strategy will precede the changes to the Unitary Plan that will be required under the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management.

Since the programme’s initiation in September 2017, staff have developed a draft work programme, as well as undertaking preliminary analytical work. This includes resolving the intersection of the strategy with the section 17A review, mapping the council group’s water-related activities, and analysing the public feedback on the proposed Auckland Plan and 10-year budget.

Now that the Auckland Plan has been adopted, and water quality issues are high on the public agenda, it is timely to develop an Auckland’s waters strategy that can provide a strategic focus on water.

Political Oversight

An Auckland’s Waters Political Reference Group has been established to provide political guidance on the strategy, guide input from decision making bodies and resolve any cross-project, cross council group issues.

The political reference group’s membership consists of:

- Chair of the Environment and Community Committee - Councillor Penny Hulse (Chair)
- Deputy Mayor – Councillor Bill Cashmore
- A representative if the Kaitiaki Forum - Tame Te Rangi
- Chair of Watercare – Dr. Margaret Devlin,
- Chair of Auckland Transport - Lester Levy.

The group has met once and has provided feedback on the proposed programme of work described in this agenda report. Feedback so far has shown a clear preference for a focused and quick programme of work that defines successful outcomes for Auckland’s waters, identifies accountabilities, and has the potential to continue to develop over time.

This report asks the committee to confirm the establishment and membership of this group.

Tātaritanga me ngā tohutohu / Analysis and advice

Proposed purpose and scope of the Auckland’s waters strategy

The Auckland’s waters strategy will provide strategic direction and priorities for the council group in how we meet the challenges and opportunities for improved water management. It will recognise the links of water to our natural, rural and urban environments, and to the health and wellbeing of Aucklanders. The strategy will provide a framework that promotes a holistic and collaborative approach to decision making.
26. The Auckland’s waters strategy is proposed to:
   i) include water in all its forms, including natural surface waters, stormwater, wastewater, drinking water, groundwater, estuarine waters, and marine waters;
   ii) recognise mana whenua values and knowledge, and their role as kaitiaki of Auckland’s waters;
   iii) establish the outcomes needed for Auckland’s waters, and how those will support delivery of the Auckland Plan;
   iv) describe the challenges and opportunities for achieving these outcomes, including growth, climate change and the need for water resilience;
   v) articulate the council group’s direction and approach to water management, including:
      - identifying and prioritising the key strategic actions and activities needed to deliver water outcomes
      - setting water outcomes for inclusion in other relevant strategies, policies and plans
      - providing strategic direction that enables the council’s water services to meet customer expectations for levels of service both now and in the long term
      - recognising the diverse range of partners and stakeholders involved and identifying the potential for collaboration to achieve water outcomes.

Options for preparation of the strategy

27. Three options have been considered for the scope, timeframe and funding of the Auckland’s waters strategy, to meet the objectives above. These are outlined in Table One below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option one: Full collaborative strategy</th>
<th>Option two: Streamlined strategy</th>
<th>Option three: Three waters strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Strategy would offer an all-inclusive view of water in the Auckland region. Would address all waters and secure widespread public engagement by using a full collaborative process, similar to Sea Change – Tai Timu Tai Pari.</td>
<td>Strategy would identify the top-line issues and outcomes for water, including setting regional targets and other relevant outcomes. Existing materials and consultations would be used to consolidate a draft strategy from previously stated positions, supported by targeted engagement with key stakeholders and the public. Written to be reviewed in line with Auckland Plan process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy would focus on asset management and infrastructure planning for drinking water, waste water and stormwater only. Emphasis on utility (district council) functions related to water. Public engagement likely to emphasise questions about council management and levels of service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Auckland’s waters strategy: Proposed scope, timeframe and budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Five years</th>
<th>One year</th>
<th>One year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding (est. operational expenditure)</td>
<td>Several millions / Unquantified</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$1.5M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advantages**

- A comprehensive approach with wide-rangeing stakeholder buy-in.
- Part one of a staged approach to the many strategic actions needed to address water issues. Would determine and communicate the overall direction quickly, with emphasis on outcomes. Detailed implementation and implications would continue to be developed after the strategy is agreed.
- There is ample existing evidence, experience and recorded public input to underpin such an approach.
- Clear link to the business of council, as it relates to utilities, where council may have the most direct influence over outcomes.
- Aligns with the Department of Internal Affairs Three Waters Review.

**Disadvantages**

- Incomplete evidence base would delay development of the strategy.
- Breadth of strategy and level of detail required could become unwieldy and take too long to complete.
- Would raise perception that extensive recent public feedback was not utilised for this purpose.
- Potentially difficult to get broad based consensus.
- Risk of scope creep and challenging to find a balance between comprehensiveness and clarity.
- Streamlined approach to development of draft strategy may not capture all stakeholders’ views.
- Focus is limited to district council utility functions – does not encompass regional or unitary council functions or take a holistic approach. Limited asset management approach. Does not address other parts of the water cycle, and related actions, for example land use planning and community-led programmes.

28. The option recommended to this Committee and also favoured by the Political Reference Group is Option Two: a streamlined strategy. This approach will allow staff to move quickly and efficiently, drawing on existing materials, including the results of recent public consultations, to develop a draft strategy. This will be developed in consultation with mana whenua and local boards and identify agreed outcomes for water, within the frame of the Auckland Plan.

29. A streamlined approach (Option Two) would still involve targeted engagement with key communities, water infrastructure providers and other relevant parties on the draft strategy, but would not require the full collaborative approach and heavy resource requirements outlined in Option One. Taking this approach will be more cost-effective, avoid consultation fatigue and allow the council to adopt a strategy sooner (compared to Option One).
30. Option Two is preferred to Option Three, as it takes a more holistic view of water systems, rather than limiting its focus to the assets that the council group manages. Option Three, which would be primarily focused on district council utility functions, would not be consistent with the Auckland Plan, which seeks a more integrated approach.

**Proposed draft themes**

31. It is proposed to adopt the same value-based thematic structure as has been used nationally for the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management, with an added theme to address natural hazards and resilience. This will ensure consistency with other work programmes (including the council’s work on the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management), and limit ‘double handling’ of information. The five major value themes proposed are:

   i. Water resources – this theme will include a long-term approach to securing potable water supply and public health priorities, allocation of water for extractive uses such as irrigation, water efficiency and resilience, and water supply customer service levels;

   ii. Water and recreation – includes the issue of swimmability in our waterways and public health risk, and pathogen management from surface runoff, as well as point sources. It will consider other water quality attributes such as turbidity, E. coli, cyanobacteria and access to waterways;

   iii. Water and ecosystem health – includes issues such as the cumulative effects of sedimentation, habitat loss, dissolved metals and nutrient pollution, urban stream syndrome and stream health;

   iv. Water and cultural health – the Māori world view of water aligns with an integrated and holistic approach to water management – an approach that is also reflected in the Auckland Plan. There are specific cultural objectives and values that a water strategy will need to encompass, such as improved water quality – Te Mana o Te Wai, realising the holistic value of water resources, and fostering enduring iwi relationships that support their role as kaitiaki of water bodies;

   v. Water resilience and natural hazards – includes issues of flooding, erosion, drought and climate change.

**Connection with Section 17A review**

32. The Three Waters section 17A review was reported to the Finance and Performance Committee on 6 November 2017 and recommended the development of a Three Waters Strategy for stormwater, water supply and wastewater services as a mean to deliver efficiencies across the water operations of the council group.

33. Subsequently the operational and strategic elements of the section 17A recommendations have been separated. The strategic recommendations will be addressed through the development of the Auckland’s waters strategy to be overseen by the Environment and Community Committee.

34. Simultaneously, a joint working team has been established to progress the findings of the section 17A review relating to joint procurement, capital planning, and operations and maintenance. Anticipated savings and a brief action plan for achieving these will be provided to the Finance and Performance Committee in June 2018.

35. Recommendations of the section 17A review relating to economic regulation, the operating model for all water services and consolidation of environmental regulation will be progressed post-completion of the Auckland’s waters strategy. These will also be informed by the central government’s Three Waters Review.
Ngā whakaaweawe ā-rohe me ngā tirohanga a te poari ā-rohe / Local impacts and local board views

36. Local boards have a strong interest in improving water quality across the Auckland region and currently fund many local projects focused on riparian planting and restoration of waterways.

37. Staff attended a Local Board Chairs meeting on 13 November 2017 to introduce the concept of the strategy and expected range of activities arising from the strategy. Board chairs indicated their interest in continued involvement.

38. Local boards will be consulted on the development of the draft Auckland’s waters strategy before it is submitted to this Committee for approval for public consultation in December 2018.

Stakeholder views

39. A detailed engagement plan to capture community views will be developed once the scope of the strategy is agreed. In broad terms, the engagement plan will:

- make the most of the thousands of submissions and feedback points already provided by the community, local boards and mana whenua on water related issues (most recently for the Auckland Plan and ten-year budget consultations. It will also draw on other documents such as iwi management plans and earlier engagements with specific communities on the network discharge consent or water infrastructure projects in their area

- provide opportunities for further, targeted engagement with key stakeholders, such as water infrastructure providers, the rural sector, and environmental groups (e.g., the Stop Auckland Sewerage Overflows Coalition), in developing the details of the draft strategy

- provide for a period of public consultation on the draft strategy in early 2019 before the final strategy is recommended for adoption by June 2019.

Tauākī whakaaweawe Māori / Māori impact statement

40. Mauri (life force) is a fundamental concept of the Māori worldview. The state of mauri is an indicator of overall environmental, cultural and social wellbeing. All water sources have an inherent mauri that can be diminished or enhanced.

41. Enhancing the mauri of waterways is of key significance to mana whenua in their role as kaitiaki of Auckland’s waters. Early engagement with mana whenua to promote kaitiakitanga and embed mana whenua values into this work will be critical to the success of the actions outlined in this report.

42. Development of the Auckland’s waters strategy has been workshopped with the Mana Whenua Kaitiaki Governance Forum. The forum requested that one of their members be included on the governance group for the development of the strategy. This has been achieved through development of the Auckland’s Water Political Reference Group for the strategy, as described above.

43. Mana whenua will also be consulted on the strategy throughout the development, consultation and adoption process.

Ngā ritenga ā-pūtea / Financial implications

44. The section 17A review estimated the cost of a separate Three Waters Policy and Strategy to be in the order of $1.5 million. After developing a more detailed draft programme of work for the Auckland’s waters strategy, staff have identified that a number of key tasks can be internalised and integrated within existing budgets and work programmes.
45. The budget estimate for delivering the draft programme of work for the Auckland’s waters strategy is $440,000. While significantly lower than undertaking independent development of a strategy, as envisaged by the section 17A review, there are still additional costs that cannot be absorbed by the existing programmes.

46. The funding for this programme of work is an operational expense, primarily for staff time, consultation and engagement. Professional services will be required to backfill for staff involved in the programme at its various stages. Resources will also be necessary for public engagement, including publication and communication materials and workshop facilitation with stakeholders.

47. An allowance for peer review and analysis of options has also been included to ensure there is some extra oversight, for example, in terms of economic analysis and feasibility.

48. Estimates of key costs are as follows:
   - backfill for existing staff across council family - $155,000
   - consultation and engagement and publication - $175,000
   - peer review and analysis - $75,000
   - contingency - $35,000.

49. Budget for development of the strategy has been included in the draft ten-year budget which will be approved by the council in June 2018.

Ngā raru tūpono / Risks

50. An initial risk assessment for the programme has been carried out, as shown in Table Two below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table two: Auckland’s waters programme risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ngā koringa ā-muri / Next steps

51. The next steps for the strategy development are outlined in Figure One below.

**Figure one. Timeframe and actions to complete Auckland's waters strategy**

- **June 2018**
  - Develop a strategic summary of water related outcomes within the Auckland Plan
  - Identify integrated water outcomes
  - Finalise communication and engagement plan

- **July to Oct 2018**
  - High level regional options are developed and assessed for the five draft themes in consultation with mana whenua, local boards and key stakeholders.

- **Dec 2018**
  - Draft Auckland's waters strategy presented to Environment and Community Committee for approval for release for public consultation.

- **Feb to April 2018**
  - Targeted public engagement on the draft Auckland's waters strategy in February to March 2018.
  - Feedback analysed and presented to elected members in April 2018.

- **June 2019**
  - Final strategy presented to Environment and Community Committee for adoption.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments

There are no attachments for this report.
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Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To note progress on the forward work programme - Attachment A.
2. To provide a public record of memos, workshop or briefing papers that have been distributed for the Committee’s information since 8 May 2018.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
3. This is regular information-only report which aims to provide public visibility of information circulated to committee members via memo or other means, where no decisions are required.
4. The following papers/memos were circulated to members:
   - 20180501_Global Engagement Activity update – May 2018
   - 20180502_Sexual Orientation submission
   - 20180523_Aucklanders and the Arts
   - 20180601_Memo re Inter-regional Marine Pest Pathway Management Plan
   - 20180601_Global Engagement Activity update – June 2018
   - 20180606_Update on Integrated Climate Action Plan

Note that staff will not be present to answer questions about the items referred to in this summary. Committee members should direct any questions to the authors.
5. This document can be found on the Auckland Council website, at the following link: http://infocouncil.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/
   - at the top of the page, select meeting “Environment and Community Committee” from the drop-down tab and click ‘View’;
   - under ‘Attachments’, select either the HTML or PDF version of the document entitled ‘Extra Attachments’.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:
   a) receive the information report.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
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### ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEE FORWARD WORK PROGRAMME 2018

This committee deals with strategy and policy decision-making that relates to the environmental, social, economic and cultural activities of Auckland as well as matters that are not the responsibility of another committee or the Governing Body.

**Priorities for 2018**

1. **Clear demonstration that Auckland is making progress with climate change adaptation and mitigation and taking action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions**
2. **Enable green growth with a focus on improved water quality, pest eradication and ecological restoration**
3. **Strengthen communities and enable Aucklanders to be active and connected**
4. **Make measurable progress towards the social and community aspects of housing all Aucklanders in secure, healthy homes they can afford**
5. **Grow skills and a local workforce to support economic growth in Auckland**

The work of the committee will:

- Deliver on the outcomes in the Auckland Plan
- Be focused on initiatives that have a high impact
- Meet the Council’s statutory obligations, including funding allocation decisions
- Increase the public’s trust and confidence in the organisation.

### Updated 01/06/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY17/18 FY18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar Apr-Jun Jul-Sep Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Feb 10 April 10 July 16 Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 March 8 May 14 Aug 13 Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 June 11 Sept 4 Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strategic approach to Climate Change</td>
<td>To demonstrate that Auckland is making progress with climate change adaptation and mitigation and taking action to reduce emissions.</td>
<td><strong>Strategic direction</strong> will be provided in the coming months.</td>
<td>Q3 (Feb) Q4 Q1 (Sept) Q2 (Dec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low carbon living</td>
<td>To deliver on Low Carbon Auckland Plan commitments by the design and implementation of awareness raising and incentives programmes to reduce household, community, business and schools carbon emissions by approximately 50% of current levels.</td>
<td><strong>Strategic direction and endorse</strong> programmes as part of the Low Carbon Auckland Plan implementation.</td>
<td>Report was considered at 20/2/18 meeting. Res ENV/2018/11 report back in Dec18 for a decision. Independent Advisory Group (IAG) was approved. Chairs Planning and Env &amp; Community Cttees, an IMSB member and the Mayor’s office to decide on the membership of the IAG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low Carbon Auckland / Climate Change</td>
<td>Four-yearly review of strategic action plan due in 2018; increased engagement with and commitments via C40</td>
<td><strong>Decision and endorsement</strong> of strategic direction</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority #</td>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</td>
<td>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Cities membership; development of proactive policy agenda to central government emerging</td>
<td>Progress to date: Report was considered at 20/2/18 meeting. Res ENV/2018/11 report back in Dec18 for a decision. Independent Advisory Group was approved. Workshops scheduled: 4/7/18 and 26/09/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Climate Plan Workshop</td>
<td>Risks and vulnerabilities</td>
<td>Committee workshop on risks and vulnerabilities</td>
<td>FY17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Climate Plan Workshop</td>
<td>Prioritisation criteria and identified actions</td>
<td>Cost benefit and total value analysis</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Draft Climate Plan to Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review all actions</td>
<td>(June)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Final Adoption of Climate Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft plan</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Urban Forest Strategy</td>
<td>Strategic approach to delivering on the wider social, economic and environmental benefits of a growing urban forest in the context of rapid population growth and intensification.</td>
<td>Decision: Adopt the Final Adopon of Climate Plan (Mar 2019)</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>Waste Management and Minimisation Plan Review</td>
<td>To adopt a new Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.</td>
<td>Decision: A Waste Political Advisory Group was established</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution ENV/2016/6 Item 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Plan was adopted for consultation on 5/12/17. Res ENV/2017/185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCP process in April for June meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund</td>
<td>Decision making over medium and large funds from the Waste Minimisation and Innovation fund in line with the fund’s adopted policy. Funds to contribute towards council’s aspirational goal of zero waste to landfill by 2040.</td>
<td>Decision on the annual allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund for the 2018-2019 financial year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong> Decision: Approval of allocation of September 2016 funding round Resolution ENV/2016/19 Item C5. Approval of grants in Dec 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regional Pest Management Plan review</td>
<td>Statutory obligations under the Biosecurity Act to control weeds and animal pests. To ensure that the plan is consistent with the national policy direction and up to date.</td>
<td>Decision and strategic direction on weed and plants that will be subject to statutory controls. Consider submissions received on the draft plan in mid 2018 and adopt the final plan by December 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong> Decision: Agreed to the inconsistencies in ACT at the 14 Feb 2017 ENV/2017/7 Item 12. Workshops held on 4/04/17, 3/05/17 and 27/09/17. Draft plan was approved for consultation in Nov 2017. Funding for implementation of the proposed RPMP through LTP. Forward process and adoption scheduled in July 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan</td>
<td>To ensure the plan is consistent with Auckland Council’s: - proposed Regional Pest Management Plan - current and future marine biosecurity programmes - response to SeaChange – Tai Timu Tai Pari Hauraki Gulf Marine Spatial Plan.</td>
<td>Decision on the development of the discussion document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan for public consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong> A memo was distributed on 31/05/18 advising the committee on the Auckland Council’s participation in the development of a discussion document for an inter-regional marine pest pathway management plan, through the Top of the North Marine Biosecurity partnership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment A

#### Item 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>Allocation of the Regional Natural Heritage Grant</td>
<td>Decision-making over regional environment fund as per the grants funding policy and fund guidelines</td>
<td>Decision on the annual allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund for the 2018-2019 financial year.</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 (Dec)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progress to date:**
Allocation of the Regional Environmental Natural Heritage Grant for the 2017-2018 financial year was made on 6 Dec 2016_ENV/2016/11 Item 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management</td>
<td>The National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management is being implemented, with periodic reporting to council committee on progress, and responding to ongoing central government refinement of the framework for achieving water outcomes.</td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong> Council submission was approved on Central Govt. Clean Water Consultation 2017 process: Minutes of 4 April ENV/2017/54 Item 12. Follow up is required for resolution b) — a workshop held on 14 June. A supplementary submission on the Clean Water Consultation package was made on 25 May 2017, Item 14 13/06/17 Decision ENV/2018/14 on engagement approach for consultation on the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management in Feb 2018.</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 (Dec)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In December 2018 further decisions will be sought under the national policy statement, including:
- approve final targets for swim-ability of major rivers in the Auckland region
- approve the updated Progressive Implementation Plan for the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Food Policy Alliance</td>
<td>To consider food policy alliance</td>
<td>Decision on food policy alliance</td>
<td>Q3 (Mar) TBC Q2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 and 2    | Auckland Growing Greener | Statutory obligations under the Resource Management Act, Biosecurity Act and Local Government Act. Consideration of items to give effect to the adopted commitment of Auckland Council to grow greener. | **Strategic direction** and oversight into council’s role to improve the natural environment, and to endorse proposed incentives. This may include **endorsing:**
- a framework to ensure planning and growth decisions are underpinned by relevant environmental data
- proposed incentives for green growth
- recommendations arising from a current state statutory obligations review. | Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hunua Aerial 1080 Operation</td>
<td>Provide information on outcomes of the Hunua 1080 aerial pest control operation</td>
<td>To note outcomes of the Hunua 1080 aerial pest control operation.</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 (Nov)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sport and Rec Strategic Partnership Grant to Aktive Auck Sports Rec</td>
<td>Approval of $552,000 strategic partnership grant to Aktive Auck &amp; Sport to deliver on agreed priority initiatives.</td>
<td>To approve the $552,000 strategic partnership grant to Aktive Auckland Sport &amp; Recreation for 2017/2018 Progress to date: Report was considered 5/12/17 Resolution ENV/2017/186 – report back against KPI every six months.</td>
<td>Q4 (Jun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Te Motu a Hiaroa (Puketutu Island)</td>
<td>Status update on the Te Motu a Hiaroa Governance Trust</td>
<td>To note further update on progress of the governance trust</td>
<td>Q1 (Jul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sport and Recreation Strategic Action Plan</td>
<td>Status report on implementation plan</td>
<td>Direction on future options for sport and recreation.</td>
<td>Q3 Q1 Q2 (Nov)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sports Investment Plan</td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcomes, priorities and investment in sports</td>
<td>Decision on issues papers Draft Plan approval Finalise and adopt investment plan Progress to date: Evaluation of current sports facilities investments and proposed changes was adopted on 14 March, resolution ENV/2017/39 Item 2, with the final draft investment plan to be adopted prior to consultation. An outcome measurement tool to support the Sports Facilities Investment Plan was considered and agreed at the 4 April 2017 meeting. Resolution ENV/2017/50 Item 9 The findings of the pilot will be reported in mid-2019 seeking a decision on the roll-out model.</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 (2019) Q1 Q2 (Nov)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Golf Investment Plan</td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcomes, priorities and investment in golf.</td>
<td>Decision on issues papers Draft Plan approval Finalise and adopt investment plan Progress to date: Confidential workshop held 13/06/17 (what future for golf).</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 (Sep) Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Indoor Courts</td>
<td>Strategic business case for indoor courts investment</td>
<td>Decision on investment approach</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 (Aug) Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>Priority #</td>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Western Springs Community School Partnership</td>
<td>Improve Community Access to school facilities</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on Business and Investment in indoor court facility at Western Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Growth Programme</td>
<td>Update on proposed growth funding allocation for 2018-2020</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on growth funding allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regional Sports Grants</td>
<td>Improving monitoring and evaluation of sports grants</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on monitoring and evaluation framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regional Sport and Recreation grants programme 2018/2020</td>
<td>Review of previous grants allocation and recommendation for next round</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on sport and recreation grants programme objectives and approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012: TOR</td>
<td>The review will assess the efficacy of the guidelines in for the council to deliver the best possible outcomes for Auckland through community leases</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on the terms of reference for the review of the Community Occupancy Guidelines 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Active Recreation Investment and Visitor Experience</td>
<td>Council’s strategic approach to outcome, priorities and investment for active walking, cycling, waterways and visitor experience on open space, parks and regional parks</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on scope and phasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Takaro – Investing in Play discussion</td>
<td>Development of a play investment plan</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> on approval for public release</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regional Parks Management Plan 2010 – variation to incorporate land at Piha into the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park</td>
<td>To approve variation to incorporate land purchased at Piha to be known as Taitomo Special Management Zone as part of the Waitākere Ranges Regional Park</td>
<td>Decision on approval to a variation</td>
<td>Progress to date: Approved on 20/2/2018 Res ENV/2018/15 report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

1. **The Southern Initiative (TSI)**
   - Provide an update on the TSI approach, priorities and achievements.
   - **Strategic direction** of the TSI approach to social and community innovation in south Auckland
   - Progress to date: Approved on 20/2/2018 Res ENV/2018/15 report
   - Manager, Regional Parks, will prepare an integrated vegetation management and fire-risk reduction plan in consultation with the local community and report back on the resourcing needs for its effective implementation.
   - FY17/18: Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2
   - FY18/19: Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2

5. **Global Engagement Strategy**
   - Provide an update and direction of Auckland Council’s global engagement strategy and priorities. It has been three years since a new strategic direction was introduced, progress on this strategy will presented.
   - **Strategic direction** of Auckland Council’s global engagement strategy and priorities
   - Progress to date: Monthly global engagement updates are published on each agenda
   - FY17/18: Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2
   - FY18/19: Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2

5. **International Education Framework**
   - Provide strategic direction to ATEED through its consideration of options for growing the international education sector.
   - **Strategic direction** relating to international education. ATEED has responsibility for growing the international education market in Auckland.
   - **Workshop to be scheduled**
   - FY17/18: Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2
   - FY18/19: Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2

5. **Local Economic Development Framework**
   - Provide strategic direction to ATEED through its consideration of options for delivering local economic development.
   - **Strategic direction** relating to Local Economic Development. ATEED has responsibility for leading Local Economic development.
   - FY17/18: Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 (tbc)
   - FY18/19: Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2

5. **Auckland Trade Programme**
   - Provide strategic direction to ATEED through its consideration of options for growing Auckland’s trade and exports.
   - **Strategic direction** relating to trade and exports. ATEED has responsibility for supporting the increase of Auckland’s trade competitiveness.
   - FY17/18: Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2
   - FY18/19: Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2

3. **Options to expand**
   - Provide strategic direction to expand revenue streams
   - **Strategic direction** to expand revenue streams to fund future
   - FY17/18: Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2
   - FY18/19: Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2

**Progress to date:**
- Approved on 16/05/17 for public release the discussion document and will report to E&C for approval in late 2017
- Takaro was approved for release on 20 Feb 2018
- A report back by August 18 for approval to initiate public consultation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>revenue streams for sport facilities investment</td>
<td>To fund future sports facilities investment in the draft <em>Sports Facilities Investment Plan</em></td>
<td>sports facilities investment in the draft <em>Sports Facilities Investment Plan</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>A report was considered in Aug. Res ENV/2017/121</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community Facilities Network Plan</td>
<td>Update on progress and report back on strategic business case for central west.</td>
<td>Decision on indicative business case for central west</td>
<td>Q3 (Mar) Q4 Q1 (July) Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priorities Plan</td>
<td>Develop and endorse the <em>Sports Facilities Investment Plan</em> to enable Auckland Council to take a more co-ordinated approach to its sports facilities investment.</td>
<td>Decision on the Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priorities Plan. Decision on sector’s investment priorities and investigate potential funding options.</td>
<td>Q1 (Sept) Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>Implementing Regional Policy and Strategy resolution to progress work around Council’s strategic position on addressing homelessness (note this work will be informed by discussions at the Community Development and Safety Committee)</td>
<td>Decision on scope Decision on role and direction addressing homelessness</td>
<td>Q3 (Feb) Q4 Q1 (Aug) Q2 TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Facilities Partnerships</td>
<td>Identify the range of current council approaches to facility partnerships, issues, opportunities and agree next steps</td>
<td>Decision on facility partnership approach Decision to adopt Facility Partnership Framework in December 2017</td>
<td>Q3 (Feb) Q4 Q1 (Dec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Citizens Advice Bureaux Services</td>
<td>Review of the Citizens Advice Bureaux Services</td>
<td>Decision on review results</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 (Feb/M)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOCIAL, COMMUNITY, CULTURAL INFRASTRUCTURE**

3. Community Facilities Network Plan

2. Auckland Sport Sector: Facility Priorities Plan

4. Homelessness

3. Facilities Partnerships

3. Citizens Advice Bureaux Services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress to date:</td>
<td>FY17/18 FY18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSP decision in April 2016 [REG/2016/22]</td>
<td>Strategic overview of social and community housing initiatives. Wider housing portfolio and spatial outcomes of council’s role in housing is led by the Planning Committee.</td>
<td><strong>Progress to date:</strong> Report was considered at 20 Feb meeting. Decision: lies on the table. A supplementary report was considered on 10 April 2018, Res ENV/2018/48 and with changes for an updated funding model to be agreed by 1 April 2019</td>
<td>Jan-Mar 20 Feb 13 March Apr-Jun 10 April 8 May 12 June Jul-Sep 10 July 14 Aug 11 Sept Oct-Dec 16 Oct 13 Nov 4 Dec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Social and Community Housing Strategy and initiatives</td>
<td>Understanding NZ and international interventions to address affordable housing</td>
<td>Decision on future Auckland Council approaches to affordable housing interventions</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Intervention</td>
<td>Libraries and Information is carrying out a change programme (Fit for the future) to accelerate the implementation of this 2013-2023 strategy (approved by the Governing Body)</td>
<td>Direction relating to priorities and to receive update on strategic direction and implementation progress Decide whether Auckland should be a member of the network</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 (Sep) Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Te Kauroa – Library Strategy</td>
<td>A strategic review of the Central Library has been commissioned to understand how the current building can meet future need and demand for services, assess the Central Library’s current and potential future role in the region, and guide decision making about future investment and development opportunities</td>
<td>Decide direction and receive the strategic review</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Central library strategic review</td>
<td>Work around the integration with customer services</td>
<td>Decision on matters relating to regional aspects of the proposed integration (local boards will decide on local outcomes)</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Consideration of a proposal to join the Intercultural Cities Network to support implementation and monitoring of progress on ‘Inclusive Auckland’ actions.</td>
<td>Decide whether Auckland should be a member of the network</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 (Jun) Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Intercultural Cities Network</td>
<td>Identify issues and opportunities for an inclusive friendly city (Regional Policy and Strategy resolution REG/2016/92)</td>
<td>Strategic direction on the approach to a friendly, inclusive, diverse city. Progress to date: Update reports were circulated on 18 April 2018 and 14 Dec 2017. Staff report findings and the proposed next phase in 2018.</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 (July) Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority #</td>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</td>
<td>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and 5</td>
<td>Social Enterprise approaches for youth and long term unemployed</td>
<td>Improved understanding of social enterprise reach, impacts, costs and benefits</td>
<td>Strategic direction on councils approach to social enterprise.</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 (Jul) Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and 5</td>
<td>Youth volunteer programmes</td>
<td>Intervention assessment of youth volunteer programmes on long term education and employment – understanding impacts, costs and benefits</td>
<td>Strategic direction on interventions approach</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 (Jul) Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Events Policy</td>
<td>A review of what is working well and what isn’t</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 (Sep) Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grant Policy Monitoring</td>
<td>Audit of the application of the Grants Policy</td>
<td>Decision on audit results</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thriving Communities Action Plan</td>
<td>A review of the Action Plan to understand what we are doing well and where there are areas for improvement</td>
<td>Decision on current state results</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 (Jun) Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Toi Whitiki Strategy</td>
<td>Targeted analysis of social return on investment on specific art and culture investment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 (Dec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>Review of the Public Arts Policy: what’s working what’s not. Decisions relating to major public arts</td>
<td>Decision on review results</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2 (Dec)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGISLATION/CENTRAL GOVERNMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>National Environmental Standards</td>
<td>Council response on the National Direction for aquaculture expected following scheduled release of consultation document in April 2017. The National Direction is likely to address matters relating to re-consenting, bay-wide management, innovation and research, and biosecurity.</td>
<td>Direction Committee agreement to a council submission on the National Direction for Aquaculture</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LAND ACQUISITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority #</th>
<th>Area of work</th>
<th>Reason for work</th>
<th>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</th>
<th>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Strategic acquisition issues and opportunities</td>
<td>Understanding current acquisition issues and options.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Land acquisition for</td>
<td>Delegated responsibility of the committee.</td>
<td>Decision to acquire land. Reports will come to committee as</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority #</td>
<td>Area of work</td>
<td>Reason for work</td>
<td>Environment and Community Committee role (decision or direction)</td>
<td>Expected timeframes Quarter (month if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stormwater purposes</td>
<td>To acquire land for stormwater management and development purposes, to either support a structure plan or ad-hoc development.</td>
<td>required. Next report will be in Feb 2018 seeking authority to carry out compulsory acquisition of land in the Henderson area for a flood prevention project.</td>
<td>FY17/18: Jan: 20 Feb, Mar: 13 March&lt;br&gt;Apr-Jun: 10 April, May: 8 May, Jun: 12 June&lt;br&gt;FY18/19: Jul-Sep: 10 July, Aug: 14 Aug, Sep: 11 Sept, Oct-Dec: Oct: 16 Oct, Nov: 13 Nov, Dec: 4 Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>Long-term Plan</td>
<td>Informing the development of the 2018-2028 Auckland Council Long-term Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY17/18: Q3&lt;br&gt;FY18/19: Q4, Q1, Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>Attachment A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am Auckland - Youth Strategy</td>
<td>Implementation of strategy. Identify areas of success and improvement opportunity</td>
<td><strong>Decision:</strong> Approval for the development and an implementation plan was considered on 14 Feb 2017. Resolution ENV/2017/10 Item 15</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UNESCO Auckland City of Music</td>
<td>Decide whether to commit to being a UNESCO City of Music (from Regional and Strategy and Policy resolution REG/2016/70)</td>
<td><strong>Decision:</strong> Endorsement was given at 14 March Resolution ENV/2017/35 Item 10</td>
<td>Q3 (March)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Weed Management Policy Implementation</td>
<td>To ensure implementation of the Weed Management policy occurs, and that how it will be implemented is reported to elected members</td>
<td><strong>Decision:</strong> Appointment by the Mayor to a Political Advisory Group - Committee agenda 14 Feb 2017 Item 23</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>One Voice Auckland Sport and Recreation</td>
<td>One Voice – sector wide advisory group for sport and recreation</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> – Appointment of 3 Elected Members to One Voice: Crs Cooper, Filipaina &amp; W Walker on 4 April – Committee Resolution ENV/2017/53 Item 13</td>
<td>Q3 (Mar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regional Sport and Recreation Grant Programme</td>
<td>Contestable grant programmes</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> – Allocation of the budget 2017/2018 was approved on 4 April Resolution ENV/2017/51 Item 10</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community Access Scheme</td>
<td>Review of Council investment in third party facilities to increase community access</td>
<td><strong>Decision</strong> – Allocation of funding of Community Access grants was approved on 16 May Resolution ENV/2017/73 Item 18</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 (May) Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community School Partnerships</td>
<td>Improve Community Access to school facilities</td>
<td>Decision and direction on investment and development of partnerships with schools Update on Community and School Partnership project was provided 16 May 2017 Item 20 Approval for entering into a partnership agreement with Western Springs College and MOE to secure 4 additional indoor courts for school and community use was granted 15 May 2017 ENV/2017/71 Item 17</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 (May) Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Waste assessment endorsement</td>
<td>The Waste Minimisation Act 2008 requires the committee to endorse the findings of the waste assessment</td>
<td><strong>Endorsement</strong> of Waste Political Advisory Group to progress the implementation of a food waste at 16 May 2017 meeting Item 19 and resolution ENV/2017/74 Item 19 Will be notified alongside the draft waste management plan</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 (May) Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pest Free Auckland</td>
<td>To eliminate weed and animal pests from Auckland</td>
<td>Strategic direction and oversight, and to endorse the programme. An update was provided at 14 March 2017 meeting: Bio News Item 16</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Marine Biosecurity</td>
<td>Statutory obligations under the Biosecurity Act to develop and implement non-regulatory and regulatory programmes to manage marine pests.</td>
<td>Strategic direction and endorse new programmes – for input into Long-term Plan preparation. Included in the Regional Pest Management Plan report</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Implementation of Housing Taskforce</td>
<td>The Housing Taskforce is led by His Worship the Mayor. The taskforce is likely to recommend actions to council and some of these actions may fall under the Environment and Community Committee remit.</td>
<td>Strategic direction on interventions to pursue Governing Body on 27 July 2017 adopted the Housing Taskforce report Item 10</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 and 5</td>
<td>Coastal Erosion Management Strategy</td>
<td>To agree to the actions and tools to improve coastal asset management and prioritised decision-making in respect of climate change, sea-level rise and Auckland’s projected growth.</td>
<td>Decision on the final strategy, approve next steps and the associated work programme(s). Progress to date: Decision 8 August meeting – adopt the coastal management framework approach for the Auckland Region report. Resolution ENV/2017/116. Staff to regularly report back on progress and issues arising from the coastal compartment plans work programme</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>Seachange – Tai Timu Tai Pari</td>
<td>The marine spatial plan for the Hauraki Gulf – Seachange Tai Timu Tai Pari – was completed by the independent stakeholder working group in November 2016. Staff will report on implications of the plan and options for Auckland Council implementation to the Planning Committee. The Environment and Community Committee will likely provide direction and oversee aspects of implementation.</td>
<td>Strategic direction on the spatial plan and implementation actions. Progress to date: The initial assessment was considered at the 2 May Planning Committee meeting, resolution PLA/2017/50 Item 9 Political Ref Group was established. Approval of TOR and work programme was considered in Sept ENV/2017/115</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Te Whau Pathway project</td>
<td>To review and amend the MOU between Auckland Council and the Whau Coastal Walkway Env Trust</td>
<td>MOU amended and endorsed on 14 Feb 2017. Report Res ENV/2017/4 An update report was given on 12 Sept 2017 Res ENV/2017/112</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hauraki Gulf Forum</td>
<td>Possible consideration of recommendations from the Hauraki Gulf Forum arising from the completion of Seachange Tai Timu Tai Pari.</td>
<td>Decisions on governance and/or resourcing arrangements.</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tripartite Economic Alliance</td>
<td>Provide direction on preparation for Guangzhou 2017 Tripartite summit and seek approval for the renewal of the Tripartite Economic Alliance 2017 Tripartite Summit funded out of Global Partnerships and Strategy budget, CCO's budget and through sponsorship.</td>
<td>Direction and approval of the extension of the Tripartite Economic Alliance beyond its initial three year period. Progress to date: Update was provided at 14 March 2017 meeting – summit in Sept 2017 Item 16</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Smoke-free Policy</td>
<td>Improve policy and implementation</td>
<td>Decision on updated Smokefree policy Progress to date: considered the report for adoption at the August meeting. Resolution ENV/2017/113 Approval of the policy on 17 Oct Resolution ENV/2017/142</td>
<td>Q3 Q4 Q1 Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Productivity Commission – inquiry</td>
<td>Decision to proposed key themes for submission to the Productivity Commission’s low emissions economy issues paper. Progress to date: A report was considered on 12 Sept meeting. Endorsed the key themes Resolution ENV/2017/117. Auckland Council submission lodged in Oct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demographic Advisory Panels</td>
<td>Decision Approving demographic advisory panels work programme. Progress to date: Disability and Seniors Advisory Panels work programme were approved in Sept. Ethnic Peoples and Youth Advisory Panels were approved in Oct. Pacific Peoples and Rainbow Panels were approved in Nov.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Open Space management: issues paper</td>
<td>Decision on potential solutions and next steps. Progress to date: Staff have done some work on this item to identify the key issues impacting on open space, however, the final product does not require a decision from the governing body. Aspects of this work have also been superseded by the Governance Review and well as the current review of the Occupancy Guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund</td>
<td>Decision on the annual allocation of the Waste Minimisation and Innovation Fund for the 2017-2018 financial year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>Kauri Dieback</td>
<td>Decision on options for management of Kauri dieback – for input into the Long-term Plan preparation. A decision report was considered on 4 April 2018 Resolution ENV/2018/44.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Decision on air quality action. A report was considered in Feb 2018 for an improved approach to managing Auckland’s compliance with national air quality standards. Staff will develop communications material about air quality that the public can undertake this winter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Destination Auckland Strategy</td>
<td>Strategic direction relating to tourism strategies. ATEED has responsibility for the provision of initiatives in the tourism sector in Auckland. Workshop held in Nov 2017. The destination strategy update was presented at the 13 March 2018. Public launch scheduled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Child Poverty Reduction Bill</td>
<td>The purpose of the bill is “to encourage a focus on child poverty reduction, facilitate political accountability against published targets, require transparent reporting on child poverty levels, and create a greater commitment by Government to address child well-being.”</td>
<td>Direction The aims of the bill are aligned with those of the Auckland Plan and the I Am Auckland strategic action plan, specifically around ensuring equity of opportunity and outcomes for children and young people, and staff suggest a submission in broad support of the bill. Progress to date: A retrospective submission was approved at the 8 May 2018 meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Safeswim</td>
<td>To consider best future options for the delivery of Safeswim</td>
<td>Decision on options for expansion of the Safeswim programme. Progress to date: Endorsed the recommended improvements by 1 Nov to the programme on 14/02/17 meeting. Requested a report on costs and benefits of “white box” model. A further update was provided on 14/03/17 on food safety for seafood gatherers. Progress was presented at Sept meeting – scheduled to go live on 1/11/17. An update was given in 14 Nov. A further update on activity over the summer period will be provided in March 2018 and a decision sought on next steps for Safeswim. This report was considered on 10 April on the findings of the review and endorsed the proposed future direction of Safeswim programme Res ENV/2018/47. Regular updates will be provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Weed Management Policy</td>
<td>Governance group to oversee the implementation of the weed management policy. February 2017</td>
<td>Provide political direction to the Environment and Community Committee and staff in regards to weed management decisions. Report back to the Environment and Community Committee on progress within six months of establishment. An update report was presented in October. An update memo was attached to the 10/04/18 agenda. Public meetings of the Weed Management Advisory Political are scheduled on 4/7/18, 12/09/18 and 5/12/18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Investment into sport field lighting at Pulman Park (Covering report)

File No.: CP2018/09858

Te take mō te pūrongo / Purpose of the report
1. To seek approval for the allocation of $200,000 from the Parks, Sport and Recreation partnerships budget to the Pulman Park Trust towards the installation of permanent flood-lights on up to two sports fields at Pulman Park.

Whakarāpopototanga matua / Executive summary
2. This is a late covering report for the above item. The comprehensive agenda report was not available when the agenda went to print and will be provided prior to the 12 June 2018 meeting.

3. Pulman Park is a sports park in the Papakura Local Board Area which has been developed in partnership between council and the Pulman Park Trust. The Pulman Park Trust operates the park and facilities.

4. The park currently has floodlighting which provides lit training capacity on sports fields, this capacity is primarily utilised by the Ardmore Marist Rugby Club.

5. The lighting capacity at Pulman Park is provided via portable floodlights which do not meet the council service levels and could potentially pose a safety concern as they are not placed in permanent foundations.

6. The Pulman Park Trust put in an long-term Plan submission requesting support for the project to install permanent floodlighting solutions at the park.

7. The Papakura Local Board are to consider a grant of locally delivered initiative toward the development of the project, this will be considered at a local board meeting on 27 June 2018.

Ngā tūtohunga / Recommendation/s
That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) approve a partnership grant of $200,000 from the Parks, Sport and Recreation partnership budget to the Pulman Park Trust as council’s contribution towards the floodlighting of up to two sports fields at Pulman Park.

b) request staff to develop a funding agreement with appropriate requirements including requirements to: construct floodlighting to Auckland Council specifications; ensure community access to lit sports fields; and report annually on performance against KPI’s.

c) delegate the approval of the terms and conditions within the Partnership Agreement to the General Manager Parks, Sport and Recreation.

Ngā tāpirihanga / Attachments
There are no attachments for this report.

Ngā kaihaina / Signatories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Dave Stewart - Manager Sport &amp; Recreation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorisers</td>
<td>Mace Ward - General Manager Parks, Sports and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Koro Dickinson – Lead Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exclusion of the Public: Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

That the Environment and Community Committee:

a) exclude the public from the following part(s) of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution follows.

This resolution is made in reliance on section 48(1)(a) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the particular interest or interests protected by section 6 or section 7 of that Act which would be prejudiced by the holding of the whole or relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting in public, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</th>
<th>Particular interest(s) protected (where applicable)</th>
<th>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
<td>s7(2)(h) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry out, without prejudice or disadvantage, commercial activities. In particular, the report identifies land the council seeks to acquire for open space purposes. s7(2)(i) - The withholding of the information is necessary to enable the local authority to carry on, without prejudice or disadvantage, negotiations (including commercial and industrial negotiations). In particular, the report identifies land the council seeks to acquire for open space purposes.</td>
<td>s48(1)(a) The public conduct of the part of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding exists under section 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>